PATROLOGY

ALPHA INSTITUTE OF THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE
Thalassery, Kerala, India - 670 101
Ph: 0490 2344727, 2343707
Web: www.alphathalassery.org, Email: alphits@gmail.com

Patrology

Title: Patrology
Published by: The Director, Alpha Institute, Archdiocese of Tellicherry, Sandesa Bhavan, Tellicherry, 670 101, Kannur, Kerala
Ph: 0490 - 2344727, 2343707
Published on: 2016 March 27 (Easter Day)

Editorial Board: Rev. Dr. Joseph Pamplany
Rev. Dr. Thomas Kochukarottu
Rev. Fr. Joseph Kakkaramattathil

Office Assistance: Mr. Renjith KC
Mrs. Anitha Vijayan
Mrs. Maneesha Shinoj
Mrs. Jeshitha Vijesh
Design & Layout: Mr. Midhun Thomas
Printing: Vimala Offset Press, Thalassery

Contents

Chapter 1

An Over View of the Patristic Literature

Patrology, the study of the writings of the Fathers of the Church, has more commonly been known as "patristics", or , more commonly still, as "patristic study". Some writers, chiefly in Germany , have distinguished between *patrologia* and *patristica*: Fessler, for instance, defines *patrologia* as the science which provides all that is necessary for the using of the works of the Fathers, dealing, therefore, with their authority, the criteria for judging their genuineness, the difficulties to be met within them, and the rules for their use. But Fessler's own "Institutiones Patrologi" has a lar ger range, as have similar works entitled Patrologies, of which the most serviceable is that of Bardenhewer (tr. Shahan, Freiburg, 1908). On the other hand, Fessler describes *patristica* as that theological science by which all that concerns faith, morals, or discipline in the writings of the Fathers is collected and sorted. Lastly, the lives and works of the Fathers are described by another science: literary history. These distinctions are not much observed, nor do they seem very necessary; they are nothing else than aspects of patristic study as it forms part of fundamental theology, of positive theology, and of literary history. Another meaning of the word

patrologia has come to it from the title of the great collections of the complete works of the Fathers published by the Abbé Migne, "Patrologia Latina", 221 vols., and "Patrologia Græca", 161 vols.

Patristic literature is generally identified today with the entire Christian literature of the early Christian centuries, excluding the New Testament, written by Christians before the 8th century AD, irrespective of its orthodoxy or the reverse. Taken literally, however, patristic literature should denote the literature emanating from the Fathers of the Christian Church, the Fathers being those respected bishops and other teachers of exemplary life who witnessed to and expounded the orthodox faith in the early centuries. This would be in line with the ancient practice of designating as "the Fathers" prominent church teachers of past generations who had taken part in ecumenical councils or whose writings were appealed to as authoritative. Almost everywhere, however, this restrictive definition has been abandoned. There are several reasons why a more elastic usage is to be welcomed. One is that some of the most exciting Christian authors, such as Origen, were of questionable orthodoxy, and others-Tertullian, for example-deliberately left the church. Another is that the undoubtedly orthodox Fathers themselves cannot be properly understood in isolation from their doctrinally unorthodox contemporaries. Most decisive is the consideration that early Christian literature exists, and deserves to be studied, as a whole and that much will be lost if any sector is neglected because of supposed doctrinal shortcomings.

1. The ante-Nicene period

During the first three centuries of its existence the Christian Church had first to emerge from the Jewish environment that had cradled it and then come to terms with the predominantly Hellenistic (Greek) culture surrounding it. Its legal position at best precarious, it was exposed to outbursts of persecution at the very time when it was working out its distinctive system of beliefs, defining its position vis-à-vis Judaism on the one hand and Gnosticism (a heretical movement that upheld the dualistic view that matter is evil and the spirit good) on the other, and constructing its characteristic organization and ethic. It was a period of flux and experiment, but also one of consolidation and growing self-confidence, and these are all mirrored in its literature.

The Apostolic Fathers

According to conventional reckoning, the earliest examples of patristic literature are the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers; the name derives from their supposed contacts with the Apostles or the apostolic community. These writings include the church order called the *Didachc*, or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*(dealing with church practices and morals), the *Letter of Barnabas*, and the*Shepherd of Hermas*, all of which hovered at times on the fringe of the New Testament canon in that they were used as sacred scripture by some local churches; the *First Letter of Clement*, the seven letters that Ignatius of Antioch (d. *c*.110) wrote when being escorted to Rome for his martyrdom, the related *Letter to the Philippians* by Polycarp of Smyrna (d. *c*. 156 or 168), and the narrative report of Polycarp's martyrdom; some fragmentary accounts of the origins of the Gospels byPapias (fl. late 1st or early 2nd century AD), bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, Asia Minor; and an ancient homily (sermon) known as the *Second Letter of Clement*. They all belong to the late 1st or early 2nd century and were all to a greater or lesser extent influenced (sometimes by way of reaction) by the profoundly Jewish atmosphere that pervaded Christian thinking and practice at this primitive stage. For this reason alone, modern scholars tend to regard them as a somewhat arbitrarily selected group. A more scientific assessment would place them in the context of a much wider contemporary Jewish-Christian literature that has largely disappeared but whose character can be judged from pseudepigraphal (or noncanonical) works such as the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Odes of Solomon*, and certain extracanonical texts modeled on the New Testament.

Even with this qualification the Apostolic Fathers, with their rich variety of provenance and genre (types), illustrate the difficult doctrinal and organizational problems with which the church grappled in those transitional generations. Important among these problems were the creation of a ministerial hierarchy and of an accepted structure of ecclesiastical authority. The *Didachc*, which is Syrian in background and possibly the oldest of these documents, suggests a phase when Apostles and prophets were still active but when the routine ministry of bishops and deacons was already winning recognition. The *First Letter of Clement*, an official letter from the Roman to the Corinthian Church, reflects the more advanced state of a collegiate episcopate, with its

shared authority among an assembly of bishops. This view of authority was supported by an emergent theory of apostolic succession in which bishops were regarded as jurisdictional heirs of the early Apostles. The *First Letter of Clement* is also instructive in showing that the Roman Church, even in the late 1st century, was asserting its right to intervene in the affairs of other churches. The letters of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch at the beginning of the 2nd century, depict the position of the monarchical bishop, flanked by subordinate presbyters (priests) and deacons (personal assistants to the bishop), which had been securely established in Asia Minor.

Almost more urgent was the question of the relation of Christianity to Judaism, and in particular of the Christian attitude toward the Old Testament. In the *Didachc* there is little sign of embarrassment; Jewish ethical material is taken over with suitable adaptations, and the Jewish basis of the liturgical elements is palpable. But with *Barnabas* the tension becomes acute; violently anti-Jewish, the Alexandrian author substitutes allegorism (use of symbolism) for Jewish literalism and thus enables himself to wrest a Christian meaning from the Old Testament. The same tension is underlined by Ignatius' polemic against Judaizing tendencies in the church. At the same time all these writings-especially those of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias-testify to the growing awareness of a specifically Christian tradition embodied in the teaching transmitted from the Apostles.

Almost all the Apostolic Fathers throw light on primitive doctrine and practice. The *Didachc*, for example, presents the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and *I Clement* incorporates contemporary prayers. *II Clement* invites its readers to think of Christ as of God, and of the church as a pre-existent reality. The *Shepherd of Hermas* seeks to modify the rigorist view that sin committed after baptism cannot be forgiven. But the real key to the theology of the Apostolic Fathers, which also explains its often curious imagery, is that it is Jewish-Christian through and through, expressing itself in categories derived from latter-day Judaism and apocalyptic literature (depicting the intervention of God in history in the last times), which were soon to become unfashionable and be discarded.

The Apologists

The orthodox literature of the 2nd and early 3rd centuries tends to have a distinctly defensive or polemical colouring. It was the age of

Apologists, and these Apologists engaged in battle on two fronts. First, there was the hostility and criticism of pagan society. Because of its very aloofness the church was popularly suspected of sheltering all sorts of immoralities and thus of threatening the established order. At a higher level, Christianity, as it became better known, was being increasingly exposed to intellectual attack. The physician Galen of Pergamum (129-*c.* 199) and the Middle Platonist thinker Celsus, who followed the religiously inclined form of Platonism that flourished from the 3rd century BC to the 3rd century AD (compare his devastating *Alcthcs logos*, or *True Word*, written *c*. 178), were only two among many "cultured despisers." But, second, orthodoxy had to take issue with distorting tendencies within, whether these took the form of Gnosticism or of other heresies, such as the so-called semi-Gnostic Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament revelation or the claim of the ecstatic prophet from Phrygia, Montanus, to be the vehicle of a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Christianity had also to define exactly where it stood in relation to Hellenistic culture.

Strictly speaking, the term Apologists denotes the 2nd-century writers who defended Christianity against external critics, pagan and Jewish. The earliest of this group was Quadratus, who in about 124 addressed an apology for the faith to the emperor Hadrian; apart from a single fragment it is now lost. Other early Apologists who are mere names known to scholars are Aristo of Pella, the first to prepare an apology to counter Jewish objections, and Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, said to be the author of numerous apologetic works and also of a critique of Montanism. An early apology that has survived intact is that of Aristides, addressed about 140 to the emperor Antoninus Pius; after being completely lost, the text was rediscovered in the 19th century. The most famous Apologist, however, was Justin, who was converted to Christianity after trying various philosophical schools, paid lengthy visits to Rome, and was martyred there (*c.* 165). Justin's two *Apologies* are skillful presentations of the Christian case to the pagan critics; and his *Dialogue with Trypho* is an elaborate defense of Christianity against Judaism.

Justin's attitude to pagan philosophy was positive, but his pupil Tatian could see nothing but evil in the Greco-Roman civilization. Indeed, Tatian's *Discourse to the Greeks* is less a positive vindication of Christianity than a sharp attack on paganism. His contemporary

Athenagoras of Athens, author of the apologetic work *Embassy for the Christians* and a treatise *On the Resurrection of the Dead*, is as friendly as Justin to Greek culture and philosophy. Two others who deserve mention are Theophilus of Antioch, a prolific publicist whose only surviving work is *To Autolycus*, prepared for his pagan friend Autolycus; and the anonymous author of the *Letter to Diognetus*, an attractive and persuasive exposition of the Christian way of life that is often included among the Apostolic Fathers.

As stylists the Apologists reach only a passable level; even Athenagoras scarcely achieves the elegance at which he obviously aimed. But they had little difficulty in refuting the spurious charges popularly brought against Christians, including atheism, cannibalism, and promiscuity, or in mounting a counterattack against the debasements of paganism. More positively, they strove to vindicate the Christian understanding of God and specific doctrines such as the divinity of Christ and the resurrection of the body. In so doing, most of them exploited current philosophical conceptions, in particular that of the Logos (Word), or rational principle underlying and permeating reality, which they regarded as the divine reason, become incarnate in Jesus. They have been accused of Hellenizing Christianity (making it Greek in form and method), but they were in fact attempting to formulate it in intellectual categories congenial to their age. In a real sense they were the first Christian theologians. But the same tension between the Gospel and philosophy was to persist throughout the patristic period, with results that were sometimes positive, as in Augustine and Gregory of Nyssa, and sometimes negative, as in the radical Arians Aëtius and Eunomius.

As the 2nd century advanced, a more confident, aggressive spirit came over Christian Apologists, and their intellectual and literary stature increased greatly.Clement of Alexandria, for example, while insisting on the supremacy of faith, freely drew on Platonism and Stoicism to clarify Christian teaching. In his *Protreptikos*(“Exhortation”) and *Paidagogos* (“Instructor”) he urged pagans to abandon their futile beliefs, accept the Logos as guide, and allow their souls to be trained by him. In interpreting scripture he used an allegorizing method derived from the Jewish philosopher Philo, and against Gnosticism he argued that the baptized believer who studies the Scriptures is the true Gnostic, faith being at once superior to knowledge and the beginning of knowledge.

The critique of Gnosticism was much more systematically developed by Clement’s older contemporary, Irenaeus of Lyon, in his voluminous *Against Heresies*. While countering the Valentinian dualism that asserted that spirit was good and matter evil, this treatise makes clear the church’s growing reliance on its creed or “rule of faith,” on the New Testament canon, and on the succession of bishops as guarantors of the true apostolic tradition. Irenaeus was also a constructive theologian, expounding ideas about God as Creator, about the Son and the Spirit as his “two hands,” about Christ as the New Adam who reconciles fallen humanity with God, and about the worldwide church with its apostolic faith and ministry, a concept that theology was later to take up eagerly.

More brilliant as a stylist and controversialist, the North African lawyer Tertullian was also the first Latin theologian of considerable importance. Unlike Clement, he reacted with hostility to pagan culture, scornfully asking, “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?” His *Apology* remains a classic of ancient Christian literature, and his numerous moral and practical works reveal an uncompromisingly rigid moral view. Although later becoming a Montanist himself (a follower of the morally rigorous and prophetic sect founded by Montanus), he wrote several antiheretical tracts, full of abuse and biting sarcasm. Yet, in castigating heresy he was able to formulate the terminology, and to some extent the theory, of later Trinitarian and Christological orthodoxy; his teaching on the Fall of Man, aimed against Gnostic dualism, in part anticipates Augustine.

Roughly contemporary with Tertullian, and like him an intellectual and a rigorist, was Hippolytus, a Greek-speaking Roman theologian and antipope. He, too, had a vast literary output, and although some of the surviving works attributed to him are disputed, it is probable that he wrote the comprehensive *Refutation of All Heresies*, attacking Gnosticism, as well as treatises denouncing specifically Christian heresies. He was also the author both of numerous commentaries on scripture and (probably) of the *Apostolic Tradition*, an invaluable source of knowledge about the primitive Roman liturgy. His *Commentary on Daniel* (*c.* 204) is the oldest Christian biblical commentary to survive in its entirety. His exegesis (interpretive method) is primarily typological-*i.e.*, treating the Old Testament figures, events, and other aspects as “types” of the new order that was inaugurated by Christ.

Late 2nd to early 4th century

Meanwhile, a brilliant and distinctive phase of Christian literature was opening at Alexandria, the chief cultural centre of the empire and the meeting ground of the best in Hellenistic Judaism, Gnosticism, and Neoplatonism. Marked by the desire to present Christianity in intellectually satisfying terms, this literature has usually been connected with the catechetical school, which, according to tradition, flourished at Alexandria from the end of the 2nd through the 4th century. Except for the brief period, however, when Origen was in charge of it, it may be doubted whether the school was ever itself a focus of higher Christian studies. When speaking of the school of Alexandria, some scholars claim that it is better to think of a distinguished succession of like-minded thinkers and teachers who worked there and whose highly sophisticated interpretation of Christianity exercised for generations a formative impact on large sectors of eastern Christendom.

The real founder of this theology, with its Platonist leaning, its readiness to exploit the metaphysical implications of revelation, and its allegorical understanding of scripture, was Clement (*c.* 150-*c.* 215), the Christian humanist whose welcoming attitude to Hellenism and critique of Gnosticism were noted above. His major work, the *Stromateis* ("Miscellanies"), untidy and deliberately unsystematic, brings together the inheritance of Jewish Christianity and Middle Platonism in what aspires to be a summary of Christian gnosis (knowledge). All his reasoning is dominated by the idea of the Logos who created the universe and who manifests the ineffable Father alike in the Old Testament Law, the philosophy of the Greeks, and finally the incarnation of Christ. Clement was also a mystic for whom the higher life of the soul is a continuous moral and spiritual ascent.

But it is Origen (*c.* 185-*c.* 254) whose achievement stamps the Alexandrian school. First and foremost, he was an exegete (critical interpreter), as determined to establish the text of scripture scientifically (compare his *Hexapla*) as to wrest its spiritual import from it. In homilies, scholia (annotated works), and continuous commentaries he covered the whole Bible, deploying a subtle, strongly allegorical exegesis designed to bring out several levels of significance. As an apologist, in his*Contra Celsum*, he refuted the pagan philosopher Celsus' damaging onslaught on Christianity. In all his writings, but especially his *On First Principles*, Origen shows himself to be one

of the most original and profound of speculative theologians. Neoplatonist in background, his system embraces both the notion of the pre-existence of souls, with their fall and final restoration, and a deeply subordinationist doctrine of the Trinity-*i.e.*, one in which the Son is subordinate to the Father. For his spiritual teaching, with its emphasis on the battle against sin, on freedom from passions, and on the soul's mystical marriage with the Logos, his *Commentary on Canticles* provides an attractive introduction.

Origen's influence on Christian doctrine and spirituality was to be immense and many-sided; the orthodox Fathers and the leading heretics of the 4th century alike reflect it. Meanwhile, the Alexandrian tradition was maintained by several remarkable disciples. Two of these whose works have been entirely lost but who are reported to have been polished writers were Theognostus (fl. 250-280) and Pierius (fl. 280-300), both heads of the catechetical school and apparently propagators of Origen's ideas. But there are two others of note, Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* 200-*c.* 265) and Gregory Thaumaturgus (*c.* 213-*c.* 270), of whose works some fragments have survived. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote on natural philosophy and the Christian doctrine of creation but is chiefly remembered for his dispute with Pope Dionysius (reigned 259-268) of Rome on the correct understanding of the Trinity. In this Dionysius of Alexandria is revealed as a faithful exponent of Origen's pluralism and subordinationism. Gregory Thaumaturgus left a fascinating *Panegyric to Origen*, giving a graphic description of Origen's method of instruction, as well as a dogmatically important *Symbol* and a *Canonical Epistle* that is in effect one of the most ancient treatises of casuistry (*i.e.*, the application of moral principles to practical questions).

If Origen inspired admiration, his daring speculations also provoked criticism. At Alexandria itself, Peter, who became bishop in about 300 and composed theological essays of which only fragments remain, attacked Origen's doctrines of the pre-existence of souls and their return into the condition of pure spirits. But the acutest of his critics was Methodius of Olympus (d. 311), of whose treatises *The Banquet*, exalting virginity, survives in Greek and others mainly in Slavonic translations. Although indebted to Alexandrian allegorism, Methodius remained faithful to the Asiatic tradition (literal and historical) of Irenaeus-who had come to France from Asia Minor-and his realism

and castigated Origen's ideas on the pre-existence of souls, the flesh as the spirit's prison, and the spiritual nature of the resurrected body. As a writer he strove after literary effect, and Jerome, writing a century later, praised the excellence of his style.

Latin Christian literature was slow in getting started, and North Africa has often been claimed as its birth place. Tertullian, admittedly, was the first Christian Latinist of genius, but he evidently had humbler predecessors. Latin versions of the Bible, recoverable in part from manuscripts, were appearing in Africa, Gaul, and Italy during the 2nd century. In that century, too, admired works such as *I Clement*, *Barnabas*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas* were translated into Latin. The oldest original Latin texts are probably the Muratorian Canon, a late 2nd-century Roman canon, or list of works accepted as scripture, and the *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs* (180) of Africa.

The first noteworthy Roman Christian to use Latin was Novatian, the leader of a rigorist schismatic group. His surviving works reveal him as an elegant stylist, trained in rhetoric and philosophy, and a competent theologian. His doctrinally influential *De trinitate* ("Concerning the Trinity") is basically apologetic: against Gnostics it defends the oneness and creative role of Almighty God, against Marcion it argues that Christ is the Son of God the Creator, against Docetism (the heresy claiming that Jesus only seemed the Christ) that Christ is truly man, and against Sabellianism (the denial of real distinctions in the Godhead, viewing the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three successive modes of revelation) that in spite of Christ's being fully divine there is but one God. His rigorous moralism comes out in his *On Public Shows* and *On the Excellence of Chastity* (both once attributed to Cyprian); in*On Jewish Foods* he maintains that the Old Testament food laws no longer apply to Christians, the animals that were classified as unclean having been intended to symbolize vices.

A much greater writer than Novatian was his contemporary and correspondent,Cyprian, the statesmanlike bishop of Carthage. A highly educated convert to Christianity, Cyprian left a large corpus of writings, including 65 letters and a number of moral, practical, and theological treatises. As an admirer of Tertullian, he continued some of his fellow North African's tendencies, but his style is more classical, though much less brilliant and individual. Cyprian's letters are a mine of

information about a fascinating juncture in church history. His collections of *Three Books of Testimonies to Quirinus*, or authoritative scripture texts, illustrate the church's reliance on these in defending its theological and ethical positions. A work that has been of exceptional importance historically is *On the Unity of the Catholic Church*, in which Cyprian contends that there is no salvation outside the church and defines the role of the Roman see. His *To Demetrianus* is an original, powerful essay refuting the allegation of pagans that Christianity was responsible for the calamities afflicting society.

Three writers from the later portion of this period deserve mention. Victorinus of Pettau was the first known Latin biblical exegete; of his numerous commentaries the only one that remains is the commentary on Revelation, which maintained a millenarian outlook-predicting the 1,000-year reign of Christ at the end of history-and was clumsy in style. Arnobius the Elder (converted by 300) sought in his*Adversus nationes* ("Against the Pagans"), like Tertullian and Cyprian before him, to free Christianity from the charge of having caused all the evils plaguing the empire, but ended up by launching a violent attack on the contemporary pagan cults. A surprising feature of this ill-constructed, verbose apology is Arnobius' apparent ignorance concerning several cardinal points of Christian doctrine, combined with his great enthusiasm for his new-found faith.

By contrast, his much abler pupil Lactantius (*c.* AD 240-*c.* 320), like him a native of North Africa, was a polished writer and the leading Latin rhetorician of the day. His most ambitious work, the *Divine Institutes*, attempted, against increasingly formidable pagan attacks, to portray Christianity as the true form of religion and life and is in effect the first systematic presentation of Christian teaching in Latin. The later *On the Death of Persecutors*, now generally recognized as his, describes the grim fates of persecuting emperors; it is a primary source for the history of the early 4th century and also represents a crude attempt at a Christian philosophy of history.

2. The post-Nicene period

The 4th and early 5th centuries witnessed an extraordinary flowering of Christian literature, the result partly of the freedom and privileged status now enjoyed by the church, partly of the diversification

of its own inner life (compare the rise of monasticism), but chiefly of the controversies in which it hammered out its fundamental doctrines.

Arianism, which denied Christ's essential divinity, aroused an all-pervasive reaction in the 4th century; the task of the first two ecumenical councils, at Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381), was to affirm the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. In the 5th century the Christological question moved to the fore, and the Council of Chalcedon (451), completing that of Ephesus (431), defined Christ as one person in two natures. The Christological controversies of the 5th century were extremely complex, involving not only theological issues but also issues of national concerns-especially in the Syrian-influenced East, where the national churches were called non-Chalcedonian because they rejected the doctrinal formulas of the Council of Chalcedon.

Involved in the 5th-century Christological controversy were many persons and movements: Nestorius, consecrated patriarch of Constantinople in 428, and his followers, the Nestorians, who were concerned with preserving the humanity of Christ as well as his divinity; Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, and his followers, who were devoted to maintaining a balanced emphasis on both of the natures of Christ, divine and human; Eutyches (*c.* 378–after 451), a muddleheaded archimandrite (head of a monastery) who affirmed two natures before and one nature after the incarnation; the Monophysites, who (following Eutyches) stressed the one unified nature of Christ; and the moderates and those who sought theological, ecclesiastical, and even political solutions to this highly complex doctrinal dispute, such as Pope Leo I. It was a time when the Alexandrian and Antiochene theological schools vied with each other for the control of the theology of the church. In the Syrian East the Antiochene tradition continued in the schools of Edessa and Nisibis, which became centres of a non-Greek national renaissance. The issues of grace, free will, and the Fall of Man concerned the West mainly. Meanwhile, old literary forms were developing along more mature lines, and new ones were emerging, including historiography, lives of saints, set piece (fixed-form) oratory, mystical writings, and hymnody.

The Nicene Fathers

A seesaw struggle between Arians and orthodox Christians dominated the immediate post-Nicene period. Arius himself, Eusebius

of Nicomedia, and other radicals occupied the extreme left wing, carrying Origen's views on the subordination of the Son to what became dangerous lengths. Apart from a few precious letters and fragments, their writings have perished. On the extreme right Athanasius, Eustathius of Antioch, and Marcellus of Ancyra (strongly anti-Origenist) tenaciously upheld the Nicene decision that the Son was of the same substance with the Father. Again, the writings of the two latter figures, except for scattered but illuminating fragments, have disappeared. Most churchmen preferred the middle ground; loyal to the Origenist tradition, they suspected the Nicene Creed of opening the door to Sabellianism but were equally shocked by Arianism in its more uncompromising forms. Eusebius of Caesarea (*c.* 260–*c.* 340) was their spokesman, and for decades the eastern emperors supported his mediating line.

Eusebius is chiefly known as a historian; his *Ecclesiastical History*, with its scholarly use of documents and guiding idea that the victory of Christianity is the proof of its divine origin, introduced something novel and epoch-making. But he also wrote voluminous apologetic treatises, biblical and exegetical works, and polemical tracts against Marcellus of Ancyra. From these can be gathered his theology of the Word, which was Origenist in inspiration and profoundly subordinationist and which made the strict Nicenes suspect him as an ally of Arius. Such suspicions were unjust, for he upheld Origen's doctrine of eternal generation (*i.e.*, that the Word is generated outside the category of time) and rejected the extreme Arian theses. His influence can be studied in the works of Cyril of Jerusalem (*c.* 315–386?), whose *Catecheses*, or introductory lectures on Christian doctrine for candidates for baptism, exemplify a pastoral type of Christian literature. Though critical of the Arian positions, Cyril remained reserved in his attitude toward the Nicene theology and at several other points showed affinities with Eusebius.

Athanasius (*c.* 293–373) bestrides the 4th century as the inflexible champion of the Nicene dogma. He had been present at the council, defending Alexander, the theologian-bishop of Alexandria from 313 to 328, who had exposed Arius; and after succeeding Alexander in 328 he spent the rest of his stormy life defending, expounding, and drawing out the implications of the Nicene theology. His most thorough and effective exposition of the Son's eternal origin in the Father and

essential unity with him is contained in his *Four Orations Against the Arians*; but in addition he produced a whole series of treatises, historical or dogmatic or both, as well as letters, covering different aspects of the controversy.

It would be misleading, however, to delineate Athanasius exclusively as a polemicist. First, even in his polemical writings he was working out a positive doctrine of the triune God that anticipated later formal definitions. His *Letters to Bishop Serapion*, with their persuasive presentation of the Holy Spirit as a consubstantial (of the same substance) person in the Godhead, are an admirable illustration. Also his noncontroversial works, such as the relatively early but brilliant apologies *Discourse Against the Pagans* and *The Incarnation of the Word of God*; the attractive and influential *Life of St. Antony*, which was to give a powerful impulse to monasticism (especially in the West); and his numerous exegetical and ascetic essays, which survive largely in fragments, sometimes in Coptic or Syriac translations, should not be overlooked.

The Cappadocian Fathers

Although Athanasius prepared the ground, constructive agreement on the central doctrine of the Trinity was not reached in his lifetime, either between the divided parties in the East or between East and West with their divergent traditions. The decisive contribution to the Trinitarian argument was made by a remarkable group of philosophically minded theologians from Cappadocia-Basil of Caesarea, his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his lifelong friend Gregory of Nazianzus. Of aristocratic birth and consummate culture, all three were drawn to the monastic ideal, and Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus achieved literary distinction of the highest order. While their joint accomplishments in doctrinal definition were indeed outstanding, each made a noteworthy mark in other fields as well.

So far as Trinitarian dogma is concerned, the Cappadocians succeeded, negatively, in overthrowing Arianism in the radical form in which two acute thinkers, Aëtius (d. *c*.366) and Eunomius (d. *c.* 394), had revived it in their day, and, positively, in formulating a conception of God as three Persons in one essence that eventually proved generally acceptable. The oldest of Basil's dogmatic writings is his only partially successful *Against Eunomius*, the most mature

his essay *On the Holy Spirit*. Gregory of Nyssa continued the attack on Eunomius in four massive treatises and published several more positive dogmatic essays, the most successful of which is the *Great Catechetical Oration*, a systematic theology in miniature. The output of Gregory of Nazianzus was much smaller, but his 45 *Orations*, as well as being masterpieces of eloquence, contain his classic statement of Trinitarian orthodoxy. Basil's vast correspondence testifies to his practical efforts to reconcile divergent movements in Trinitarian thinking.

Basil is famous as a letter writer and preacher and for his views on the appropriate attitude of Christians toward Hellenistic culture; but his achievement was not less significant as a monastic legislator. His two monastic rules, used by St. Benedict and still authoritative in the Greek Orthodox Church, are tokens of this. Gregory of Nazianzus, too, was an accomplished letter writer, but his numerous, often lengthy poems have a special interest. Dogmatic, historical, and autobiographical, they are often intensely personal and lay bare his sensitive soul. On the other hand, Gregory of Nyssa, much the most speculative of the three, was an Origenist both in his allegorical interpretation of scripture and his eschatology. But he is chiefly remarkable as a pioneer of Christian mysticism, and in his *Life of Moses, Homilies on Canticles*, and other books he describes how the soul, in virtue of having been created in the divine image, is able to ascend, by successive stages of purification, to a vision of God.

A figure who stood in sharp contrast, intellectually and in temperament, to the Cappadocians was their contemporary, Epiphanius of Salamis, in Cyprus. A fanatical defender of the Nicene solution, he was in no sense a constructive theologian like them, but an uncritical traditionalist who rejected every kind of speculation. He was an indefatigable hammer against heretics, and his principal work, the *Panarion* ("Medicine Chest"), is a detailed examination of 80 heresies (20 of them pre-Christian); it is invaluable for the mass of otherwise unobtainable documents it excerpts. Conformably with Epiphanius' contempt for classical learning, the work is written in Greek without any pretension to elegance. His particular bete noire was Origen, to whose speculations and allegorism he traced virtually all heresies.

Monastic literature

From the end of the 3rd century onward, monasticism was one of the most significant manifestations of the Christian spirit. Originating in Egypt and spreading thence to Palestine, Syria, and the whole Mediterranean world, it fostered a literature that illuminates the life of the ancient church.

Both Anthony (*c.* 250–355), the founder of eremitical, or solitary, monasticism in the Egyptian desert, and Ammonas (fl. *c.* 350), his successor as leader of his colony of anchorites (hermits), wrote numerous letters; a handful from the pen of each is extant, almost entirely in Greek or Latin translation of the Coptic originals. Those of Ammonas are particularly valuable for the history of the movement and as reflecting the uncomplicated mysticism that inspired it. The founder of monastic community life, also in Egypt, was Pachomius (*c.* 290–346), and the extremely influential rule that he drew up has been preserved, mainly in a Latin translation made by Jerome.

Though these and other early pioneers were simple, practical men, monasticism received a highly cultivated convert in 382 in Evagrius Ponticus. He was the first monk to write extensively and was in the habit of arranging his material in groups of a hundred aphorisms, or "centuries," a literary form that he invented and that was to have a great vogue in Byzantine times. A master of the spiritual life, he classified the eight sins that undermine the monk's resolution and also the ascending levels by which the soul rises to wordless contemplation. Later condemned as an Origenist, he was deeply influential in the East, and, through John Cassian, in the West as well.

Side by side with works composed by monks there sprang up a literature concerned with them and the monastic movement. Much of it was biographical, the classic example being Athanasius' *Life of St. Antony*. Sulpicius Severus (*c.* 363-*c.* 420) took this work as his model when early in the 5th century he wrote his *Life of St. Martin of Tours*, the first Western biography of a monastic hero and the pattern of a long line of medieval lives of saints. But it was Palladius (*c.* 363-before 431), a pupil of Evagrius Ponticus, who proved to be the principal historian of primitive monasticism. His *Lausiac History* (so called after Lausus, the court chamberlain to whom he dedicated it), composed

about 419/420, describes the movement in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. Since much of the work is based on personal reminiscences or information received from observers, it is, despite the legendary character of many of its narratives, an invaluable source book.

Finally, no work so authentically conveys the spirit of Egyptian monasticism as the *Apophthegmata Patrum* ("Sayings of the Fathers"). Compiled toward the end of the 5th century, but using much older material, it is a collection of pronouncements of the famous desert personalities and anecdotes about them. The existing text is in Greek, but it probably derives from an oral tradition in Coptic.

The school of Antioch

Antioch, like Alexandria, was a renowned intellectual centre, and a distinctive school of Christian theology flourished there and in the surrounding region throughout the 4th and the first half of the 5th century. In contrast to the Alexandrian school, it was characterized by a literalist exegesis and a concern for the completeness of Christ's manhood. Little is known of its traditional founder, the martyr-priest Lucian (d. 312), except that he was a learned biblical scholar who revised the texts of the Septuagint and the New Testament. His strictly theological views, though a mystery, must have been heterodox, for Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and other Arians claimed to be his disciples ("fellow Lucianists"), and Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, who denounced them, lists Lucian among those who influenced them. But Eustathius of Antioch, the champion of Nicene orthodoxy, is probably more representative of the school, with his antipathy to what he regarded as Origen's excessive allegorism and his recognition, as against the Arians, of the presence of a human soul in the incarnate Christ.

It was, however, much later in the 4th century, in the person of Diodore of Tarsus (*c.*330-*c.* 390), that the School of Antioch began to reach the height of its fame. Diodore courageously defended Christ's divinity against Julian the Apostate, the Roman emperor who attempted to revive paganism, and in his lifetime was regarded as a pillar of orthodoxy. Later critics detected anticipations of Nestorianism (the heresy upholding the division of Christ's Person) in his teaching, and as a result his works, apart from some meagre fragments, have

perished. They were evidently voluminous and wide-ranging, covering exegesis, apologetics, polemics, and even astronomy; and he not only strenuously opposed Alexandrian allegorism but also expounded the Antiochene *theoria*, or principle for discovering the deeper intention of scripture and at the same time remaining loyal to its literal sense.

In stature and intellectual power Diodore was overshadowed by his two brilliant pupils, Theodore of Mopsuestia (*c.* 350-428/429) and John Chrysostom (*c.* 347-407). Both had also studied under the famous pagan Sophist rhetorician Libanius (314-393), thereby illustrating the cross-fertilization of pagan and Christian cultures at this period. Like Diodore, Theodore later fell under the imputation of Nestorianism, and the bulk of his enormous literary output-comprising dogmatic as well as exegetical works-was lost. Fortunately, the 20th century has seen the recovery of a few important texts in Syriac translations (notably his *Commentary on St. John* and his *Catechetical Homilies*), as well as the reconstruction of the greater part of his *Commentary on the Psalms*. This fresh evidence confirms that Theodore was not only the most acute of the Antiochene exegetes, deploying the hermeneutics (critical interpretive principles) of his school in a thoroughly scientific manner, but also an original theologian who, despite dangerous tendencies, made a unique contribution to the advancement of Christology. His *Catechetical Homilies* are immensely valuable both for understanding his ideas and for the light they throw on sacramental doctrine and liturgical practice.

In contrast to Theodore, John was primarily a preacher; indeed he was one of the most accomplished of Christian orators and amply merited his title "Golden-Mouthed" (*Chrysostomos*). With the exception of a few practical treatises and a large dossier of letters, his writings consist entirely of addresses, the majority being expository of the Bible. There he shows himself a strict exponent of Antiochene literalism, reserved in exploiting even the traditional typology (*i.e.*, treatment of Old Testament events and so forth as prefigurative of the new Christian order) but alert to the moral and pastoral lessons of his texts. This interest, combined with his graphic descriptive powers, makes his sermons a mirror of the social, cultural, and ecclesiastical conditions in contemporary Antioch and Constantinople, as well as of his own compassionate concern as a pastor. Indefatigable in denouncing heresy, he was not an original thinker; on the other hand,

he was outstanding as a writer, and connoisseurs of rhetoric have always admired the grace and simplicity of his style in some moods, its splendour and pathos in others.

The last noteworthy Antiochene, Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*c.* 393-*c.* 458), in Syria, was also an elegant stylist. His writings were encyclopaedic in range, but the most memorable perhaps are his *Remedy for Greek Maladies*, the last of ancient apologies against paganism; and his *Ecclesiastical History*, continuing Eusebius' work down to 428. His controversial treatises are also important, for he skillfully defended the Antiochene Christology against the orthodox Bishop Cyril of Alexandria and was instrumental in getting its more valuable features recognized at the Council of Chalcedon. He was a scholar with a comprehensive and eclectic mind, and his large correspondence testifies to his learning and mastery of Greek prose as well as illustrating the history and intellectual life of the age.

The schools of Edessa and Nisibis

Parallel with its richer and better-known Greek and Latin counterparts, an independent Syriac Christian literature flourished inside, and later outside (in Persia), the frontiers of the Roman Empire from the early 4th century onward.Aphraates, an ascetic cleric under whose name 23 treatises written between 336 and 345 have survived, is considered the first Syriac Father. Deeply Christian in tone, these tracts present a primitive theology, with no trace of Hellenistic influence but a firm grasp and skillful use of scripture. Edessa and Nisibis (now Urfa and Nusaybin in southeast Turkey) were the creative centres of this literature. Edessa had been a focus of Christian culture well before 200; the old Syriac version of the New Testament and Tatian's *Diatessaron*, as well as a mass of Syriac apocryphal writings, probably originated there.

The chief glory of Edessene Christianity was Ephraem Syrus (*c.* 306–373), the classic writer of the Syrian Church who established his school of theology there when Nisibis, its original home and his own birthplace, was ceded to Persia under the peace treaty of 363, after the death of Julian the Apostate. In his lifetime Ephraem had a reputation as a brilliant preacher, commentator, controversialist, and above all, sacred poet. His exegesis shows Antiochene tendencies, but as a theologian he championed Nicene orthodoxy and attacked

Arianism. His hymns, many in his favourite seven-syllable metre, deal with such themes as the Nativity, the Epiphany, and the Crucifixion or else are directed against skeptics and heretics. His *Carmina Nisibena* ("Songs of Nisibis") make a valuable source book for historians, especially for information about the frontier wars.

After Ephraem's death in 373, the school at Edessa developed his lively interest in exegesis and became increasingly identified with the Antiochene line in theology. Among those responsible for this was one of its leading instructors, Ibas (d. 457), who worked energetically translating Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentaries and disseminating his Christological views. His own stance on the now urgent Christological issue was akin to that of Theodoret of Cyrrhus - roughly midway between Nestorius' dualism and the Alexandrian doctrine of one nature - and he bluntly criticized Cyril's position in his famous letter to Maris (433), the sole survivor (in a Greek translation) of his abundant works; it was one of the Three Chaptersanathematized by the second Council of Constantinople (553).

The frankly Antiochene posture typified by Ibas brought the school into collision with Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 412 to 435, an uncompromising supporter of Cyril and the Alexandrian Christology. As well as writing numerous letters, hymns, and a sermon against Nestorius, Rabbula translated Cyril's *De recta fide*(*Concerning the Correct Faith*) into Syriac and also probably compiled the revised Syriac version of the four Gospels (contained in the Peshitta) in order to oust Tatian's*Diatessaron*. On his death he was succeeded by Ibas, who predictably exerted his influence in an Antiochene direction.

Another eminent Edessene writer was Narses (d. *c.* 503), who became one of the formative theologians of the Nestorian Church. He was the author of extensive commentaries, now lost, and of metrical homilies, dialogue songs, and liturgical hymns. In 447, when a Monophysite reaction set in, he was expelled from Edessa along with Barsumas, the head of the school, but they promptly set up a new school at Nisibis on Persian territory. The school at Edessa was finally closed, because of its Nestorian leanings, by the emperor Zeno in 489, but its offshoot at Nisibis flourished for more than 200 years and became the principal seat of Nestorian culture. At one time it had as many as 800 students and was able to ensure that the then

prosperous church in Persia was Nestorian. On the other hand, Philoxenus of Mabbug, who had studied at Edessa in the second half of the 5th century and was one of the most learned of Syrian theologians, was a vehement advocate of Monophysitism. His 13 homilies on the Christian life and his letters reveal him as a fine prose writer; but he is chiefly remembered for the revision of the Syriac translation of the Bible (the so-called Philoxenian version) for which he was responsible and which was used by Syrian Monophysites in the 6th century.

3. The Chalcedonian Fathers

From about 428 onward Christology became an increasingly urgent subject of debate in the East and excited interest in the West as well. Two broad positions had defined themselves in the 4th century. Among Alexandrian theologians the "Word-flesh" approach was preferred, according to which the Word had assumed human flesh at the Incarnation; Christ's possession of a human soul or mind was either denied or ignored. Antiochene theologians, on the other hand, consistently upheld the "Word-man" approach, according to which the Word had united himself to a complete man; this position ran the risk, unless carefully handled, of so separating the divinity and the humanity as to imperil Christ's personal unity.

Apollinarius the Younger (*c.* 310-*c.* 390) had brilliantly exposed the logical implications of the Alexandrian view; although condemned as a heretic, he had forced churchmen of all schools to recognize, though with varying degrees of practical realism, a human mind in the Redeemer. His writings were systematically destroyed, but the remaining fragments confirm his intellectual acuteness as well as his literary skill. The crisis of the 5th century was precipitated by the proclamation by Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople - pushing Antiochene tendencies to extremes - of a Christology that seemed to many to imply two Sons. Nestorius held that Mary was not only *Theotokos* ("God-bearing") but also*anthropotokos* ("man-bearing"), though he preferred the term *Christotokos* ("Christ-bearing"). In essence, he was attempting to protect the concept of the humanity of Christ. The controversy raged with extraordinary violence from 428 to 451, when the Council of Chalcedon hammered out a formula that at the time seemed acceptable to most and that attempted to do justice to the valuable insights of both traditions.

A number of theologians and ecclesiastics either prepared the way for or contributed to the Chalcedonian solution. Three who deserve mention are Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Proclus of Constantinople, and John Cassian. The first was probably responsible for drafting the Formula of Union (433) that became the basis of the Chalcedonian Definition. Proclus was an outstanding pulpit orator, and several of his sermons as well as seven letters concerned with the controversy have been preserved; he worked indefatigably to reconcile the warring factions. Cassian prepared the West for the controversy by producing in 430, at the request of the deacon (later pope) Leo, a weighty treatise against Nestorius.

But much the most important, not least because they approached the debate from different standpoints, were Cyril of Alexandria and Pope Leo the Great. Cyril had been the first to denounce Nestorius, and in a whole series of letters and dogmatic treatises he drove home his critique and expounded his own positive theory of hypostatic (substantive, or essential) union. He secured the condemnation of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (431), and his own letters were canonically approved at Chalcedon. A convinced adherent of the Alexandrian Word-flesh Christology, he deepened his understanding of the problem as the debate progressed; but his preferred expression for the unity of the Redeemer remained "one incarnate nature of the Word," which he mistakenly believed to derive from Athanasius. Leo provided the necessary balance to this with his famous *Dogmatic Letter*, also endorsed at Chalcedon, which affirmed the coexistence of two complete natures, united without confusion, in the one Person of the Incarnate Word, or Christ.

In patristic literature, however, the interest of both Cyril and Leo extends far beyond Christology. Cyril published essays on the Trinitarian issue against the Arians and also commentaries on Old and New Testament books. If the former show little originality, his exegesis marked a reaction against the more fanciful Alexandrian allegorism and a concentration on the strictly typological significance of the text. Leo, for his part, was a notable preacher and one of the greatest of popes. His short, pithy sermons, clear and elegant in style, set a fine model for pulpit oratory in the West; and his numerous letters give an impressive picture of his continuous struggle to promote orthodoxy and the interests of the Roman see.

Non - Chalcedonian Fathers

The Chalcedonian settlement was not achieved without some of the leading participants in the debate that preceded it being branded as heretics because their positions fell outside the limits accepted as permissible. It also left to subsequent generations a legacy of misunderstanding and division.

The outstanding personalities in the former category were Nestorius and Eutyches. It was Nestorius whose imprudent brandishing of extremist Antiochene theses - particularly his reluctance to grant the title of *Theotokos* to Mary, mother of Jesus - had touched off the controversy. Only fragments of his works remain, for after his condemnation their destruction was ordered by the Byzantine government, but these have been supplemented by the discovery, in a Syriac translation, of his *Book of Heraclides of Damascus*. Written late in his life, when Monophysitism had become the bogey, this is a prolix apology in which Nestorius pleads that his own beliefs are identical with those of Leo and the new orthodoxy. Eutyches, on the other hand, an over-enthusiastic follower of Cyril, was led by his antipathy to Nestorianism into the opposite error of confusing the natures. He contended that there was only one nature after the union of divinity and humanity in the Incarnate Word, and he was thus the father of Monophysitism in the strict, and not merely verbal, sense.

After the Council of Ephesus in 431 the eastern bishops of Nestorian sympathies gradually formed a separate Nestorian Church on Persian soil, with the see of its patriarch at Ctesiphon on the Tigris. Edessa and then Nisibis were its theological and literary centres. But a much wider body of eastern Christians, particularly from Egypt and Palestine, found the Chalcedonian dogma of "two natures" a betrayal of the truth as stated by their hero Cyril. For the next two centuries the struggle between these Monophysites and strict Chalcedonians to secure the upper hand convulsed the Eastern Church. Among the Monophysites it produced theologians of high calibre and literary distinction, notably the moderate Severus of Antioch (*c.*465–538), who while contending stoutly for "one nature after the union" was equally insistent on the reality of Christ's humanity. His contemporary Julian of Halicarnassus taught the more radical doctrine that, through union with the Word, Christ's body had been incorruptible and immortal from the moment of the Incarnation.

In the 7th century, inspired by the need for unity in the face of successive Persian and Arab attacks, an attempt was made to reconcile the Monophysite dissenters with the orthodox Chalcedonians. The formula, which it was thought might prove acceptable to both, asserted that, though Christ had two natures, he had only one activity-*i.e.,* one divine will. This doctrine, Monothelitism, stimulated an intense theological controversy but was subjected to profound and far-reaching criticism byMaximus the Confessor, who perceived that, if Christians are to find in Christ the model for their freedom and individuality, his human nature must be complete and therefore equipped with a human will. The formula was condemned as heretical at the third Council of Constantinople of 680–681.

4. The post-Nicene Latin Fathers

Latin Christian literature in this period was slower than Greek in getting started, and it always remained sparser. Indeed, the first half of the 4th century produced onlyJulius Firmicus Maternus, author not only of the most complete treatise on astrology bequeathed by antiquity to the modern world but also of a fierce diatribe against paganism that has the added interest of appealing to the state to employ force to repress it and its immoralities. From Africa, rent asunder by Donatism, the heretical movement that rejected the efficacy of sacraments administered by priests who had denied their faith under persecution, came the measured anti-Donatist polemic of Optatus of Milevis, writing in 366 or 367, whose line of argument anticipates Augustine's later attack against the Donatists.

Much more significant than either, however, was Gaius Marius Victorinus, the brilliant professor whose conversion in 355 caused a sensation at Rome. Obscure but strikingly original in his writings, he was an effective critic of Arianism and sought to present orthodox Trinitarianism in uncompromisingly Neoplatonic terms. His speculations about the inner life of the triune Godhead were to be taken up by Augustine.

Three remarkable figures, all different, dominate the second half of the century. The first, Hilary of Poitiers, was a considerable theologian, next to Augustine the finest produced by the West in the patristic epoch. For years he deployed his exceptional gifts in persuading the anti-Arian groups to abandon their traditional

catchwords and rally round the Nicene formula, which they had tended to view with suspicion. Often unfairly described as a popularizer of Eastern ideas, he was an original thinker whose scriptural commentaries and perceptive Trinitarian studies brought fresh insights. The second, Ambrose of Milan, was an outstanding ecclesiastical statesman, equally vigilant for orthodoxy against Arianism as for the rights of the church against the state. Both in his dogmatic treatises and in his largely allegorical, pastorally oriented exegetical works he relied heavily on Greek models. One of the pioneers of Catholic moral theology, he also wrote hymns that are still sung in the liturgy.

The third, Jerome, was primarily a biblical scholar. His enormous commentaries are erudite but unequal in quality; the earlier ones were greatly influenced by Origen's allegorism, but the ones written later, when he had turned against Origen, were more literalist and historical in their exegesis. Jerome's crowning gift to the Western Church and Western culture was the Vulgate translation of the Bible. Prompted by Pope Damasus, he thoroughly revised the existing Latin versions of the Gospels; the Old Testament he translated afresh from the Hebrew. His historical and polemical writings (the latter full of sarcasm and invective) are all interesting, and his rich correspondence supremely so. As a stylist he wrote with a verve and brilliance unmatched in Latin patristic literature.

The two foremost Christian Latin poets of ancient times, Prudentius and Paulinus of Nola, also belong to this half-century. Both used the old classical forms with considerable skill, filling them with a fresh Christian spirit. Prudentius' work is both the finer in quality and the more wide-ranging; in his *Psychomachia* ("The Contest of the Soul"), he introduced an allegorical form that made an enormous appeal to the Middle Ages. Paulinus is also interesting for his extensive correspondence, much admired in his own day, which kept him in close touch with many leading Christian contemporaries.

All these figures are overshadowed by the towering genius of Augustine (354–430). The range of his writings was enormous: they comprise profound discussions of Christian doctrine (notably his *De Trinitate*, or *On the Trinity*); sustained and carefully argued polemics against heresies (Manichaeism, a dualistic religion; Donatism; and Pelagianism, a view that emphasized free will); exegesis, homilies, and ordinary sermons; and a vast collection of letters. His two best-

known works, the *Confessions* and *The City of God*, broke entirely fresh ground, the one being both an autobiography and an interior colloquy between the soul and God, the other perhaps the most searching study ever made of the theology of history and of the fundamental contrast between Christianity and the world. On almost every issue he handled-the problem of evil, creation, grace and free will, the nature of the church-Augustine opened up lines of thought that are still debated. The prose style he used matched the level of his argument, having a rich texture, subtle assonance, and grave beauty that were new in Latin.

In part recovered in recent years, the works of Pelagius (fl. 405–418) show him to have been a writer and thinker of high quality. Early in the 5th century, when the monasteries of southern Gaul became active intellectual centres, Vincent of Lérins and John Cassian published critiques of Augustine's extreme positions on grace and free will, proposing the alternative doctrine called Semi-Pelagianism, which held that humans by their own free will could desire life with God. This in turn was criticized by able writers like Prosper of Aquitaine (*c.* 390–*c.* 463) and the celebrated preacher Caesarius of Arles (470–542) and was condemned at the Council of Orange (529). Cassian, however, a firsthand student of Eastern monasticism, is chiefly important for his studies of the monastic life, based on material collected in the East. The rules he formulated were freely drawn upon a century later by St. Benedict of Nursia, the reformer of Western monasticism, when Benedict composed his famous and immensely influential rule at Monte Cassino.

The 6th century marks the final phase of Latin patristic literature, which includes several notable figures, of whom Boethius (480–524), philosopher and statesman, is the most distinguished. His *Consolation of Philosophy* was widely studied in the Middle Ages, but he also composed technically philosophical works, including translations of, and commentaries on, Aristotle. Beside him should be set his longer-lived contemporary, Cassiodorus (*c.* 490–*c.* 585), who, as well as encouraging the study of Greek and Latin classics and the copying of manuscripts in monasteries, was himself the author of theological, historical, and encyclopaedic treatises. Also notable is Venantius Fortunatus (*c.* 540–*c.* 600), an accomplished poet whose hymns, such as "Vexilla regis" ("The royal banners forward go") and "Pange lingua"

("Sing, my tongue, the glorious battle"), are still sung. Finally, Gregory the Great (*c.* 540–604) was so prolific and successful an author as to earn the title of Fourth Doctor of the Latin Church. Although unoriginal theologically and reflecting the credulity of the age, his works (which include the earliest life of St. Benedict) made an enormous appeal to the medieval mind.

5. Later Greek Fathers

The closing phase of patristic literature lasted longer in the Greek East than in the Latin West, where the decline of culture was hastened by barbarian inroads. But even in the East a slackening of effort and originality was becoming perceptible in the latter half of the 5th century. A clear illustration of this is provided by the practice of substituting chain commentaries composed of excerpts from earlier exegetes and anthologies of opinions of respected past theologians for independent exposition and speculation.

Yet the picture was not altogether dim. In the strictly theological field, Leontius of Byzantium (d. *c.* 545) showed ability and originality in reinterpreting the Chalcedonian Christology along the lines of St. Cyril with the aid of the increasingly favoured Aristotelian philosophy. Two other writers, very different from him and from each other, revived in the late 5th and early 6th centuries the brilliance of past generations. One was the figure who called himself Dionysius the Areopagite (*c.*500), the unidentified author of theological and mystical treatises that were destined to have an enormous influence. Based on a synthesis of Christian dogma and Neoplatonism, his work exalts the negative theology (God is understood by what he is not) and traces the soul's ascent from a dialectical knowledge of God to mystical union with him. The other is Romanos Melodos (fl. 6th century), greatest hymnist of the Eastern Church, who invented the kontakion, an acrostic verse sermon in many stanzas with a recurring refrain. The sweep, pathos, and grandeur of his compositions give him a high place of honour among religious poets.

With Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus the end of the patristic epoch is reached. Maximus was a major critic of Monothelitism; he was also a remarkable constructive thinker whose speculative and mystical doctrines were held in unity by his vision of the incarnation as the goal of history. Writing early in the 8th century,

John was chiefly influential through his comprehensive presentation of the teaching of the Greek Fathers on the principal Christian doctrines. But in constructing his synthesis he added at many points a finishing touch of his own; his writings in defense of images, prepared to counter the Iconoclasts (those who advocated destruction of religious images, or icons), were original and important; and he was the author of striking poems, some of which found a place in the Greek liturgy.

For 400 or 500 years, when secular culture was slowly but steadily in decline, the patristic writers breathed new life into the Greek and Latin languages and created Syriac as a literary medium. Even when the period came to an end, the halt was really only a temporary pause until the impulses behind it could force other outlets. The literature of the later Byzantine Empire looked back to and drew nourishment from the golden centuries of the Fathers, while Latin Christian letters experienced more than one renascence in the Middle Ages.

The range and variety, too, of the literature are impressive. Its overwhelmingly theological concern necessarily imposed understandable but serious limitations, but, when these have been allowed for, the Christian writers must be acknowledged to have been remarkably successful at molding the traditional literary forms to their new purposes and also at improvising fresh ones adapted to their special situations. Aesthetically considered, patristic literature contains much that is mediocre and even shoddy, but also a great deal that by any standards reaches the heights. And it has a unique interest as the creation of an immensely dynamic and far-reachingly important religious movement during the centuries when it could dominate the whole of life and society.

In the following study we will discuss Didache, one of the most ancient early Christian writing and the theological insights of eight Church Fathers: Ignatius of Antioch, Iranaeus of Lyons, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Basil, John Chrysostom and Ephrem.

Chapter 2

The Didache

Didache is a short treatise which was accounted by some of the Fathers as next to Holy Scripture. It was rediscovered in 1873 by Bryennios, Greek Orthodox metropolitan of Nicomedia, in the codex from which, in 1875, he had published the full text of the Epistles of St. Clement. The title in the manuscript is *Didache kyriou dia ton dodeka apostolon ethesin*, but before this it gives the heading *Didache ton dodeka apostolon*. The old Latin translation of cc. i-v, found by Dr. J. Schlecht in 1900, has the longer title, omitting "twelve", and has a rubric *De doctrinâ Apostolorum*. For convenience the contents may be divided into three parts: the first is the "Two Ways", the Way of Life and the Way of Death; the second part is a *rituale* dealing with baptism, fasting, and Holy Communion; the third speaks of the ministry. Doctrinal teaching is presupposed, and none is imparted.

The Didache is mentioned by Eusebius after the books of Scripture (*Church History* III.25.4): "Let there be placed among the spuria the writing of the Acts of Paul, the so-called Shepherd and the Apocalypse of Peter, and besides these the Epistle known as that of Barnabas, and what are called the Teachings of the

Apostles, and also ... the Apocalypse of John, if this be thought fit ..." S t. Athanasius and Rufinus add the "Teaching" to the sapiential and other deutero-canonical books. (Rufinus gives the curious alternative title "Judicium Petri".) It has a similar place in the lists of Nicephorus, Pseudo-Anastasius, and Pseudo-Athanasius (Synopsis). The Pseudo-Cyprianic "Adversus Aleatores" quotes it by name. Unacknowledged citations are very common, if less certain. The "T wo Ways" appears in Barnabas, cc. xviii-xx, sometimes word for word, sometimes added to, dislocated, or abridged, and Barn., iv, 9 is from Didache, xvi, 2-3, or vice versa. Hermas, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen seem to use the work, and so in the West do Optatus and the "Gesta apud Zenophilum". The Didascalia Apostolorum are founded upon the Didache. The Apostolic church ordinance has used a part, the Apostolic Constitutions have embodied the Didascalia. There are echoes in Justin, Tatian, Theophilus, Cyprian, and Lactantius.

Contents

First Part: The Way of Life is the love of God and of our neighbour. The latter only is spoken of at length. We first find the Golden Rule in the negative form (cf. the "W estern" text of Acts 15:19 and 29). Then short extracts from the Sermon on the Mount, together with a curious passage on giving and receiving, which is cited with variations by Hermas (Mand., ii, 4-6). The Latin omits ch. i, 3-6 and ch. ii, 1, and these sections have no parallel in Barnabas; they may therefore be a later addition, and Hermas and the present text of the Didache may have used a common source, or Hermas may be the original. The second chapter contains the Commandments against murder, adultery, theft, coveting, and false witness - in this order - and additional recommendations depending on these.

In ch. iii we are told how one vice leads to another: anger to murder, concupiscence to adultery, and so forth. This section shows some close likenesses to the Babylonian Talmud. The whole chapter is passed over in Barnabas. A number of precepts are added in ch. iv, which ends: "This is the Way of Life." The Way of Death is a mere list of vices to be avoided (v). Ch. vi exhorts to the keeping in the Way of this Teaching: "If thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou wilt be perfect; but if thou canst not, do what thou canst. But as for food, bear what thou canst; but straitly avoid things offered to

idols; for it is a service of dead gods." Many take this to be a recommendation to abstain from flesh, as some explain Romans 14:2. But the "let him eat herbs" of S t. Paul is a hyperbolical expression like 1 Corinthians 8:13: "I will never eat flesh, lest I should scandalize my brother", and gives no support to the notion of vegetarianism in the Early Church. The Didache is referring to Jewish meats. The Latin version substitutes for ch. vi a similar close, omitting all reference to meats and to *idolothyta*, and concluding with *per d. n. j. C... in sæcula sæculor um, amen*. This is the end of the translation. We see that the translator lived at a day when idolatry had disappeared, and when the remainder of the Didache was out of date. He had no such reason for omitting ch. i, 3-6, so that this was presumably not in his copy.

Second Part (vii-x) begins with an instruction on baptism, which is to be conferred "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" in living water, if it can be had - if not, in cold or even hot water. The baptized and, if possible, the baptizer, and other persons must fast for one or two days previously. If the water is insufficient for immersion, it may be poured thrice on the head. This is said by Bigg to show a late date; but it seems a natural concession for hot and dry countries, when baptism was not as yet celebrated exclusively at Easter and Pentecost and in churches, where a *columbethra* and a supply of water would not be wanting. Fasts are not to be on Monday and Thursday "with the hypocrites" (i.e. the Jews), but on Wednesday and Friday (viii). Nor must Christians pray with the hypocrites, but they shall say the Our Father thrice a day. The text of the prayer is not quite that of St. Matthew, and it is given with the doxology "for Thine is the power and the glory for ever", whereas all but a few manuscripts of St. Matthew have this interpolation with "the kingdom and the power" etc.

Ch. ix runs thus: "Concerning the Eucharist, thus shall you give thanks: 'We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the holy Vine of David Thy Child, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy Child; to Thee be the glory for ever'. And of the broken Bread: 'We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the Life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy Child; to Thee be glory for ever. For as this broken Bread was dispersed over the mountains,

and being collected 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.' And let none eat or drink of your Eucharist but those who have been baptized in the Name of Christ; for of this the Lord said: 'Give not the holy Thing to the dogs'." These are clearly prayers after the Consecration and before Communion. Ch. x gives a thanksgiving after Communion, slightly longer, in which mention is made of the "spiritual food and drink and eternal Life through Thy Child". After a doxology, as before, come the remarkable exclamations: "Let grace come, and this world pass away! Hosanna to the Son of David! If any is holy, let him come. If any be not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen". We are not only reminded of the *Hosanna* and *Sancta sanctis* of the liturgies, but also of Apocalypse 22:17-20, and 1 Corinthians 16:22. In these prayers we find deep reverence, and the effect of the Eucharist for eternal Life, though there is no distinct mention of the Real Presence. The words in thanksgiving for the chalice are echoed by Clement of Alexandria, "Quis div.", 29: "It is He [Christ] Who has poured out the Wine, the Blood of the Vine of David, upon our wounded souls"; and by Origen, "In i Judic.", Hom. vi: "Before we are inebriated with the Blood of the True Vine Which ascends from the root of David." The mention of the chalice before the bread is in accordance with St. Luke, xxii, 17-19, in the "Western" text (which omits verse 20), and is apparently from a Jewish blessing of wine and bread, with which rite the prayers in ch. ix have a close affinity.

The Third Part speaks first of teachers or doctors (*didaskaloi*) in general. These are to be received if they teach the above doctrine; and if they add the justice and knowledge of the Lord they are to be received as the Lord. Every Apostle is to be received as the Lord, and he may stay one day or two, but if he stay three, he is a false prophet. On leaving he shall take nothing with him but bread. If he ask for money, he is a false prophet. Similarly with the order of prophets: to judge them when they speak in the spirit is the unpardonable sin; but they must be known by their morals. If they seek gain, they are to be rejected. All travellers who come in the name of the Lord are to be received, but only for two or three days; and they must exercise their trade, if they have one, or at least must not be idle. Anyone who will not work is a *Christemporos* - one who makes a

gain out of the name of Christ. Teachers and prophets are worthy of their food. Firstfruits are to be given to the prophets, "for they are your High Priests; but if you have not a prophet, give the firstfruits to the poor". The breaking of bread and Thanksgiving [Eucharist] is on Sunday, "after you have confessed your transgressions, that your Sacrifice may be pure", and those who are at discord must agree, for this is the clean oblation prophesied by Malachias, i, 11, 14. "Ordain therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons, worthy of the Lord... for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers". Notice that it is for the sacrifice that bishops and deacons are to be ordained. The last chapter (xvi) exhorts to watching and tells the signs of the end of the world.

Sources

It is held by very many critics that the "Two Ways" is older than the rest of the Didache, and is in origin a Jewish work, intended for the instruction of proselytes. The use of the Sibylline Oracles and other Jewish sources may be probable, and the agreement of ch. ii with the Talmud may be certain; but on the other hand Funk has shown that (apart from the admittedly Christian ch. i, 3-6, and the occasional citations of the New Testament) the 0. T. is often not quoted directly, but from the Gospels. Bartlet suggests an oral Jewish catechesis as the source. But the use of such material would surprise us in one whose name for the Jews is "the hypocrites", and in the vehemently anti-Jewish Barnabas still more. The whole base of this theory is destroyed by the fact that the rest of the work, vii-xvi, though wholly Christian in its subject-matter, has an equally remarkable agreement with the Talmud in cc. ix and x. Beyond doubt we must look upon the writer as living at a very early period when Jewish influence was still important in the Church. He warns Christians not to fast with the Jews or pray with them; yet the two fasts and the three times of prayer are modelled on Jewish custom. Similarly the prophets stand in the place of the High Priest.

Date

There are other signs of early date: the simplicity of the baptismal rite, which is apparently neither preceded by exorcisms nor by formal admission to the catechumenate; the simplicity of the Eucharist, in

comparison with the elaborate quasi-Eucharistic prayer in Clement, I Corinthians 59-61; the permission to prophets to extemporize their Eucharistic thanksgiving; the immediate expectation of the second advent. As we find the Christian Sunday already substituted for the Jewish Sabbath as the day of assembly in Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 16:2, and called the Lord's day (Revelation 1:10), there is no difficulty in supposing that the parallel and consequent shifting of the fasts to Wednesday and Friday may have taken place at an equally early date, at least in some places. But the chief point is the ministry. It is twofold: (1) local and (2) itinerant. - (1) The local ministers are bishops and deacons, as in St. Paul (Philippians 1:1) and St. Clement. Presbyters are not mentioned, and the bishops are clearly presbyter-bishops, as in Acts 20, and in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. But when St. Ignatius wrote in 107, or at the latest 117, the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons were already considered necessary to the very name of a Church, in Syria, Asia Minor, and Rome. If it is probable that in St. Clement's time there was as yet no "monarchical" bishop at Corinth, yet such a state of things cannot have lasted long in any important Church. On this ground therefore the Didache must be set either in the first century or else in some backwater of church life. The itinerant ministry is obviously yet more archaic. In the second century prophecy was a charisma only and not a ministry, except among the Montanists. - (2) The itinerant ministers are not mentioned by Clement or Ignatius. The three orders are apostles, prophets, and teachers, as in 1 Corinthians 12:28 sq.: "God hath set some in the Church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors [teachers]; after that miracles, then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all doctors?" The Didache places teachers below apostles and prophets, the two orders which St. Paul makes the foundation of the Church (Ephesians 2:20). The term *apostle* is applied by St. Paul not only to the Twelve, but also to himself, to Barnabas, to his kinsmen, Andronicus and Junias, who had been converted before him, and to a class of preachers of the first rank. But apostles must have "seen the Lord" and have received a special call. There is no instance in Holy Scripture or in early literature of the existence of an order called apostles later than the Apostolic age. We have no right to assume a second-century order of apostles, who had not seen Christ

in the flesh, for the sake of bolstering up a preconceived notion of the date of the Didache. Since in that work the visit of an apostle or of a pretended apostle is contemplated as a not improbable event, we cannot place the book later than about 80. The limit, would seem to be from 65 to 80. Harnack gives 131-160, holding that Barnabas and the Didache independently employ a Christianized form of the Jewish "T wo Ways", while Did., xvi, is citing Barnabas - a somewhat roundabout hypothesis. He places Barnabas in 131, and the Didache later than this. Those who date Barnabas under Vespasian mostly make the Didache the borrower in cc. i-v and xvi. Many, with Funk, place Barnabas under Nerva. The commoner view is that which puts the Didache before 100. Bartlet agrees with Ehrhard that 80-90 is the most probable decade. Sabatier, Minasi, Jacquier, and others have preferred a date even before 70.

As to the place of composition, many suggest Egypt because they think the "Epistle of Barnabas" was written there. The corn upon the mountains does not suit Egypt, though it might be a prayer borrowed from Palestine. There are really no materials even for a conjecture on the subject.

Chapter 3

St. Ignatius of Antioch

Ignatius is also called Theophorus (*ho Theophoros*); born in Syria, around the year 50; died at Rome between 98 and 117. More than one of the earliest ecclesiastical writers have given credence, though apparently without good reason, to the legend that Ignatius was the child whom the Savior took up in His arms, as described in Mark 9:35. It is also believed, and with great probability, that, with his friend Polycarp, he was among the auditors of the Apostle St. John. If we include St. Peter, Ignatius was the third Bishop of Antioch and the immediate successor of Evodius (Eusebius, *Church History* II.3.22). Theodoret ("Dial. Immutab.", I, iv , 33a, Paris, 1642) is the authority for the statement that St. Peter appointed Ignatius to the See of Antioch. St. John Chrysostom lays special emphasis on the honor conferred upon the martyr in receiving his episcopal consecration at the hands of the Apostles themselves ("Hom. in S t. Ig.", IV. 587). Natalis Alexander quotes Theodoret to the same effect (III, xii, art. xvi, p. 53).

All the sterling qualities of ideal pastor and a true soldier of Christ were possessed by the Bishop of Antioch in a pre-eminent degree. Accordingly, when the storm of the persecution of Domitian broke in its full fury upon the Christians of Syria, it found their faithful

leader prepared and watchful. He was unremitting in his vigilance and tireless in his efforts to inspire hope and to strengthen the weaklings of his flock against the terrors of the persecution. The restoration of peace, though it was short-lived, greatly comforted him. But it was not for himself that he rejoiced, as the one great and ever-present wish of his chivalrous soul was that he might receive the fullness of Christian discipleship through the medium of martyrdom. His desire was not to remain long unsatisfied. Associated with the writings of St. Ignatius is a work called "Martyrium Ignatii", which purports to be an account by eyewitnesses of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius and the acts leading up to it. In this work, which such competent Protestant critics as Pearson and Ussher regard as genuine, the full history of that eventful journey from Syria to Rome is faithfully recorded for the edification of the Church of Antioch. It is certainly very ancient and is reputed to have been written by Philo, deacon of Tarsus, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian, who accompanied Ignatius to Rome. It is generally admitted, even by those who regarded it as authentic, that this work has been greatly interpolated. Its most reliable form is that found in the "Martyrium Colbertinum" which closes the mixed recension and is so called because its oldest witness is the tenth-century Codex Colbertinus (Paris).

According to these Acts, in the ninth year of his reign, Trajan, flushed with victory over the Scythians and Dacians, sought to perfect the universality of his dominion by a species of religious conquest. He decreed, therefore, that the Christians should unite with their pagan neighbors in the worship of the gods. A general persecution was threatened, and death was named as the penalty for all who refused to offer the prescribed sacrifice. Instantly alert to the danger that threatened, Ignatius availed himself of all the means within his reach to thwart the purpose of the emperor. The success of his zealous efforts did not long remain hidden from the Church's persecutors. He was soon arrested and led before Trajan, who was then sojourning in Antioch. Accused by the emperor himself of violating the imperial edict, and of inciting others to like transgressions, Ignatius valiantly bore witness to the faith of Christ. If we may believe the account given in the "Martyrium", his bearing before Trajan was characterized by inspired eloquence, sublime courage, and even a spirit of exultation. Incapable of appreciating the motives that animated him, the emperor

ordered him to be put in chains and taken to Rome, there to become the food of wild beasts and a spectacle for the people.

That the trials of this journey to Rome were great we gather from his letter to the Romans (par. 5): “From Syria even to Rome I fight with wild beasts, by land and sea, by night and by day , being bound amidst ten leopards, even a company of soldiers, who only grow worse when they are kindly treated.” Despite all this, his journey was a kind of triumph. News of his fate, his destination, and his probable itinerary had gone swiftly before. At several places along the road his fellow-Christians greeted him with words of comfort and reverential homage. It is probable that he embarked on his way to Rome at Seleucia, in Syria, the nearest port to Antioch, for either Tarsus in Cilicia, or Attalia in Pamphylia, and thence, as we gather from his letters, he journeyed overland through Asia Minor. At Laodicea, on the River Lycus, where a choice of routes presented itself, his guards selected the more northerly, which brought the prospective martyr through Philadelphia and Sardis, and finally to Smyrna, where Polycarp, his fellow-disciple in the school of St. John, was bishop. The stay at Smyrna, which was a protracted one, gave the representatives of the various Christian communities in Asia Minor an opportunity of greeting the illustrious prisoner, and offering him the homage of the Churches they represented. From the congregations of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, deputations came to comfort him. To each of these Christian communities he addressed letters from Smyrna, exhorting them to obedience to their respective bishops, and warning them to avoid the contamination of heresy. These, letters are redolent with the spirit of Christian charity, apostolic zeal, and pastoral solicitude. While still there he wrote also to the Christians of Rome, begging them to do nothing to deprive him of the opportunity of martyrdom.

From Smyrna his captors took him to Troas, from which place he dispatched letters to the Christians of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Polycarp. Besides these letters, Ignatius had intended to address others to the Christian communities of Asia Minor, inviting them to give public expression to their sympathy with the brethren in Antioch, but the altered plans of his guards, necessitating a hurried departure, from Troas, defeated his purpose, and he was obliged to content himself with delegating this office to his friend Polycarp. At Troas they took ship for Neapolis. From this place their journey led them overland

through Macedonia and Illyria. The next port of embarkation was probably Dyrrhachium (Durazzo). Whether having arrived at the shores of the Adriatic, he completed his journey by land or sea, it is impossible to determine. Not long after his arrival in Rome he won his long-coveted crown of martyrdom in the Flavian amphitheater. The relics of the holy martyr were borne back to Antioch by the deacon Philo of Cilicia, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian, and were interred outside the gates not far from the beautiful suburb of Daphne. They were afterwards removed by the Emperor Theodosius II to the Tychaeum, or Temple of Fortune which was then converted into a Christian church under the patronage of the martyr whose relics it sheltered. In 637 they were translated to St. Clement’s at Rome, where they now rest. The Church celebrates the feast of St. Ignatius on 1 February.

The character of St. Ignatius, as deduced from his own and the extant writings of his contemporaries, is that of a true athlete of Christ. The triple honor of apostle, bishop, and martyr was well merited by this energetic soldier of the Faith. An enthusiastic devotion to duty, a passionate love of sacrifice, and an utter fearlessness in the defense of Christian truth, were his chief characteristics. Zeal for the spiritual well-being of those under his charge breathes from every line of his writings. Ever vigilant lest they be infected by the rampant heresies of those early days; praying for them, that their faith and courage may not be wanting in the hour of persecution; constantly exhorting them to unfailing obedience to their bishops; teaching them all Catholic truth; eagerly sighing for the crown of martyrdom, that his own blood may fructify in added graces in the souls of his flock, he proves himself in every sense a true, pastor of souls, the good shepherd that lays down his life for his sheep.

Collections

The oldest collection of the writings of St. Ignatius known to have existed was that made use of by the historian Eusebius in the first half of the fourth century, but which unfortunately is no longer extant. It was made up of the seven letters written by Ignatius whilst on his way to Rome; These letters were addressed to the Christians

- of Ephesus (*Pros Ephesious*);
- of Magnesia (*Magnesieusin*);

- of Tralles (*Trallianois*);
- of Rome (*Pros Romaious*);
- of Philadelphia (*Philadelpheusin*);
- of Smyrna (*Smyrnaiois*); and
- to Polycarp (*Pros Polykarpon*).

We find these seven mentioned not only by Eusebius (*Church History* III.36) but also by St. Jerome (De viris illust., c. xvi). Of later collections of Ignatian letters which have been preserved, the oldest is known as the "long recension". This collection, the author of which is unknown, dates from the latter part of the fourth century. It contains the seven genuine and six spurious letters, but even the genuine epistles were greatly interpolated to lend weight to the personal views of its author. For this reason they are incapable of bearing witness to the original form. The spurious letters in this recension are those that purport to be from Ignatius

- to Mary of Cassobola (*Pros Marian Kassoboliten*);
- to the Tarsians (*Pros tous en tarso*);
- to the Philippians (*Pros Philippesious*);
- to the Antiochenes (*Pros Antiocheis*);
- to Hero a deacon of Antioch (*Pros Erona diakonon Antiocheias*). Associated with the foregoing is
- a letter from Mary of Cassobola to Ignatius.

It is extremely probable that the interpolation of the genuine, the addition of the spurious letters, and the union of both in the long recension was the work of an Apollinarist of Syria or Egypt, who wrote towards the beginning of the fifth century. Funk identifies him with the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions, which came out of Syria in the early part of the same century. Subsequently there was added to this collection a panegyric on St. Ignatius entitled, "Laus Heronis". Though in the original it was probably written in Greek, it is now extant only in Latin and Coptic texts. There is also a third recension, designated by Funk as the "mixed collection". The time of its origin can be only vaguely determined as being between that of the collection known to Eusebius and the long recension. Besides the seven genuine letters of Ignatius in their original form, it also contains the six spurious ones, with the exception of that to the Philippians.

In this collection is also to be found the "Martyrium Colbertinum". The Greek original of this recension is contained in a single codex, the famous Mediceo-Laurentianus manuscript at Florence. This codex is incomplete, wanting the letter to the Romans, which, however, is to be found associated with the "Martyrium Colbertinum" in the Codex Colbertinus, at Paris. The mixed collection is regarded as the most reliable of all in determining what was the authentic text of the genuine Ignatian letters. There is also an ancient Latin version which is an unusually exact rendering of the Greek. Critics are generally inclined to look upon this version as a translation of some Greek manuscript of the same type as that of the Medicean Codex. This version owes its discovery to Archbishop Ussher, of Ireland, who found it in two manuscripts in English libraries and published it in 1644. It was the work of Robert Grosseteste, a Franciscan friar and Bishop of Lincoln (c. 1250). The original Syriac version has come down to us in its entirety only in an Armenian translation. It also contains the seven genuine and six spurious letters. This collection in the original Syriac would be invaluable in determining the exact text of Ignatius, were it in existence, for the reason that it could not have been later than the fourth or fifth century. The deficiencies of the Armenian version are in part supplied by the abridged recension in the original Syriac. This abridgment contains the three genuine letters to the Ephesians, the Romans, and to Polycarp. The manuscript was discovered by Cureton in a collection of Syriac manuscripts obtained in 1843 from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara in the Desert of Nitria. Also there are three letters extant only in Latin. Two of the three purport to be from Ignatius to St. John the Apostle, and one to the Blessed Virgin, with her reply to the same. These are probably of Western origin, dating no further back than the twelfth century.

The controversy

At intervals during the last several centuries a warm controversy has been carried on by patrologists concerning the authenticity of the Ignatian letters. Each particular recension has had its apologists and its opponents. Each has been favored to the exclusion of all the others, and all, in turn, have been collectively rejected, especially by the coreligionists of Calvin. The reformer himself, in language as violent as it is uncritical (Institutes, 1-3), repudiates *in globo* the letters which

so completely discredit his own peculiar views on ecclesiastical government. The convincing evidence which the letters bear to the Divine origin of Catholic doctrine is not conducive to predisposing non-Catholic critics in their favor, in fact, it has added not a little to the heat of the controversy. In general, Catholic and Anglican scholars are ranged on the side of the letters written to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrniots, and to Polycarp; whilst Presbyterians, as a rule, and perhaps a priori, repudiate everything claiming Ignatian authorship.

The two letters to the Apostle St. John and the one to the Blessed Virgin, which exist only in Latin, are unanimously admitted to be spurious. The great body of critics who acknowledge the authenticity of the Ignatian letters restrict their approval to those mentioned by Eusebius and St. Jerome. The six others are not defended by any of the early Fathers. The majority of those who acknowledge the Ignatian authorship of the seven letters do so conditionally, rejecting what they consider the obvious interpolations in these letters. In 1623, whilst the controversy was at its height, Vedelius gave expression to this latter opinion by publishing at Geneva an edition of the Ignatian letters in which the seven genuine letters are set apart from the five spurious. In the genuine letters he indicated what was regarded as interpolations. The reformer Dallaeus, at Geneva, in 1666, published a work entitled "De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur", in which (lib. II) he called into question the authenticity of all seven letters. To this the Anglican Pearson replied spiritedly in a work called "Vindiciae epistolarum S. Ignatii", published at Cambridge, 1672. So convincing were the arguments adduced in this scholarly work that for two hundred years the controversy remained closed in favor of the genuineness of the seven letters. The discussion was reopened by Cureton's discovery (1843) of the abridged Syriac version, containing the letters of Ignatius to the Ephesians, Romans, and to Polycarp. In a work entitled "Vindiciae Ignatianae" London, 1846), he defended the position that only the letters contained in his abridged Syriac recension, and in the form therein contained, were genuine, and that all others were interpolated or forged outright. This position was vigorously combated by several British and German critics, including the Catholics Denzinger and Hefele, who successfully defended the genuineness of the entire seven epistles. It is now

generally admitted that Cureton's Syriac version is only an abbreviation of the original.

While it can hardly be said that there is at present any unanimous agreement on the subject, the best modern criticism favors the authenticity of the seven letters mentioned by Eusebius. Even such eminent non-Catholic critics as Zahn, Lightfoot, and Harnack hold this view. Perhaps the best evidence of their authenticity is to be found in the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians, which mentions each of them by name. As an intimate friend of Ignatius, Polycarp, writing shortly after the martyr's death, bears contemporaneous witness to the authenticity of these letters, unless, indeed, that of Polycarp itself be regarded as interpolated or forged. When, furthermore, we take into consideration the passage of Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., V, xxviii, 4) found in the original Greek in Eusebius (*Church History* III.36), in which he refers to the letter to the Romans. (iv, I) in the following words: "Just as one of our brethren said, condemned to the wild beasts in martyrdom for his faith", the evidence of authenticity becomes compelling. The romance of Lucian of Samosata, "De morte peregrini", written in 167, bears incontestable evidence that the writer was not only familiar with the Ignatian letters, but even made use of them. Harnack, who was not always so minded, describes these proofs as "testimony as strong to the genuineness of the epistles as any that can be conceived of" (Expositor , ser. 3, III, p. 11).

He was unremitting in his vigilance and tireless in his efforts to inspire hope and to strengthen the weaklings of his flock against the terrors of the persecution. The restoration of peace, though it was short-lived, greatly comforted him. But it was not for himself that he rejoiced, as the one great and ever-present wish of his chivalrous soul was that he might receive the fullness of Christian discipleship through the medium of martyrdom. His desire was not to remain long unsatisfied. Associated with the writings of St. Ignatius is a work called "Martyrium Ignatii", which purports to be an account by eyewitnesses of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius and the acts leading up to it. In this work, which such competent Protestant critics as Pearson and Ussher regard as genuine, the full history of that eventful journey from Syria to Rome is faithfully recorded for the edification of the Church of Antioch. It is certainly very ancient and is reputed to have been written by Philo,

deacon of Tarsus, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian, who accompanied Ignatius to Rome. It is generally admitted, even by those who regarded it as authentic, that this work has been greatly interpolated. Its most reliable form is that found in the "Martyrium Colbertinum" which closes the mixed recension and is so called because its oldest witness is the tenth-century Codex Colbertinus (Paris).

Contents of the letters

It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of the testimony which the Ignatian letters offer to the dogmatic character of Apostolic Christianity. The martyred Bishop of Antioch constitutes a most important link between the Apostles and the Fathers of the early Church. Receiving from the Apostles themselves, whose auditor he was, not only the substance of revelation, but also their own inspired interpretation of it; dwelling, as it were, at the very fountain-head of Gospel truth, his testimony must necessarily carry with it the greatest weight and demand the most serious consideration. Cardinal Newman did not exaggerate the matter when he said ("The Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius", in "Historical Sketches", I, London, 1890) that "the whole system of Catholic doctrine may be discovered, at least in outline, not to say in parts filled up, in the course of his seven epistles". Among the many Catholic doctrines to be found in the letters are the following:

- the Church was Divinely established as a visible society, the salvation of souls is its end, and those who separate themselves from it cut themselves off from God (*Philadelphians* 3)
- the hierarchy of the Church was instituted by Christ (Introduction to *Philadelphians*; *Ephesians* 6)
- the threefold character of the hierarchy (*Magnesians* 6)
- the order of the episcopacy superior by Divine authority to that of the priesthood (*Magnesians* 6 and 13; *Smyrnæans* 8; *Trallians* 3)
- the unity of the Church (*Trallians* 6; *Philadelphians* 3; *Magnesians* 13)
- the holiness of the Church (*Smyrnæans*, *Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Trallians* and *Romans*)

- the catholicity of the Church (*Smyrnæans* 8); the infallibility of the Church (*Philadelphians* 3; *Ephesians* 16-17)
- the doctrine of the Eucharist (*Smyrnæans* 8), which word we find for the first time applied to the Blessed Sacrament, just as in *Smyrnæans* 8, we meet for the first time the phrase "Catholic Church", used to designate all Christians
- the Incarnation (*Ephesians* 18); the supernatural virtue of virginity, already much esteemed and made the subject of a vow (*Polycarp* 5)
- the religious character of matrimony (*Polycarp* 5)
- the value of united prayer (*Ephesians* 13)
- the primacy of the See of Rome (Introduction to *Romans* 13)

He, moreover, denounces in principle the Protestant doctrine of private judgment in matters of religion (*Philadelphians* 3), The heresy against which he chiefly inveighs is Docetism. Neither do the Judaizing heresies escape his vigorous condemnation.

Editions

The four letters found in Latin only were printed in Paris in 1495. The common Latin version of eleven letters, together with a letter of Polycarp and some reputed works of Dionysius the Areopagite, was printed in Paris, 1498, by Lefèvre d'Etaples. Another edition of the seven genuine and six spurious letters, including the one to Mary of Cassobola, was edited by Symphorianus Champerius, of Lyons, Paris, 1516. Valentinus Paceus published a Greek edition of twelve letters (Dillingen, 1557). A similar edition was brought out at Zurich, in 1559, by Andrew Gesner; a Latin version of the work of John Brunner accompanied it. Both of these editions made use of the Greek text of the long recension. In 1644 Archbishop Ussher edited the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp. The common Latin version, with three of the four Latin letters, was subjoined. It also contained the Latin version of eleven letters taken from Ussher's manuscripts. In 1646 Isaac Voss published at Amsterdam an edition from the famous Medicean Codex at Florence. Ussher brought out another edition in 1647, entitled "Appendix Ignatiana", which contained the Greek text of the genuine epistles and the Latin version of the "Martyrium Ignatii".

In 1672 J.B. Cotelier's edition appeared at Paris, containing all the letters, genuine and supposititious, of Ignatius, with those of the other Apostolic Fathers. A new edition of this work was printed by Le Clerc at Antwerp, in 1698. It was reprinted at Venice, 1765-1767, and at Paris by Migne in 1857. The letter to the Romans was published from the "Martyrium Colbertinum" at Paris, by Ruinart, in 1689. In 1724 Le Clerc brought out at Amsterdam a second edition of Cotelier's "Patres Apostolici", which contains all the letters, both genuine and spurious, in Greek and Latin versions. It also includes the letters of Mary of Cassobola and those purporting to be from the Blessed Virgin in the "Martyrium Ignatii", the "Vindiciae Ignatianae" of Pearson, and several dissertations. The first edition of the Armenian version was published at Constantinople in 1783. In 1839 Hefele edited the Ignatian letters in a work entitled "Opera Patrum Apostolicorum", which appeared at Tübingen. Migne took his text from the third edition of this work (Tübingen, 1847). Bardenhewer designates the following as the best editions: Zahn, "Ignatii et Polycarpi epistulae martyria, fragmenta" in "Patr . apostol. opp. rec.", ed. by de Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, fasc. II, Leipzig, 1876; Funk, "Opp. Patr . apostol.", I, Tübingen, 1878, 1887, 1901; Lightfoot, "The Apostolic Fathers", part II, London, 1885, 1889; an English version of the letters to be found in Lightfoot's "Apostolic Fathers", London, 1907, from which are taken all the quotations of the letters in this article, and to which all citations refer.

Chapter 4

St. Irenaeus of Lyons

St. Irenaeus was the Bishop of Lyons, and Father of the Church. Information as to his life is scarce, and in some measure inexact. He was born in Proconsular Asia, or at least in some province bordering thereon, in the first half of the second century; the exact date is controverted, between the years 115 and 125, according to some, or, according to others, between 130 and 142. It is certain that, while still very young, Irenaeus had seen and heard the holy Bishop Polycarp (d. 155) at Smyrna. During the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, Irenaeus was a priest of the Church of Lyons. The clergy of that city, many of whom were suffering imprisonment for the Faith, sent him (177 or 178) to Rome with a letter to Pope Eleutherius concerning Montanism, and on that occasion bore emphatic testimony to his merits. Returning to Gaul, Irenaeus succeeded the martyr Saint Pothinus as Bishop of Lyons. During the religious peace which followed the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, the new bishop divided his activities between the duties of a pastor and of a missionary (as to which we have but brief data, late and not very certain) and his writings, almost all of which were directed against Gnosticism, the heresy then spreading in Gaul and elsewhere. In 190 or 191 he interceded with Pope Victor to lift the

sentence of excommunication laid by that pontiff upon the Christian communities of Asia Minor which persevered in the practice of the Quartodecimans in regard to the celebration of Easter. Nothing is known of the date of his death, which must have occurred at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. In spite of some isolated and later testimony to that effect, it is not very probable that he ended his career with martyrdom. His feast is celebrated on 28 June in the Latin Church, and on 23 August in the Greek.

Irenaeus wrote in Greek many works which have secured for him an exceptional place in Christian literature, because in controverted religious questions of capital importance they exhibit the testimony of a contemporary of the heroic age of the Church, of one who had heard St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and who, in a manner, belonged to the Apostolic Age. None of these writings has come down to us in the original text, though a great many fragments of them are extant as citations in later writers (Hippolytus, Eusebius, etc.). Two of these works, however, have reached us in their entirety in a Latin version:

- A treatise in five books, commonly entitled *Adversus haereses*, and devoted, according to its true title, to the "Detection and Overthrow of the False Knowledge." Of this work we possess a very ancient Latin translation, the scrupulous fidelity of which is beyond doubt. It is the chief work of Irenaeus and truly of the highest importance; it contains a profound exposition not only of Gnosticism under its different forms, but also of the principal heresies which had sprung up in the various Christian communities, and thus constitutes an invaluable source of information on the most ancient ecclesiastical literature from its beginnings to the end of the second century. In refuting the heterodox systems Irenaeus often opposes to them the true doctrine of the Church, and in this way furnishes positive and very early evidence of high importance. Suffice it to mention the passages, so often and so fully commented upon by theologians and polemical writers, concerning the origin of the Gospel according to St. John, the Holy Eucharist, and the primacy of the Roman Church.
- Of a second work, written after the "Adversus Haereses", an ancient literal translation in the Armenian language. This is the "Proof of the Apostolic Preaching." The author's aim here is not to confute heretics, but to confirm the faithful by expounding the Christian doctrine to them, and notably by demonstrating the truth of the Gospel by means of the Old Testament prophecies. Although it contains fundamentally, so to speak, nothing that has not already been expounded in the "Adversus Haereses", it is a document of the highest interest, and a magnificent testimony of the deep and lively faith of Irenaeus.

Of his other works only scattered fragments exist; many, indeed, are known only through the mention made of them by later writers, not even fragments of the works themselves having come down to us. These are

- a treatise against the Greeks entitled "On the Subject of Knowledge" (mentioned by Eusebius);
- a writing addressed to the Roman priest Florinus "On the Monarchy, or How God is not the Cause of Evil" (fragment in Eusebius);
- a work "On the Ogdoad", probably against the Ogdoad of Valentinus the Gnostic, written for the same priest Florinus, who had gone over to the sect of the Valentinians (fragment in Eusebius);
- a treatise on schism, addressed to Blastus (mentioned by Eusebius);
- a letter to Pope Victor against the Roman priest Florinus (fragment preserved in Syriac);
- another letter to the same on the Paschal controversies (extracts in Eusebius);
- other letters to various correspondents on the same subject (mentioned by Eusebius, a fragment preserved in Syriac);
- a book of divers discourses, probably a collection of homilies (mentioned by Eusebius); and
- other minor works for which we have less clear or less certain attestations.

The four fragments which Pfaff published in 1715, ostensibly from a Turin manuscript, have been proven by Funk to be apocryphal, and Harnack has established the fact that Pfaff himself fabricated them.

Chapter 5

St. Justin Martyr

Christian apologist, born at Flavia Neapolis, about A.D. 100, converted to Christianity about A.D. 130, taught and defended the Christian religion in Asia Minor and at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom about the year 165. Two "Apologies" bearing his name and his "Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon" have come down to us. Leo XIII had a Mass and an Office composed in his honour and set his feast for 14 April.

Life

Among the Fathers of the second century his life is the best known, and from the most authentic documents. In both "Apologies" and in his "Dialogue" he gives many personal details, e.g. about his studies in philosophy and his conversion; they are not, however, an autobiography, but are partly idealized, and it is necessary to distinguish in them between poetry and truth; they furnish us however with several precious and reliable clues. For his martyrdom we have documents of undisputed authority. In the first line of his "Apology" he calls himself "Justin, the son of Priscos, son of Baccheios, of Flavia Neapolis, in Palestinian Syria". Flavia Neapolis, his native town, founded by Vespasian (A.D. 72), was built

on the site of a place called Mabortha, or Mamortha, quite near Sichem (Guérin, "Samarie", I, Paris, 1874, 390-423; Schürer , "History of the Jewish People", tr ., I, Edinburgh, 1885). Its inhabitants were all, or for the most part, pagans. The names of the father and grandfather of Justin suggest a pagan origin, and he speaks of himself as uncircumcised (Dialogue, xxviii). The date of his birth is uncertain, but would seem to fall in the first years of the second century. He received a good education in philosophy, an account of which he gives us at the beginning of his "Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon"; he placed himself first under a Stoic, but after some time found that he had learned nothing about God and that in fact his master had nothing to teach him on the subject. A Peripatetic whom he then found welcomed him at first but afterwards demanded a fee from him; this proved that he was not a philosopher. A Pythagorean refused to teach him anything until he should have learned music, astronomy, and geometry. Finally a Platonist arrived on the scene and for some time delighted Justin. This account cannot be taken too literally; the facts seem to be arranged with a view to showing the weakness of the pagan philosophies and of contrasting them with the teachings of the Prophets and of Christ. The main facts, however, may be accepted; the works of Justin seem to show just such a philosophic development as is here described, Eclectic, but owing much to Stoicism and more to Platonism. He was still under the charm of the Platonistic philosophy when, as he walked one day along the seashore, he met a mysterious old man; the conclusion of their long discussion was that he soul could not arrive through human knowledge at the idea of God, but that it needed to be instructed by the Prophets who, inspired by the Holy Ghost, had known God and could make Him known ("Dialogue", iii, vii; cf. Zahm, "Dichtung and Wahrheit in Justins Dialog mit dem Jeden Trypho" in "Zeitschr . für Kirchengesch.", VIII, 1885-1886, 37-66).

The "Apologies" throw light on another phase of the conversion of Justin: "When I was a disciple of Plato", he writes, "hearing the accusations made against the Christians and seeing them intrepid in the face of death and of all that men fear, I said to myself that it was impossible that they should be living in evil and in the love of pleasure" (II Apol., xviii, 1). Both accounts exhibit the two aspects of Christianity that most strongly influenced St. Justin; in the "Apologies" he is moved

by its moral beauty (I Apol., xiv), in the "Dialogue" by its truth. His conversion must have taken place at the latest towards A.D. 130, since St. Justin places during the war of Bar-Cocheba (132-135) the interview with the Jew Tryphon, related in his "Dialogue". This interview is evidently not described exactly as it took place, and yet the account cannot be wholly fictitious. Tryphon, according to Eusebius (*Church History* IV.18.6), was "the best known Jew of that time", which description the historian may have borrowed from the introduction to the "Dialogue", now lost. It is possible to identify in a general way this Tryphon with the Rabbi Tarphon often mentioned in the Talmud (Schürer , "Gesch. d. Jud. Volkes", 3rd ed., II, 377 seq., 555 seq., cf., however , Herford, "Christianity in Talmud and Midrash", London, 1903, 156). The place of the interview is not definitely told, but Ephesus is clearly enough indicated; the literary setting lacks neither probability nor life, the chance meetings under the porticoes, the groups of curious onlookers who stop a while and then disperse during the interviews, offer a vivid picture of such extemporary conferences. St. Justin lived certainly some time at Ephesus; the Acts of his martyrdom tell us that he went to Rome twice and lived "near the baths of Timothy with a man named Martin". He taught school there, and in the aforesaid Acts of his martyrdom we read of several of his disciples who were condemned with him.

In his second "Apology" (iii) Justin says: "I, too, expect to be persecuted and to be crucified by some of those whom I have named, or by Crescens, that friend of noise and of ostentation." Indeed Tatian relates (*Address to the Greeks* 19) that the Cynic philosopher Crescens did pursue him and Justin; he does not tell us the result and, moreover, it is not certain that the "Discourse" of Tatian was written after the death of Justin. Eusebius (*Church History* IV.16.7-8) says that it was the intrigues of Crescens which brought about the death of Justin; this is credible, but not certain; Eusebius has apparently no other reason for affirming it than the two passages cited above from Justin and Tatian. St. Justin was condemned to death by the prefect, Rusticus, towards A.D. 165, with six companions, Chariton, Charito, Evelpostos, Pæon, Hierax, and Liberianos. We still have the authentic account of their martyrdom ("Acta SS.", April, II, 104-19; Otto, "Corpus Apologetarum", III, Jena, 1879, 266-78; P .G., VI, 1565-72). The examination ends as follows:

"The Prefect Rusticus says: Approach and sacrifice, all of you, to the gods. Justin says: No one in his right mind gives up piety for impiety. The Prefect Rusticus says: If you do not obey, you will be tortured without mercy. Justin replies: That is our desire, to be tortured for Our Lord, Jesus Christ, and so to be saved, for that will give us salvation and firm confidence at the more terrible universal tribunal of Our Lord and Saviour. And all the martyrs said: Do as you wish; for we are Christians, and we do not sacrifice to idols. The Prefect Rusticus read the sentence: Those who do not wish to sacrifice to the gods and to obey the emperor will be scourged and beheaded according to the laws. The holy martyrs glorifying God betook themselves to the customary place, where they were beheaded and consummated their martyrdom confessing their Saviour."

Works

Justin was a voluminous and important writer. He himself mentions a "Treatise against Heresy" (I Apology, xxvi, 8); St. Irenæus (*Against Heresies* IV.6.2) quotes a "T reatise against Marcion" which may have been only a part of the preceding work. Eusebius mentions both (*Church History* IV.11.8-10), but does not seem to have read them himself; a little further on (IV.18) he gives the following list of Justin's works: "Discourse in favour of our Faith to Antoninus Pius, to his sons, and to the Roman Senate"; an "Apology" addressed to Marcus Aurelius; "Discourse to the Greeks"; another discourse called "A Refutation"; "Treatise on the Divine Monarchy"; a book called "The Psalmist"; "Treatise on the soul"; "Dialogue against the Jews", which he had in the city of Ephesus with Tryphon, the most celebrated Israelite of that time. Eusebius adds that many more of his books are to be found in the hands of the brethren. Later writers add nothing certain to this list, itself possibly not altogether reliable. There are extant but three works of Justin, of which the authenticity is assured: the two "Apologies" and the "Dialogue". They are to be found in two manuscripts: Paris gr. 450, finished on 11 September, 1364; and Claromont. 82, written in 1571, actually at Cheltenham, in the possession of M.T.F. Fenwick. The second is only a copy of the first, which is therefore our sole authority; unfortunately this manuscript is very imperfect (Harnack, "Die Ueberlieferung der griech. Apologeten" in "Texte and Untersuchungen", I, Leipzig, 1883, i, 73-

89; Archambault, "Justin, Dialogue a vec Tryphon", Paris, 1909, p. xii-xxxviii). There are many large gaps in this manuscript, thus II Apol., ii, is almost entirely wanting, but it has been found possible to restore the manuscript text from a quotation of Eusebius (*Church History* IV.17). The "Dialogue" was dedicated to a certain Marcus Pompeius (exli, viii); it must therefore have been preceded by a dedicatory epistle and probably by an introduction or preface; both are lacking. In the seventy-fourth chapter a large part must also be missing, comprising the end of the first book and the beginning of the second (Zahn, "Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.", VIII, 1885, 37 sq., Bardenhewer, "Gesch. der altkirchl. Litter.", I, Freiburg im Br., 1902, 210). There are other less important gaps and many faulty transcriptions. There being no other manuscript, the correction of this one is very difficult; conjectures have been often quite unhappy, and Krüger, the latest editor of the "Apology", has scarcely done more than return to the text of the manuscript.

In the manuscript the three works are found in the following order: second "Apology", first "Apology", the "Dialogue". Dom Maran (Paris, 1742) re-established the original order, and all other editors have followed him. There could not be as a matter of fact any doubt as to the proper order of the "Apologies", the first is quoted in the second (iv , 2; vi, 5; viii, 1). The form of these references shows that Justin is referring, not to a different work, but to that which he was then writing (II Apol., ix, 1, cf. vii, 7; I Apol., lxiii, 16, cf. xxxii, 14; lxiii, 4, cf. xxi, 1; lxi, 6, cf. lxiv, 2). Moreover, the second "Apology" is evidently not a complete work independent of the first, but rather an appendix, owing to a new fact that came to the writer's knowledge, and which he wished to utilize without recasting both works. It has been remarked that Eusebius often alludes to the second "Apology" as the first (*Church History* IV.8.5 and IV.17.1), but the quotations from Justin by Eusebius are too inexact for us to attach much value to this fact (cf. *Church History* IV.11.8; Bardenhewer, op. cit., 201). Probably Eusebius also erred in making Justin write one apology under Antoninus (161) and another under Marcus Aurelius. The second "Apology", known to no other author, doubtless never existed (Bardenhewer, loc. cit.; Harnack, "Chronologie der christl. Litter.", I, Leipzig, 1897, 275). The date of the "Apology" cannot be determined by its dedication, which is not certain, but can be

established with the aid of the following facts: it is 150 years since the birth of Christ (I, xlvi, 1); Marcion has already spread abroad his error (I, xxvi, 5); now, according to Epiphanius (Hæres., xlii, 1), he did not begin to teach until after the death of Hyginus (A.D. 140). The Prefect of Egypt, Felix (I, xxix, 2), occupied this charge in September, 151, probably from 150 to about 154 (Grenfell-Hunt, "Oxyrhinchus Papyri", II, London, 1899, 163, 175; cf. Harnack, "Theol. Literaturzeitung", XXII, 1897, 77). From all of this we may conclude that the "Apology" was written somewhere between 153 and 155. The second "Apology", as already said, is an appendix to the first and must have been written shortly afterwards. The Prefect Urbinus mentioned in it was in charge from 144 to 160. The "Dialogue" is certainly later than the "Apology" to which it refers (*Dialogue with Trypho* 120, cf. "I Apol.", xxvi); it seems, moreover, from this same reference that the emperors to whom the "Apology" was addressed were still living when the "Dialogue" was written. This places it somewhere before A.D. 161, the date of the death of Antoninus.

The "Apology" and the "Dialogue" are difficult to analyse, for Justin's method of composition is free and capricious, and defies our habitual rules of logic. The content of the first "Apology" (Viel, "Justinus des Phil. Rechtfertigung", Strasburg, 1894, 58 seq.) is somewhat as follows:

- i-iii: exordium to the emperors: Justin is about to enlighten them and free himself of responsibility, which will now be wholly theirs.
- iv-xii: first part or introduction:
* the anti-Christian procedure is iniquitous: they persecute in the Christians a name only (iv, v);
* Christians are neither Atheists nor criminals (vi, vii);
* they allow themselves to be killed rather than deny their God (viii);
* they refuse to adore idols (ix, xii);
* conclusion (xii).
- xiii-lxvii: Second part (exposition and demonstration of Christianity):
* Christians adore the crucified Christ, as well as God (xiii);
* Christ is their Master; moral precepts (xiv-xvii);

* the future life, judgement, etc. (xviii-xx).
* Christ is the Incarnate Word (xxi-lx);
* comparison with pagan heroes, Hermes, AEsculapius, etc. (xxi-xxii);
* superiority of Christ and of Christianity before Christ (xlvi).
* The similarities that we find in the pagan worship and philosophy come from the devils (liv-lx).
* Description of Christian worship: baptism (lxi);
* the Eucharist (lxv-lxvi);
* Sunday-observance (lxvii).

Second "Apology":

- Recent injustice of the Prefect Urbinus towards the Christians (i-iii).
- Why it is that God permits these evils: Providence, human liberty, last judgement (iv-xii).

  The "Dialogue" is much longer than the two apologies taken together ("Apol." I and II in P.G., VI, 328-469; *Dialogue with Trypho*), the abundance of exegetical discussions makes any analysis particularly difficult. The following points are noteworthy:

- i-ix. Introduction: Justin gives the story of his philosophic education and of this conversion. One may know God only through the Holy Ghost; the soul is not immortal by its nature; to know truth it is necessary to study the Prophets.
- x-xxx: On the law. Tryphon reproaches the Christians for not observing the law. Justin replies that according to the Prophets themselves the law should be abrogated, it had only been given to the Jews on account of their hardness. Superiority of the Christian circumcision, necessary even for the Jews. The eternal law laid down by Christ.
- xxxi-cviii: On Christ: His two comings (xxxi sqq.); the law a figure of Christ (xl-xlv); the Divinity and the pre-existence of Christ proved above all by the Old Testament apparitions (theophanies) (lvi-lxii); incarnation and virginal conception (lxv sqq.); the death of Christ foretold (lxxxvi sqq.); His resurrection (cvi sqq.).

- cviii to the end: On the Christians. The conversion of the nations foretold by the Prophets (cix sqq.); Christians are a holier people than the Jews (cxix sqq.); the promises were made to them (cxxi); they were prefigured in the Old Testament (cxxxiv sqq.). The "Dialogue" concludes with wishes for the conversion of the Jews.

  Besides these authentic works we possess others under Justin's name that are doubtful or apocryphal.

- "On the Resurrection" (for its numerous fragments see Otto, "Corpus Apolog.", 2nd ed., III, 210-48 and the "Sacra Parallela", Holl, "Fragmente vornicanischer Kirchenvater aus den Sacra Parallela" in "Texte und Untersuchungen", new series, V, 2, Leipzig, 1899, 36-49). The treatise from which these fragments are taken was attributed to St. Justin by St. Methodius (early fourth century) and was quoted by St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, who do not, however, name the author. The attribution of the fragments to Justin is therefore probable (Harnack, "Chronologie", 508; Bousset, "Die Evangeliencitaten Justins", Göttingen, 1891, 123sq.; archambault, "Le témoignage de l'ancienne littérature Chrétienne sur l'authenticité d'un traité sur la resurrection attribué à Justin l'Apologiste" in "Revuede Philologie", XXIX, 1905, 73-93). The chief interest of these fragments consists in the introduction, where is explained with much force the transcendent nature of faith and the proper nature of its motives.
- "A Discourse to the Greeks" (Otto, op. cit., III, 1, 2, 18), an apocryphal tract, dated by Harnack (Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1896, 627-46), about A.D. 180-240. Later it was altered and enlarged in Syriac: text and English translation by Cureton, "Spicileg. Syr.", London, 1855, 38-42, 61-69.
- "Exhortation to the Greeks" (Otto, op. cit., 18-126). The authenticity of this has been defended without success by Widman ("Die Echtheit der Mahnrede Justins an die Heiden", Mainz, 1902); Puech, "Sur le *logos parainetikos* attribué à Justin" in "Mélanges Weil", Paris, 1898, 395-406, dates it about 260-300, but most critics say, with more probability, A.D. 180-240 (Gaul, "Die Abfassungsverhaltnisse der pseudojustinischen Cohortatio ad Græcos", Potsdam, 1902).

- "On Monarchy" (Otto, op. cit., 126-158), tract of uncertain date, in which are freely quoted Greek poets altered by some Jew.
- "Exposition of the Faith" (Otto, op. cit., IV, 2-66), a dogmatic treatise on the Trinity and the Incarnation preserved in two copies the longer of which seems the more ancient. It is quoted for the first time by Leontius of Byzantium (d. 543) and refers to the Christological discussions of the fifth century; it seems, therefore, to date from the second half of that century.
- "Letter to Zenas and Serenus" (Otto, op. cit., 66-98), attributed by Batiffol in "Revue Biblique", VI, 1896, 114-22, to Sisinnios, the Novatian Bishop of Constantinople about A.D. 400.
- "Answers to the Orthodox."
- "The Christian's Questions to the Greeks."
- "The Greek's Questions to the Christians."
- "Refutation of certain Aristotelean theses" (Otto, op. cit., IV, 100-222; V, 4-366).

The "Answers to the Orthodox" was re-edited in a different and more primitive form by Papadopoulos-Kerameus (St. Petersburg, 1895), from a Constantinople manuscript which ascribed the work to Theodoret. Though this ascription was adopted by the editor, it has not been generally accepted. Harnack has studied profoundly these four books and maintains, not without probability, that they are the work of Diodorus of Tarsus (Harnack, "Diodor von Tarsus., vier pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen" in "Texte und Untersuch.", XII, 4, Leipzig, 1901).

Doctrine

Justin and philosophy

The only pagan quotations to be found in Justin's works are from Homer, Euripides, Xenophon, Menander, and especially Plato (Otto, II, 593 sq.). His philosophic development has been well estimated by Purves ("The Testimony of Justin Martyr to early Christianity", London, 1882, 132): "He appears to have been a man of moderate culture. He was certainly not a genius nor an original thinker." A true eclectic, he draws inspiration from different systems, especially from

Stoicism and Platonism. Weizsäcker (Jahrbücher f. Protest. Theol., XII, 1867, 75) thought he recognized a Peripatetic idea, or inspiration, in his conception of God as immovable above the heavens (*Dialogue with Trypho* 127); it is much more likely an idea borrowed from Alexandrian Judaism, and one which furnished a very efficacious argument to Justin in his anti-Jewish polemic. In the Stoics Justin admires especially their ethics (II Apol., viii, 1); he willingly adopts their theory of a universal conflagration (*ekpyrosis*). In I Apol., xx, lx; II, vii, he adopts, but at the same time transforms, their concept of the seminal Word (*logos spermatikos*). However, he condemns their Fatalism (II Apol., vii) and their Atheism (*Dialogue with Trypho* 2). His sympathies are above all with Platonism. He likes to compare it with Christanity; apropos of the last judgment, he remarks, however (I Apol., viii, 4), that according to Plato the punishment will last a thousand years, whereas according to the Christians it will be eternal; speaking of creation (I Apol., xx, 4; lix), he says that Plato borrowed from Moses his theory of formless matter; similarly he compares Plato and Christianity apropos of human responsibility (I Apol., xliv, 8) and the Word and the Spirit (I Apol., lx). However, his acquaintance with Plato was superficial; like his contemporaries (Philo, Plutarch, St. Hippolytus), he found his chief inspiration in the Timæus. Some historians have pretended that pagan philosophy entirely dominated Justin's Christianity (Aubé, "S. Justin", Paris, 1861), or at least weakened it (Engelhardt, "Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers", Erlangen, 1878). To appreciate fairly this influence it is necessary to remember that in his "Apology" Justin is seeking above all the points of contact between Hellenism and Christianity. It would certainly be wrong to conclude from the first "Apology" (xxii) that Justin actually likens Christ to the pagan heroes of semi-heroes, Hermes, Perseus, or AEsculapius; neither can we conclude from his first "Apology" (iv , 8 or vii, 3, 4) that philosophy played among the Greeks the same role that Christianity did among the barbarians, but only that their position and their reputation were analogous.

In many passages, however, Justin tries to trace a real bond between philosophy and Christianity: according to him both the one and the other have a part in the *Logos*, partially disseminated among men and wholly manifest in Jesus Christ (I, v, 4; I, xlvi; II, viii; II, xiii,

5, 6). The idea developed in all these passages is given in the Stoic form, but this gives to its expression a greater worth. For the Stoics the seminal Word (*logos spermatikos*) is the form of every being; here it is the reason in as much as it partakes of God. This theory of the full participation in the Divine Word (*Logos*) by the sage has its full value only in Stoicism. In Justin thought and expression are antithetic, and this lends a certain incoherence to the theory; the relation established between the integral Word, i.e. Jesus Christ, and the partial Word disseminated in the world, is more specious than profound. Side by side with this theory, and quite different in its origin and scope, we find in Justin, as in most of his contemporaries, the conviction that Greek philosophy borrowed from the Bible: it was by stealing from Moses and the Prophets that Plato and the other philosophers developed their doctrines (I, xliv, lix, ls). Despite the obscurities and incoherences of this thought, he affirms clearly and positively the transcendent character of Christianity: "Our doctrine surpasses all human doctrine because the real Word became Christ who manifested himself for us, body, word and soul." (II, Apol., x, 1.) This Divine origin assures Christianity an absolute truth (II, xiii, 2) and gives to the Christians complete confidence; they die for Christ's doctrine; no one died for that of Socrates (II, x, 8). The first chapters of the "Dialogue" complete and correct these ideas. In them the rather complaisant syncretism of the "Apology" disappears, and the Christian thought is stronger .

Justin's chief reproach to the philosophers is their mutual divisions; he attributes this to the pride of the heads of sects and the servile acquiescence of their adherents; he also says a little later on (vi): "I care neither for Plato nor for Pythagoras." From it all he concludes that for the pagans philosophy is not a serious or profound thing; life does not depend on it, nor action: "Thou art a friend of discourse", says the old man to him before his conversion, "but not of action nor of truth" (iv). For Platonism he retained a kindly feeling as for a study dear in childhood or in youth. Yet he attacks it on two essential points: the relation between God and man, and the nature of the soul (*Dialogue with Trypho* 3, 6). Nevertheless he still seems influenced by it in his conception of the Divine transcendency and the interpretation that he gives to the aforesaid theophanies.

Justin and Christian revelation

That which Justin despairs of attaining through philosophy he is now sure of possessing through Jewish and Christian revelation. He admits that the soul can naturally comprehend that God is, just as it understands that virtue is beautiful (*Dialogue with Trypho* 4) but he denies that the soul without the assistance of the Holy Ghost can see God or contemplate Him directly through ecstasy, as the Platonic philosophers contended. And yet this knowledge of God is necessary for us: "We cannot know God as we know music, arithmetic or astronomy" (iii); it is necessary for us to know God not with an abstract knowledge but as we know any person with whom we have relations. The problem which it seems impossible to solve is settled by revelation; God has spoken directly to the Prophets, who in their turn have made Him known to us (viii). It is the first time in Christian theology that we find so concise an explanation of the difference which separates Christian revelation from human speculation. It does away with the confusion that might arise from the theory, taken from the "Apology", of the partial *Logos* and the *Logos* absolute or entire.

The Bible of Justin

The Old Testament

For Philo the Bible is very particularly the Pentateuch (Ryle, "Philo and Holy Scripture", XVII, London, 1895, 1-282). In keeping with the difference of his purpose, Justin has other preferences. He quotes the Pentateuch often and liberally, especially Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy; but he quotes still more frequently and at greater length the Psalms and the Books of Prophecy - above all, Isaias. The Books of Wisdom are seldom quoted, the historical books still less. The books that we never find in his works are Judges, Esdras (except one passage which is attributed to him by mistake - *Dialogue with Trypho* 72), Tobias, Judith, Ester, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Abdias, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus. It has been noticed, too (St. John Thackeray in "Journ. of Theol. Study", IV, 1903, 265, n.3), that he never cites the last chapters of Jeremias (apropos of the first "Apology", xlvii, Otto is wrong in his reference to Jeremiah 50:3). Of these omissions the most noteworthy is that of Wisdom, precisely on account of the similarity of ideas. It is to be noted, moreover, that this book, surely used in the New Testament, cited by St. Clement of

Rome (xxvii, 5) and later by St. Irenaeus (Eusebius, *Church History* V.26), is never met with in the works of the apologists (the reference of Otto to Tatian 7 is inexact). On the other hand one finds in Justin some apocryphal texts: pseudo-Esdras (*Dialogue with Trypho* 72), pseudo-Jeremias (ibid.), Psalm 96:10 (*Dialogue with Trypho* 72; I Apol., xli); sometimes also errors in ascribing quotations: Zacharias for Malachias (*Dialogue with Trypho* 49), Osee for Zacharias for Malachias (*Dialogue with Trypho* 14). For the Biblical text of Justin, see Swete, "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek", Cambridge, 1902, 417-24.

The New Testament

The testimony of Justin is here of still greater importance, especially for the Gospels, and has been more often discussed. The historical side of the question is given by W. Bousset, "Die Evangeliencitaten Justins" (Göttingen, 1891), 1-12, and since then, by Baldus, "Das Verhaltniss Justins der Mart. zu unseren synopt. Evangelien" (Munster, 1895); Lippelt, "Quæ fuerint Justini mart. *apomnemoneumata* quaque ratione cum forma Evangeliorum syro-latina cohaeserint" (Halle, 1901). The books quoted by Justin are called by him "Memoirs of the Apostles". This term, otherwise very rare, appears in Justin quite probably as an analogy with the "Memorabilia" of Xenophon (quoted in "II Apol.", xi, 3) and from a desire to accommodate his language to the habits of mind of his readers. At any rate it seems that henceforth the word "gospels" was in current usage; it is in Justin that we find it for the first time used in the plural, "the Apostles in their memoirs that are called gospels" (I Apol., lxvi, 3). These memoirs have authority, not only because they relate the words of Our Lord (as Bossuet contends, op. cit., 16 seq.), but because, even in their narrative parts, they are considered as Scripture (*Dialogue with Trypho* 49, citing Matthew 17:13). This opinion of Justin is upheld, moreover, by the Church who, in her public service reads the memoirs of the Apostles as well as the writings of the prophets (I Apol., lxvii, 3). These memoirs were composed by the Apostles and by those who followed them (*Dialogue with Trypho* 103); he refers in all probability to the four Evangelists, i.e. to two Apostles and two disciples of Christ (Stanton, "New Testament canon" in Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible", III, 535). The authors, however, are not named: once (*Dialogue with Trypho* 103) he mentions the "memoirs of Peter", but the text is very obscure and uncertain (Bousset, op. cit., 18).

All facts of the life of Christ that Justin takes from these memoirs are found indeed in our Gospels (Baldus, op. cit., 13 sqq.); he adds to them a few other and less important facts (I Apol., xxxii; xxxv; *Dialogue with Trypho* 35, 47, 51, 78), but he does not assert that he found them in the memoirs. It is quite probable that Justin used a concordance, or harmony, in which were united the three synoptic Gospels (Lippelt, op. cit., 14, 94) and it seems that the text of this concordance resembled in more than one point the so-called Western text of the Gospels (cf. ibid., 97). Justin's dependence on St. John is indisputably established by the facts which he takes from Him (I Apol., lxi, 4, 5; *Dialogue with Trypho* 69, 88), still more by the very striking similarity in vocabulary and doctrine. It is certain, however, that Justin does not use the fourth Gospel as abundantly as he does the others (Purves, op. cit., 233); this may be owing to the aforesaid concordance, or harmony, of the synoptic Gospels. He seems to use the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (I Apol., xxxv, 6; cf. *Dialogue with Trypho* 103; Revue Biblique, III, 1894, 531 sqq.; Harnack, "Bruchstücke des Evang. des Petrus", Leipzig, 1893, 37). His dependence on the *Protoevangelium of James* (*Dialogue with Trypho* 78) doubtful.

Apologetical method

Justin's attitude towards philosophy, described above, reveals at once the tendency of his polemics; he never exhibits the indignation of a Tatian or even of a Tertullian. To the hideous calumnies spread abroad against the Christians he sometimes answers, as do the other apologists, by taking the offensive and attacking pagan morality (I Apol., xxvii; II, xii, 4, 5), but he dislikes to insist on these calumnies: the interlocutor in the "Dialogue" (ix) he is careful to ignore those who would trouble him with their loud laughter. He has not the eloquence of Tertullian, and can obtain a hearing only in a small circle of men capable of understanding reason and of being moved by an idea. His chief argument, and one calculated to convert this hearers as it had converted him (II Apol., xii), is the great new fact of Christian morality. He speaks of men and women who have no fear of death

(I Apol., ii, xi, xlv; II, ii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 30), who prefer truth to life (I Apol., ii; II, iv) and are yet ready to await the time allotted by God (II, iv, 1); he makes known their devotion to their children (I, xxvii), their charity even towards their enemies, and their desire to save them (I Apol., lvii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 133), their patience and their prayers in persecution (*Dialogue with Trypho* 18), their love of mankind (*Dialogue with Trypho* 93, 110). When he contrasts the life that they led in paganism with their Christian life (I Apol., xiv), he expresses the same feeling of deliverance and exaltation as did St. Paul (1 Corinthians 6:11). He is careful, moreover, to emphasize, especially from the Sermon on the Mount, the moral teaching of Christ so as to show in it the real source of these new virtues (I Apol., xv-xviii). Throughout his expose of the new religion it is Christian chastity and the courage of the martyrs that he most insists upon.

The rational evidences of Christianity Justin finds especially in the prophecies; he gives to this argument more than a third of his "Apology" (xxx-liii) and almost the entire "Dialogue". When he is disputing with the pagans he is satisfied with drawing attention to the fact that the books of the Prophets were long anterior to Christ, guaranteed as to their authenticity by the Jews themselves, and says that they contain prophecies concerning the life of Christ and the spread of the Church that can only be explained by a Divine revelation (I Apol., xxxi). In the "Dialogue", arguing with Jews, he can assume this revelation which they also recognize, and he can invoke the Scriptures as sacred oracles. These evidences of the prophecies are for him absolutely certain. "Listen to the texts which I am about to cite; it is not necessary for me to comment upon them, but only for you to hear them" (*Dialogue with Trypho* 53; cf. I Apol., xxx, liii). Nevertheless he recognizes that Christ alone could have given the explanation of them (I Apol., xxxii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 76 and 105); to understand them the men and women of his time must have the interior dispositions that make the true Christian (*Dialogue with Trypho* 112), i.e., Divine grace is necessary (*Dialogue with Trypho* 7, 58, 112 and 119). He also appeals to miracles (*Dialogue with Trypho* 7, 35 and 69; cf. II Apol., vi), but with less insistence than to the prophecies.

Theology

God

Justin's teaching concerning God has been very diversely interpreted, some seeing in it nothing but a philosophic speculation (Engelhardt, 127 sq., 237 sqq.), others a truly Christian faith (Flemming, "Zur Beurteilung des Christentums Justins des Märtyrers", Leipzig, 1893, 70 sqq.; Stahlin, "Justin der Martyrer und sein neuester Beurtheiler", 34 sqq., Purves, op. cit., 142 sqq.). In reality it is possible to find in it these two tendencies: on one side the influence of philosophy betrays itself in his concept of the Divine transcendency, thus God is immovable (I Apol., ix; x, 1; lxiii, 1; etc.); He is above the heaven, can neither be seen nor enclosed within space (*Dialogue with Trypho* 56, 60 and 127); He is called Father, in a philosophic and Platonistic sense, inasmuch as He is the Creator of the world (I Apol., xlv, 1; lxi, 3; lxv, 3; II Apol., vi, 1, etc.). On the other hand we see the God of the Bible in his all-powerful (*Dialogue with Trypho* 84; I Apol., xix, 6), and merciful God (*Dialogue with Trypho* 84; I Apol., xix, 6); if He ordained the Sabbath it was not that He had need of the homage of the Jews, but that He desired to attach them to Himself (*Dialogue with Trypho* 22); through His mercy He preserved among them a seed of salvation (lv); through His Divine Providence He has rendered the nations worthy of their inheritance (cxviiicxxx); He delays the end of the world on account of the Christians (xxxix; I Apol., xxviii, xlv). And the great duty of man is to love Him (*Dialogue with Trypho* 93).

The Logos

The Word is numerically distinct from the Father (*Dialogue with Trypho* 128-129; cf. *Dialogue with Trypho* 56, 62). He was born of the very substance of the Father, not that this substance was divided, but He proceeds from it as one fire does from another at which it is lit (cxxviii, lxi); this form of production (procession) is compared also with that of human speech (lxi). The Word (*Logos*) is therefore the Son: much more, He alone may properly be called Son (II Apol., vi, 3); He is the *monogenes*, the *unigenitus* (*Dialogue with Trypho* 105). Elsewhere, however, Justin, like St. Paul, calls Him the eldest Son, *prototokos* (I Apol., xxxiii; xlvi; lxiii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 84, 85 and 125). The Word is God (I Apol., lxiii; *Dialogue with Trypho*

34, 36, 37, 56, 63, 76, 86, 87, 113, 115, 125, 126 and 128). His Divinity, however, seems subordinate, as does the worship which is rendered to Him (I Apol., vi; cf. lxi, 13; Teder, "Justins des Martyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus", Freibur g im Br., 1906, 103-19). The Father engendered Him by a free and voluntary act (*Dialogue with Trypho* 61, 100, 127 and 128; cf. Teder, op. cit., 104), at the beginning of all His works (*Dialogue with Trypho* 61-62, II Apol., vi, 3); in this last text certain authors thought they distinguished in the Word two states of being, one intimate, the other outspoken, but this distinction, though found in some other apologists, is in Justin very doubtful. Through the Word God has made everything (II Apol., vi; *Dialogue with Trypho* 114). The Word is diffused through all humanity (I Apol., vi; II, viii; xiii); it was He who appeared to the patriarchs (I Apol., lxii; lxiii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 56, 59, 60 etc.). Two influences are plainly discernible in the aforesaid body of doctrine. It is, of course, to Christian revelation that Justin owes his concept of the distinct personality of the Word, His Divinity and Incarnation; but philosophic speculation is responsible for his unfortunate concepts of the temporal and voluntary generation of the Word, and for the subordinationism of Justin's theology. It must be recognized, moreover, that the latter ideas stand out more boldly in the "Apology" than in the "Dialogue."

The Holy Ghost occupies the third place in the Trinity (I Apol., vi). He inspired the prophets (I Apol., vi;xxxi; *Dialogue with Trypho* 7). He gave seven gifts to Christ and descended upon Him (*Dialogue with Trypho* 87-88). For the real distinction between the Son and the Spirit see Teder, op. cit., 119-23. Justin insists constantly on the virgin birth (I Apol., xxii; xxxiii; *Dialogue with Trypho* 43, 76, 84, etc.) and the reality of the flesh of Christ (*Dialogue with Trypho* 48, 98 and 103; cf. II Apol., x, 1). He states that among the Christians there are some who do not admit the Divinity of Christ but they are a minority; he differs from them because of the authority of the Prophets (*Dialogue with Trypho* 96); the entire dialogue, moreover, is devoted to proving this thesis. Christ is the Master whose doctrine enlightens us (I Apol., xiii, 3; xxiii, 2; xxxii, 2; II, viii, 5; xiii, 2; *Dialogue with Trypho* 8, 77, 83, 100 and 113), also the Redeemer whose blood saves us (I Apol., lxiii, 10, 16; *Dialogue with Trypho* 13, 40, 41, 95 and 106; cf. Rivière, "Hist. du dogme de la rédemption", Paris, 1905, 115, and tr., London, 1908). The rest of Justin's theology is less

personal, therefore less interesting. As to the Eucharist, the baptismal Mass and the Sunday Mass are described in the first "Apology" (lxv-lxvii), with a richness of detail unique for that age. Justin here explains the dogma of the Real Presence with a wonderful clearness (lxvi, 2): "In the same way that through the power of the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour took flesh and blood for our salvation, so the nourishment consecrated by the prayer formed of the words of Christ... is the flesh and blood of this incarnate Jesus." The "Dialogue" (cxvii; cf. xli) completes this doctrine by the idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice as a memorial of the Passion.

The role of St. Justin may be summed up in one word: it is that of a witness. We behold in him one of the highest and purest pagan souls of his time in contact with Christianity, compelled to accept its irrefragable truth, its pure moral teaching, and to admire its superhuman constancy. He is also a witness of the second-century Church which he describes for us in its faith, its life, its worship, at a time when Christianity yet lacked the firm organization that it was soon to develop, but the larger outlines of whose constitution and doctrine are already luminously drawn by Justin. Finally, Justin was a witness.

Chapter 6

Tertullian

Tertullian (full name: QUINTUS SEPTIMIUS FLORENS TERTULLIANUS) Ecclesiastical writer in the second and third centuries, born probably about 160 at Carthage, being the son of a centurion in the proconsular service. He was evidently by profession an advocate in the law-courts, and he shows a close acquaintance with the procedure and terms of Roman law, though it is doubtful whether he is to be identified with a jurist Tertullian who is cited in the Pandects. He knew Greek as well as Latin, and wrote works in Greek which have not come down to us. A pagan until middle life, he had shared the pagan prejudices against Christianity, and had indulged like others in shameful pleasures. His conversion was not later than the year 197, and may have been earlier. He embraced the Faith with all the ardour of his impetuous nature. He became a priest, no doubt of the Church of Carthage. Monceaux, followed by d'Ales, considers that his earlier writings were composed while he was yet a layman, and if this be so, then his ordination was about 200. His extant writings range in date from the apologetics of 197 to the attack on a bishop who is probably Pope Callistus (after 218). It was after the year 206 that he joined the Montanist sect, and he seems to have definitively

separated from the Church about 211 (Harnack) or 213 (Monceaux). After writing more virulently against the Church than even against heathen and persecutors, he separated from the Montanists and founded a sect of his own. The remnant of the Tertullianists was reconciled to the Church by St. Augustine.

A number of the works of Tertullian are on special points of belief or discipline. According to St. Jerome he lived to extreme old age.

The year 197 saw the publication of a short address by Tertullian, "T o the Martyrs", and of his great apologetic works, the "Ad nationes" and the "Apologeticus". The former has been considered a finished sketch for the latter; but it is more true to say that the second work has a different purpose, though a great deal of the same matter occurs in both, the same arguments being displayed in the same manner, with the same examples and even the same phrases. The appeal to the nations suffers from its transmission in a single codex, in which omissions of a word or several words or whole lines are to be deplored. Tertullian's style is difficult enough without such super added causes of obscurity. But the text of the "Ad nationes" must have been always rougher than that of the "Apologeticus", which is a more careful as well as a more perfect work, and contains more matter because of its better arrangement; for it is just the same length as the two books "Ad nationes".

The "Ad nationes" has for its entire object the refutation of calumnies against Christians. In the first place they are proved to repose on unreasoning hatred only; the procedure of trial is illogical; the offence is nothing but the name of Christian, which ought rather to be a title of honour; no proof is forthcoming of any crimes, only rumour; the first persecutor was Nero, the worst of emperors. Secondly, the individual charges are met; Tertullian challenges the reader to believe in anything so contrary to nature as the accusations of infanticide and incest. Christians are not the causes of earthquakes and floods and famine, for these happened long before Christianity. The pagans despise their own gods, banish them, forbid their worship, mock them on the stage; the poets tell horrid stories of them; they were in reality only men, and bad men. You say we worship an ass's head, he goes on, but you worship all kinds of animals; your gods are images made on a cross framework, so you worship crosses. You say

we worship the sun; so do you. A certain Jew hawked about a caricature of a creature half ass, half goat, as our god; but you actually adore half-animals. As for infanticide, you expose your own children and kill the unborn. Your promiscuous lust causes you to be in danger of the incest of which you accuse us. We do not swear by the genius of Caesar, but we are loyal, for we pray for him, whereas you revolt. Caesar does not want to be a god; he prefers to be alive. You say it is through obstinacy that we despise death; but of old such contempt of death was esteemed heroic virtue. Many among you brave death for gain or wagers; but we, because we believe in judgment. Finally, do us justice; examine our case, and change your minds. The second book consists entirely in an attack on the gods of the pagans; they are marshalled in classes after Varro. It was not, urges the apologist, owing to these multitudinous gods that the empire grew.

Out of this fierce appeal and indictment was developed the grander "Apologeticus", addressed to the rulers of the empire and the administrators of justice. The former work attacked popular prejudices; the new one is an imitation of the Greek Apologies, and was intended as an attempt to secure an amelioration in the treatment of Christians by alteration of the law or its administration. Tertullian cannot restrain his invective; yet he wishes to be conciliating, and it breaks out in spite of his argument, instead of being its essence as before. He begins again by an appeal to reason. There are no witnesses, he urges, to prove our crimes; Trajan ordered Pliny not to seek us out, but yet to punish us if we were known; - what a paralogism! The actual procedure is yet more strange. Instead of being tortured until was confess, we are tortured until we deny. So far the "Ad Nationes" is merely developed and strengthened. Then, after a condensed summary of the second book as to the heathen gods, Tertullian begins in chapter xvii an exposition of the belief of Christians in one God, the Creator, invisible, infinite, to whom the soul of man, which by nature is inclined to Christianity, bears witness. The floods and the fires have been His messengers. We have a testimony, he adds, from our sacred books, which are older than all your gods. Fulfilled prophecy is the proof that they are divine. It is then explained that Christ is God, the Word of God born of a virgin; His two comings, His miracles, passion, resurrection, and forty days with the disciples, are recounted. The disciples spread His doctrine throughout the world;

Nero sowed it with blood at Rome. When tortured the Christian cries, "We worship God through Christ". The demons confess Him and they stir men up against us. Next, loyalty to Caesar is discussed at greater length than before. When the populace rises, how easily the Christians could take vengeance: "We are but of yesterday, yet we fill your cities, islands, forts, towns, councils, even camps, tribes, decuries, the palace, the senate, the forum; we have left you the temples alone". We might migrate, and leave you in shame and in desolation. We ought at least to be tolerated; for what are we? - a body compacted by community of religion, of discipline, and of hope. We meet together to pray, even for the emperors and authorities, to hear readings from the holy books and exhortations. We judge and separate those who fall into crime. We have elders of proved virtue to preside. Our common fund is replenished by voluntary donations each month, and is expended not on gluttony but on the poor and suffering. This charity is quoted against us as a disgrace; see, it is said, how they love one another. We call ourselves brethren; you also are our brethren by nature, but bad brethren. We are accused of every calamity. Yet we live with you; we avoid no profession, but those of assassins, sorcerers, and such like. You spare the philosophers, though their conduct is less admirable than ours. They confess that our teaching is older than theirs, for nothing is older than truth. The resurrection at which you jeer has many parallels in nature. You think us fools; and we rejoice to suffer for this. We conquer by our death. Inquire into the cause of our constancy. We believe this martyrdom to be the remission of all offences, and that he who is condemned before your tribunal is absolved before God.

These points are all urged with infinite wit and pungency. The faults are obvious. The effect on the pagans may have been rather to irritate than to convince. The very brevity results in obscurity. But every lover of eloquence, and there were many in those days, will have relished with the pleasure of an epicure the feast of ingenious pleading and recondite learning. The rapier thrusts are so swift, we can hardly realize their deadliness before they are renewed in showers, with sometimes a blow as of a bludgeon to vary the effect. The style is compressed like that of Tacitus, but the metrical closes are observed with care, against the rule of Tacitus; and that wonderful maker of phrases is outdone by his Christian successor in gemlike sentences

which will be quoted while the world lasts. Who does not know the *anima naturaliter Christiana* (soul by nature Christian); the *Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant* (see they exclaim, how they love one another), and the *Semen est sanguis Christianorum* (The blood of Christians is seed)? It was probably about the same time that Tertullian developed his thesis of the "Testimony of the Soul" to the existence of one God, in his little book with this title. With his usual eloquence he enlarges on the idea that common speech bids us use expressions such as "God grant", or "If God will", "God bless", "God sees", "May God repay". The soul testifies also to devils, to just vengeance, and to its own immortality.

Two or three years later (about 200) Tertullian assaulted heresy in a treatise even more brilliant, which, unlike the "Apologeticus", is not for his own day only but for all time. It is called "Liber de praescriptione haereticorum". Prescription now means the right obtained to something by long usage. In Roman law the signification was wider; it meant the cutting short of a question by the refusal to hear the adversary's arguments, on the ground of an anterior point which must cut away the ground under his feet. So Tertullian deals with heresies: it is of no use to listen to their arguments or refute them, for we have a number of antecedent proofs that they cannot deserve a hearing. Heresies, he begins, must not astonish us, for they were prophesied. Heretics urge the text, "Seek and ye shall find", but this was not said to Christians; we have a rule of faith to be accepted without question. "Let curiosity give place to faith and vain glory make way for salvation", so Tertullian parodies a line of Cicero's. The heretics argue out of Scripture; but, first, we are forbidden to consort with a heretic after one rebuke has been delivered, and secondly, disputation results only in blasphemy on the one side and indignation on the other, while the listener goes away more puzzled than he came.

The real question is, "To whom does the Faith belong? Whose are the Scriptures? By whom, through whom, when and to whom has been handed down the discipline by which we are Christians? The answer is plain: Christ sent His apostles, who founded churches in each city, from which the others have borrowed the tradition of the Faith and the seed of doctrine and daily borrow in order to become churches; so that they also are Apostolic in that they are the offspring

of the Apostolic churches. All are that one Church which the Apostles founded, so long as peace and intercommunion are observed [*dum est illis communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis*]. Therefore the testimony to the truth is this: We communicate with the apostolic Churches". The heretics will reply that the Apostles did not know all the truth. Could anything be unknown to Peter, who was called the rock on which the Church was to be built? or to John, who lay on the Lord's breast? But they will say, the churches have erred. Some indeed went wrong, and were corrected by the Apostle; though for others he had nothing but praise. "But let us admit that all have erred:- is it credible that all these great churches should have strayed into the same faith"? Admitting this absurdity, then all the baptisms, spiritual gifts, miracles, martyrdoms, were in vain until Marcion and Valentinus appeared at last! Truth will be younger than error; for both these heresiarchs are of yesterday, and were still Catholics at Rome in the episcopate of Eleutherius (this name is a slip or a false reading).

Anyhow the heresies are at best novelties, and have no continuity with the teaching of Christ. Perhaps some heretics may claim Apostolic antiquity: we reply: Let them publish the origins of their churches and unroll the catalogue of their bishops till now from the Apostles or from some bishop appointed by the Apostles, as the Smyrnaeans count from Polycarp and John, and the Romans from Clement and Peter; let heretics invent something to match this. Why, their errors were denounced by the Apostles long ago. Finally (36), he names some Apostolic churches, pointing above all to Rome, whose witness is nearest at hand, - happy Church, in which the Apostles poured out their whole teaching with their blood, where Peter suffered a death like his Master's, where Paul was crowned with an end like the Baptist's, where John was plunged into fiery oil without hurt! The Roman Rule of Faith is summarized, no doubt from the old Roman Creed, the same as our present Apostles' Creed but for a few small additions in the latter; much the same summary was given in chapter xiii, and is found also in "De vir ginibus velandis" (chapter I). Tertullian evidently avoids giving the exact words, which would be taught only to catechumens shortly before baptism. The whole luminous argument is founded on the first chapters of St. Irenaeus's third book, but its forceful exposition is not more Tertullian's own than its exhaustive

and compelling logic. Never did he show himself less violent and less obscure. The appeal to the Apostolic churches was unanswerable in his day; the rest of his argument is still valid.

A series of short works addressed to catechumens belong also to Tertullian's Catholic days, and fall between 200 and 206. "De spectaculis" explains and probably exaggerates the impossibility for a Christian to attend any heathen shows, even races or theatrical performances, without either wounding his faith by participation in idolatry or arousing his passions. "De idololatria" is by some placed at a later date, but it is anyhow closely connected with the former work. It explains that the making of idols is forbidden, and similarly astrology, selling of incense, etc. A schoolmaster cannot elude contamination. A Christian cannot be a soldier. To the question, "How am I then to live?", Tertullian replies that faith fears not famine; for the Faith we must give up our life, how much more our living? "De baptismo" is an instruction on the necessity of baptism and on its effects; it is directed against a female teacher of error belonging to the sect of Gaius (perhaps the Anti-Montanist). We learn that baptism was conferred regularly by the bishop, but with his consent could be administered by priests, deacons, or even laymen. The proper times were Easter and Pentecost. Preparation was made by fasting, vigils, and prayers.

Confirmation was conferred immediately after by unction and laying on of hands. "De paenitentia" will be mentioned later. "De oratione" contains an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, *totius evangelii breviarium*. "De cultu feminarum" is an instruction on modesty and plainness in dress; Tertullian enjoys detailing the extravagances of female toilet and ridiculing them. Besides these didactic works to catechumens, Tertullian wrote at the same period two books, "Ad uxorem", in the former of which he begs his wife not to marry again after his death, as it is not proper for a Christian, while in the second book he enjoins upon her at least to marry a Christian if she does marry, for pagans must not be consorted with. A little book on patience is touching, for the writer admits that it is an impudence in him to discourse on a virtue in which he is so conspicuously lacking. A book against the Jews contains some curious chronology, used to prove the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks. The latter half of the book is nearly identical with part of the third book against

Marcion. It would seem that Tertullian used over again what he had written in the earliest form of that work, which dates from this time. "Adversus Hermogenem" is against a certain Hermogenes, a painter (of idols?) who taught that God created the world out of pre-existing matter. Tertullian reduces his view *ad absurdum*, and establishes the creation out of nothing both from Scripture and reason.

The next period of Tertullian's literary activity shows distinct evidence of Montanist opinions, but he has not yet openly broken with the Church, which had not as yet condemned the new prophecy. Montanus and the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla had been long dead when Tertullian was converted to belief in their inspiration. He held the words of Montanus to be really those of the Paraclete, and he characteristically exaggerated their import. We find him henceforth lapsing into rigorism, and condemning absolutely second marriage and forgiveness of certain sins, and insisting on new fasts. His teaching had always been excessive in its severity; now he positively revels in harshness. Harnack and d'Alès look upon "De Virginibus velandis" as the first work of this time, though it has been placed later by Monceaux and others on account of its irritated tone. We learn that Carthage was divided by a dispute whether virgins should be veiled; Tertullian and the pro-Montanist party stood for the affirmative. The book had been preceded by a Greek writing on the same subject. Tertullian declares that the Rule of Faith is unchangeable, but discipline is progressive. He quotes a dream in favour of the veil. The date may be about 206. Shortly afterwards Tertullian published his largest extant work, five books against Marcion. A first draft had been written much earlier; a second recension had been published, when yet unfinished, without the writer's consent; the first book of the final edition was finished in the fifteenth year of Severus, 207. The last book may be a few years later. This controversy is most important for our knowledge of Marcion's doctrine. The refutation of it out of his own New Testament, which consisted of St. Luke's Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles, enables us to reconstitute much of the heretic's Scripture text. The result may be seen in Zahn's, "Geschichte des N. T. Kanons", II, 455-524. A work against the Valentinians followed. It is mainly based on the first book of St. Irenæus.

In 209 the little book "De pallio" appeared. Tertullian had excited remark by adopting the Greek pallium, the recognized dress of

philosophers, and he defends his conduct in a witty pamphlet. A long book, "De anima", gives Tertullian's psychology. He well describes the unity of the soul; he teaches that it is spiritual, but immateriality in the fullest sense he admits for nothing that exists, - even God is *corpus*. Two works are against the Docetism of the Gnostics, "De carne Christi" and "De resurrectione carnis". Here he emphasizes the reality of Christ's Body and His virgin-birth, and teaches a corporal resurrection. But he seems to deny the virginity of Mary, the Mother of Christ, *in partu*, though he affirms it *ante partum*. He addressed to a convert who was a widower an exhortation to avoid second marriage, which is equivalent to fornication. This work, "De exhortatione castitatis", implies that the writer is not yet separated from the Church. The same excessive rigour appears in the "De corona", in which Tertullian defends a soldier who had refused to wear a chaplet on his head when he received the donative granted to the army on the accession of Caracalla and Geta in 211. The man had been degraded and imprisoned. Many Christians thought his action extravagant, and refused to regard him as a martyr. Tertullian not only declares that to wear the crown would have been idolatry, but argues that no Christian can be a soldier without compromising his faith. Next in order is the "Scorpiace", or antidote to the bite of the Scorpion, directed against the teaching of the Valentinians that God cannot approve of martyrdom, since He does not want man's death; they even permitted the external act of idolatry. Tertullian shows that God desires the courage of the martyrs and their victory over temptation; he proves from Scripture the duty of suffering death for the Faith and the great promises attached to this heroism. To the year 212 belongs the open letter "Ad scapulam", addressed to the proconsul of Africa who was renewing the persecution, which had ceased since 203. He is solemnly warned of the retribution which overtakes persecutors.

The formal secession of Tertullian from the Church of Carthage seems to have taken place either in 211 or at the end of 212 at latest. The earlier date is fixed by Harnack on account of the close connection between the "De corona" of 211 with the "De fuga", which must, he thinks, have immediately followed the "De corona". It is certain that "De fuga in persecutione" was written after the secession. It condemns

flight in time of persecution, for God's providence has intended the suffering. This intolerable doctrine had not been held by Tertullian in his Catholic days. He now terms the Catholics "Psychici", as opposed to the "spiritual" Montanists. The cause of his schism is not mentioned. It is unlikely that he left the Church by his own act. Rather it would seem that when the Montanist prophecies were finally disapproved at Rome, the Church of Carthage excommunicated at least the more violent among their adherents. After "De fuga" come "De monogamia" (in which the wickedness of second marriage is yet more severely censured) and "De jejunio", a defence of the Montanist fasts. A dogmatic work, "Adversus Prazean", is of great importance. Praxeas had prevented, according to Tertullian, the recognition of the Montanist prophecy by the pope; Tertullian attacks him as a Monarchian, and develops his own doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The last remaining work of the passionate schismatic is apparently "De pudicitia", if it is a protest, as is generally held, against a Decree of Pope Callistus, in which the pardon of adulterers and fornicators, after due penance done, was published at the intercession of the martyrs. Monceaux, however, still supports the view which was once commoner than it now is, that the Decree in question was issued by a bishop of Carthage. In any case Tertullian's attribution of it to a would-be *episcopus episcoporum* and *pontifex maximus* merely attests its peremptory character. The identification of this Decree with the far wider relaxation of discipline with which Hippolytus reproaches Callistus is uncertain.

The argument of Tertullian must be considered in some detail, since his witness to the ancient system of penance is of first-rate importance. As a Catholic, he addressed "De paenitentia" to catechumens as an exhortation to repentance previous to baptism. Besides that sacrament he mentions, with an expression of unwillingness, a "last hope", a second plank of salvation, after which there is no other. This is the severe remedy of exomologesis, confession, involving a long penance in sackcloth and ashes for the remission of post-baptismal sin. In the "De pudicitia" the Montanist now declared that there is no forgiveness for the gravest sins, precisely those for which exomologesis is necessary. It is said by some modern critics, such as Funk and Turmel among Catholics, that Tertullian did not really change his view on this point the writing of the two treatises.

It is pointed out that in "De paenitentia" there is no mention of the restoration of the penitent to communion; he is to do penance, but with no hope of pardon in this life; no sacrament is administered, and the satisfaction is lifelong. This view is impossible. Tertullian declares in "De pudicitia". That he has changed his mind and expects to be taunted for his inconsistency. He implies that he used to hold such a relaxation, as the one he is attacking, to be lawful. At any rate in the "De paen." he parallels baptism with exomologesis, and supposes that the latter has the same effect as the former, obviously the forgiveness of sin in this life. Communion is never mentioned, since catechumens are addressed; but if exomologesis did not eventually restore all Christian privileges, there could be no reason for fearing that the mention of it should act as an encouragement to sin, for a lifelong penance would hardly be a reassuring prospect. No length is mentioned, evidently because the duration depended on the nature of the sin and the judgment of the bishop; had death been the term, this would have been emphatically expressed. Finally. And this is conclusive, it could not be insisted on that no second penance was ever allowed, if all penance was lifelong.

For the full understanding of Tertullian's doctrine we must know his division of sin into three classes. There are first the terrible crimes of idolatry, blasphemy, homicide, adultery, fornication, false witness, fraud (Adv. Marc., IV, ix; in "De Pud." he substitutes apostasy for false witness and adds unnatural vice). As a Montanist he calls these irremissible. Between these and mere venial sins there are modica or media (De Pud.., I), less grave but yet serious sins, which he enumerates in "De Pud.", xix: "Sins of daily committal, to which we are all subject; to whom indeed does it not occur to be angry without cause and after the sun has set, or to give a blow, or easily to curse, or to swear rashly, or break a contract, or lie through shame or necessity? How much we are tempted in business, in duties, in trade, in food, in sight, in hearing! So that, if there were no forgiveness for such things, none could be saved. Therefore there will be forgiveness for these sins by the prayer of Christ to the Father" (De Pud., xix).

Another list (*On Pudicity* 7) represents the sins which may constitute a lost sheep, as distinguished from one that is dead: "The faithful is lost if he attend the chariot races, or gladiatorial combats, or

the unclean theatre, or athletic shows, or playing, or feasts on some secular solemnity, or if he has exercised an art which in any way serves idolatry, or has lapsed without consideration into some denial or blasphemy". For these sins there is forgiveness, though the sinner has strayed from the flock. How is forgiveness obtained? We learn this only incidentally from the words: "That kind of penitence which is subsequent to faith, which can either obtain forgiveness from the bishop for lesser sins, or from God only for those which are irremissible" (*On Pudicity* 18). Thus Tertullian admits the power of the bishop for all but "irremissible" sins. The absolution which he still acknowledges for frequent sins was obviously not limited to a single occasion, but must have been frequently repeated. It is not even referred to in "De paen", which deals only with baptism and public penance for the gravest sins. Again, in "De pudicitia", Tertullian repudiates his own earlier teaching that the keys were left by Christ through Peter to His Church (*Scorpiace* 10); he now declares (*On Pudicity* 21) that the gift was to Peter personally, and cannot be claimed by the Church of the Psychici. The spiritual have the right to forgive, but the Paraclete said: "The Church has the power to forgive sins but I will not do so, lest they sin afresh."

The system of the Church of Carthage in Tertullian's time was therefore manifestly this: Those who committed grievous sins confessed them to the bishop, and he absolved them after due penance enjoined and performed, unless the case was in his judgment so grave that public penance was obligatory. This public penance was only allowed once; it was for protracted periods, even sometimes until the hour of death, but at the end of it forgiveness and restoration were promised. The term was frequently shortened at the prayer of martyrs.

Of the lost works of Tertullian the most important was the defence of the Montanist manner of prophesying, "De ecstasi", in six books, with a seventh book against Apollonius. To the peculiarities of Tertullian's views which have already been explained must be added some further remarks. He did not care for philosophy: the philosophers are the "patriarchs of the heretics". His notion that all things, pure spirits and even God, must be bodies, is accounted for by his ignorance of philosophical terminology. Yet of the human soul he actually says that it was seen in a vision as tender, light, and of the colour of air! All

our souls were contained in Adam, and are transmitted to us with the taint of original sin upon them - an ingenious if gross form of Traducianism. His Trinitarian teaching is inconsistent, being an amalgamation of the Roman doctrine with that of St. Justin Martyr. Tertullian has the true formula for the Holy Trinity, *tres Personae, una Substantia*. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are numerically distinct, and each is God; they are of one substance, one state, and one power. So far the doctrine is accurately Nicene. But by the side of this appears the Greek view which was one day to develop into Arianism: that the unity is to be sought not in the Essence but in the origin of the Persons. He says that from all eternity there was reason (*ratio*) in God, and in reason the Word (*Sermo*), not distinct from God, but *in vulva cordis*. For the purpose of creation the Word received a perfect birth as Son. There was a time when there was no Son and no sin, when God was neither Father nor Judge. In his Christology Tertullian has had no Greek influence, and is purely Roman. Like most Latin Fathers he speaks not of two Natures but of two Substances in one Person, united without confusion, and distinct in their operations. Thus he condemns by anticipation the Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monothelite heresies. But he seems to teach that Mary, the Mother of Christ, had other children. Yet he makes her the second Eve, who by her obedience effaced the disobedience of the first Eve.

Tertullian's doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has been much discussed, especially the words: "Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei". A consideration of the context shows only one interpretation to be possible. Tertullian is proving that Our Lord Himself explained bread in Jeremiah 11:19 (*mittamus lignum in panem ejus*) to refer to His Body, when He said, "This is My Body", that is, that bread was the symbol of His Body. Nothing can be elicited either for or against the Real Presence; for Tertullian does not explain whether the bread is the symbol of the Body present or absent. The context suggests the former meaning. Another passage is: *Panem, quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat*. This might mean "Bread which stands for His Body", or "Presents, makes present". D'Ales has calculated that the sense of presentation to the imagination occurs seven times in Tertullian, and the similar moral sense (presentation by picture,

etc.) occurs twelve times, whereas the sense of physical presentation occurs thirty-three times. In the treatise in question against Marcion the physical sense alone is found, and fourteen times. A more direct assertion of the Real Presence is *Corpus ejus in pane censetur* (*On Prayer* 6). As to the grace given, he has some beautiful expressions, such as: "Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo et individuitatem a corporeejus" (In petitioning for daily bread, we ask for perpetuity in Christ, and indivisibility from His body. - Ibid.). A famous passage on the Sacraments of Baptism, Unction, Confirmation, Orders and Eucharist runs: "Caro abluitur ut anima maculetur; caro ungitur ut anima consecretur; caro signatur ut et anima muniatur; caro manus impositione adumbratur ut et anima spiritu illuminetur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur ut et anima de Deo saginetur" (The flesh is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed [with the cross], that the soul, too, may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul likewise may have its fill of God - "Deres. Carnis.", viii). He testifies to the practice of daily communion, and the preserving of the Holy Eucharist by private persons for this purpose. What will a heathen husband think of that which is taken by his Christian wife before all other food? "If he knows that it is Bread, will he not believe that it is simply what it is called?" This implies not merely the Real Presence, but transubstantiation. The station days were Wednesday and Friday; on what other days besides Holy Mass was offered we do not know. Some thought that Holy Communion would break their fast on station days; Tertullian explains: "When you have received and reserved the Body of the Lord, you will have assisted at the Sacrifice and have accomplished the duty of fasting as well" (De oratione, xix). Tertullian's list of customs observed by Apostolic tradition though not in Scripture (De cor., iii) is famous: the baptismal renunciations and feeding with milk and honey, fasting Communion, offerings for the dead (Masses) on their anniversaries, no fasting or kneeling on the Lord's Day and between Easter and Pentecost, anxiety as to the falling to the ground of any crumb or drop of the Holy Eucharist, the Sign of the Cross made continually during the day.

Tertullian's canon of the Old Testament included the deuterocanonical books, since he quotes most of them. He also cites the Book of Enoch as inspired, and thinks those who rejected it were wrong. He seems also to recognize IV Esdras, and the Sibyl, though he admits that there are many Sibylline forgeries. In the New Testament he knows the Four Gospels, Acts, Epistles of St. Paul, I Peter (Ad Ponticos), I John, Jude, Apocalypse. He does not know James and II Peter, but we cannot tell that he did not know II, III John. He attributes Hebrews to St. Barnabas. He rejects the "Pastor" of Hermas and says that many councils of the Psychici had also rejected it. Tertullian was learned, but careless in his historical statements. He quotes Varro and a medical writer, Soranus of Ephesus, and was evidently well read in pagan literature. He cites Irenaeus, Justin, Miltiades, and Proclus. He probably knew parts of Clement of Alexandria's writings. He is the first of Latin theological writers. To some extent, how great we cannot tell, he must have invented a theological idiom and have coined new expressions. He is the first witness to the existence of a Latin Bible, though he seems frequently to have translated from the Greek Bible as he wrote. Zahn has denied that he possessed any Latin translation, but this opinion is commonly rejected, and St. Perpetua certainly had one at Carthage in 203.

Chapter 7

Origen

Origen, most modest of writers, hardly ever alludes to himself in his own works; but Eusebius has devoted to him almost the entire sixth book of "Ecclesiastical History". Eusebius was thoroughly acquainted with the life of his hero; he had collected a hundred of his letters; in collaboration with the martyr Pamphilus he had composed the "Apology for Origen"; he dwelt at Caesarea where Origen's library was preserved, and where his memory still lingered; if at times he may be thought somewhat partial, he is undoubtedly well informed. We find some details also in the "Farewell Address" of S t. Gregory Thaumaturgus to his master, in the controversies of St. Jerome and Rufinus, in St. Epiphanius (Haeres., LXIV), and in Photius (Biblioth. Cod. 118).

Origen at Alexandria (185-232)

Born in 185, Origen was barely seventeen when a bloody persecution of the Church of Alexandrian broke out. His father Leonides, who admired his precocious genius was charmed with his virtuous life, had given him an excellent literary education. When Leonides was cast into prison, Origen would fain have shared his lot,

but being unable to carry out his resolution, as his mother had hidden his clothes, he wrote an ardent, enthusiastic letter to his father exhorting him to persevere courageously. When Leonides had won the martyr's crown and his fortune had been confiscated by the imperial authorities, the heroic child laboured to support himself, his mother, and his six younger brothers. This he successfully accomplished by becoming a teacher, selling his manuscripts, and by the generous aid of a certain rich lady, who admired his talents. He assumed, of his own accord, the direction of the catechetical school, on the withdrawal of Clement, and in the following year was confirmed in his office by the patriarch Demetrius (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.2; St. Jerome, "De viris illust.", liv). Origen' s school, which was frequented by pagans, soon became a nursery of neophytes, confessors, and martyrs. Among the latter were Plutarch, Serenus, Heraclides, Heron, another Serenus, and a female catechumen, Herais (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.4). He accompanied them to the scene of their victories encouraging them by his exhortations. There is nothing more touching than this picture Eusebius has drawn of Origen's youth, so studious, disinterested, austere and pure, ardent and zealous even to indiscretion (VI, iii and vi). Thrust thus at so early an age into the teacher's chair, he recognized the necessity of completing his education. Frequenting the philosophic schools, especially that of Ammonius Saccas, he devoted himself to a study of the philosophers, particularly Plato and the Stoics. In this he was but following the example of his predecessors Pantenus and Clement, and of Heracles, who was to succeed him. Afterwards, when the latter shared his labours in the catechetical school, he learned Hebrew, and communicated frequently with certain Jews who helped him to solve his difficulties.

The course of his work at Alexandria was interrupted by five journeys. About 213, under Pope Zephyrinus and the emperor Caracalla, he desired "to see the very ancient Church of Rome", but he did not remain there long (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.14). Shortly afterwards he was invited to Arabia by the governor who was desirous of meeting him (VI, xix). It was probably in 215 or 216 when the persecution of Caracalla was raging in Egypt that he visited Palestine, where Theoctistus of Caesarea and Alexander of Jerusalem, invited him to preach though he was still a layman. Towards 218, it

would appear, the empress Mammaea, mother of Alexander Severus, brought him to Antioch (VI, xxi). Finally, at a much later period, under Pontian of Rome and Zebinus of Antioch (Eusebius, VI, xxiii), he journeyed into Greece, passing through Caesarea where Theoctistus, Bishop of that city, assisted by Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, raised him to the priesthood. Demetrius, although he had given letters of recommendation to Origen, was very much offended by this ordination, which had taken place without his knowledge and, as he thought, in derogation of his rights. If Eusebius (VI, viii) is to be believed, he was envious of the increasing influence of his catechist. So, on his return to Alexandria, Origen soon perceived that his bishop was rather unfriendly towards him. He yielded to the storm and quitted Egypt (231). The details of this affair were recorded by Eusebius in the lost second book of the "Apology for Origen"; according to Photius, who had read the work, two councils were held at Alexandria, one of which pronounced a decree of banishment against Origen while the other deposed him from the priesthood (Biblioth. cod. 118). St. Jerome declares expressly that he was not condemned on a point of doctrine.

Origen at Caesarea (232)

Expelled from Alexandria, Origen fixed his abode at Caesarea in Palestine (232), with his protector and friend Theoctistus, founded a new school there, and resumed his "Commentary on S t. John" at the point where it had been interrupted. He was soon surrounded by pupils. The most distinguished of these, without doubt, was St. Gregory Thaumaturgus who, with his brother Apollodorus, attended Origen's lectures for five years and delivered on leaving him a celebrated "Farewell Address". During the persecution of Maximinus (235-37) Origen visited his friend, St. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who made him remain for a long period. On this occasion he was hospitably entertained by a Christian lady of Caesarea, named Juliana, who had inherited the writing of Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament (Palladius, "Hist. Laus.", 147). The years following were devoted almost uninterruptedly to the composition of the "Commentaries". Mention is made only of a few excursions to Holy Places, a journey to Athens (Eusebius, VI, xxxii), and two voyages to Arabia, one of which was undertaken for the conversion of Beryllus, a Patripassian (Eusebius, VI, xxxiii; St. Jerome,

Illustrious Men 60), the other to refute certain heretics who denied the Resurrection (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.37). Age did not diminish his activities. He was over sixty when he wrote his "Contra Celsum" and his "Commentary on St. Matthew". The persecution of Decius (250) prevented him from continuing these works. Origen was imprisoned and barbarously tortured, but his courage was unshaken and from his prison he wrote letters breathing the spirit of the martyrs (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.39). He was still alive on the death of Decius (251), but only lingering on, and he died, probably, from the results of the sufferings endured during the persecution (253 or 254), at the age of sixty-nine (Eusebius, *Church History* VII.1). His last days were spent at Tyr, though his reason for retiring thither is unknown. He was buried with honour as a confessor of the Faith. For a long time his sepulchre, behind the high-altar of the cathedral of Tyr, was visited by pilgrims. Today, as nothing remains of this cathedral except a mass of ruins, the exact location of his tomb is unknown.

Works

Very few authors were as fertile as Origen. St. Epiphanius estimates at six thousand the number of his writings, counting separately, without doubt, the different books of a single work, his homilies, letters, and his smallest treatises (Haeres., LXIV, l xiii). This figure, repeated by many ecclesiastical writers, seems greatly exaggerated. St. Jerome assures us that the list of Origen's writings drawn up by St. Pamphilus did not contain even two thousand titles (Contra Rufin., II, xxii; III, xxiii); but this list was evidently incomplete. Eusebius (*Church History* VI.32) had inserted it in his biography of St. Pamphilus and St. Jerome inserted it in a letter to Paula.

Exegetical writings

Origen had devoted three kinds of works to the explanation of the Holy Scripture: commentaries, homilies, and scholia (St. Jerome, "Prologus interpret. homiliar . Orig. in Ezechiel"). The commentaries (*tomoi libri, volumina*) were a continuous and well-developed interpretation of the inspired text. An idea of their magnitude may be formed from the fact that the words of St. John: "In the beginning was the Word", furnished material for a whole roll. There remain in

Greek only eight books of the "Commentary on St. Matthew", and nine books of the "Commentary on S t. John"; in Latin an anonymous translation of the "Commentary on S t. Matthew" beginning with chapter xvi, three books and a half of the "Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles" translated by Rufinus, and an abridgment of the "Commentary on the Epistles to the Romans" by the same translator. The homilies (*homiliai, homiliae, tractatus*) were familiar discourses on texts of Scripture, often extemporary and recorded as well as possible by stenographers. The list is long and undoubtedly must have been longer if it be true that Origen, as St. Pamphilus declares in his "Apology" preached almost every day. There remain in Greek twenty-one (twenty on Jeremias and the celebrated homily on the witch of Endor); in Latin, one hundred and eighteen translated by Rufinus, seventy-eight translated by St. Jerome and some others of more of less doubtful authenticity, preserved in a collection of homilies. The twenty "T ractatus Origenis" recently discovered are not the work of Origen, though use has been made of his writings. Origen has been called the father of the homily; it was he who contributed most to popularize this species of literature in which are to be found so many instructive details on the customs of the primitive Church, its institutions, discipline, liturgy, and sacraments. The scholia (*scholia, excerpta, commaticum interpretandi genus*) were exegetical, philological, or historical notes, on words or passages of the Bible, like the annotations of the Alexandria grammarians on the profane writers. Except some few short fragments all of these have perished.

Other writings

We now possess only two of Origen's letters: one addressed to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus on the reading of Holy Scripture, the other to Julius Africanus on the Greek additions to the Book of Daniel. Two *opuscula* have been preserved entire in the original form; an excellent treatise "On Prayer" and an "Exhortation to Martyrdom", sent by Origen to his friend Ambrose, then a prisoner for the Faith. Finally two large works have escaped the ravages of time: the "Contra Celsum" in the original text, and the "De principiis" in a Latin translation by Rufinus and in the citations of the "Philocalia" which might equal in contents one-sixth of the whole work. In the eight books of the "Contra Celsum" Origen follows his adversary point by point, refuting

in detail each of his false imputations. It is a model of reasoning, erudition, and honest polemic. The "De principiis", composed at Alexandria, and which, it seems, got into the hands of the public before its completion, treated successively in its four books, allowing for numerous digressions, of: (a) God and the Trinity, (b) the world and its relation to God, (c) man and his free will, (d) Scripture, its inspiration and interpretation. Many other works of Origen have been entirely lost: for instance, the treatise in two books "On the Resurrection", a treatise "On Free Will", and ten books of "Miscellaneous Writings" (*Stromateis*).

Posthumous influence of Origen

During his lifetime Origen by his writings, teaching, and intercourse exercised very great influence. St. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who regarded himself as his disciple, made him remain with him for a long period to profit by his learning (Eusebius, *Church History* VI.26; Palladius, "Hist. Laus.", 147). St. Alexander of Jerusalem his fellow pupil at the catechetical school was his intimate faithful friend (Eusebius, VI, xiv), as was Theoctistus of Caesarea in Palestine, who ordained him (Photius, cod. 118). Beryllus of Bostra, whom he had won back from heresy, was deeply attached to him (Eusebius, VI, xxxiii; St. Jerome, *Illustrious Men* 60). St. Anatolus of Laodicea sang his praises in his "Carmen Paschale" (P .G., X, 210). The learned Julius Africanus consulted him, Origen's reply being extant (P.G., XI, 41-85). St. Hippolytus highly appreciated his talents (St. Jerome, *Illustrious Men* 61). St. Dionysius, his pupil and successor in the catechetical school, when Patriarch of Alexandria, dedicated to him his treatise "On the Persecution" (Eusebius, VI, xlvi), and on learning of his death wrote a letter filled with his praises (Photius, cod. 232). St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, who had been his pupil for five years at Caesarea, before leaving addressed to him his celebrated "Farewell Address" (P .G., X, 1049-1104), an enthusiastic panegyric. There is no proof that Heracles, his disciple, colleague, and successor in the catechetical school, before being raised to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, wavered in his sworn friendship. Origen's name was so highly esteemed that when there was a question of putting an end to a schism or rooting out a heresy, appeal was made to it.

After his death his reputation continued to spread. St. Pamphilus, martyred in 307, composes with Eusebius an "Apology for Origen" in six books the first alone of which has been preserved in a Latin translation by Rufinus (P.G., XVII, 541-616). Origen had at that time many other apologists whose names are unknown to us (Photius, cod. 117 and 118). The directors of the catechetical school continued to walk in his footsteps. Theognostus, in his "Hypotyposes", followed him even too closely, according to Photius (cod. 106), though his action was approved by St. Athanasius. Pierius was called by St. Jerome "Origenes junior" (*Illustrious Men* 76). Didymus the Blind composed a work to explain and justify the teaching of the "De principiis" (S t. Jerome, "Adv . Rufin.", I, vi). St. Athanasius does not hesitate to cite him with praise (Epist. IV ad Serapion., 9 and 10) and points out that he must be interpreted generously (De decretis Nic., 27).

Nor was the admiration for the great Alexandrian less outside of Egypt. St. Gregory of Nazianzus gave significant expression to his opinion (Suidas, "Lexicon", ed. Bernhardy, II, 1274: *Origenes he panton hemon achone*). In collaboration with St. Basil, he had published, under the title "Philocalia", a volume of selections from the master. In his "Panegyric on St. Gregory Thaumaturgus", St. Gregory of Nyssa called Origen the prince of Christian learning in the third century (P.G., XLVI, 905). At Caesarea in Palestine the admiration of the learned for Origen became a passion. St. Pamphilus wrote his "Apology", Euzoius had his writings transcribed on parchment (St. Jerome, *Illustrious Men* 93). Eusebius catalogued them carefully and drew upon them largely. Nor were the Latins less enthusiastic than the Greeks. According to St. Jerome, the principal Latin imitators of Origen are St. Eusebius of Verceil, St. Hilary of Poitiers, and St. Ambrose of Milan; St. Victorinus of Pettau had set them the example (St. Jerome, "Adv. Rufin.", I, ii; "Ad Augustin. Epist.", cxii, 20). Origen's writings were so much drawn upon that the solitary of Bethlehem called it plagiarism, *furta Latinarum*. However, excepting Rufinus, who is practically only a translator, St. Jerome is perhaps the Latin writer who is most indebted to Origen. Before the Origenist controversies he willingly admitted this, and even afterwards, he did not entirely repudiate it; cf. the prologues to his translations of Origen (Homilies on St. Luke, Jeremias, and Ezechiel,

the Canticle of Canticles), and also the prefaces to his own "Commentaries" (on Micheas, the Epistles to the Galatians, and to the Ephesians etc.).

Amidst these expressions of admiration and praise, a few discordant voices were heard. St. Methodius, bishop and martyr (311), had written several works against Origen, amongst others a treatise "On the Resurrection", of which St. Epiphanius cites a long extract (Haeres., LXVI, xii-lxii). St. Eustathius of Antioch, who died in exile about 337, criticized his allegorism (P.G., XVIII, 613-673). St. Alexander of Alexandria, martyred in 311, also attacked him, if we are to credit Leontius of Byzantium and the emperor Justinian. But his chief adversaries were the heretics, Sabellians, Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Apollinarists.

Origenism

By this term is understood not so much Origen's theology and the body of his teachings, as a certain number of doctrines, rightly or wrongly attributed to him, and which by their novelty or their danger called forth at an early period a refutation from orthodox writers. They are chiefly:

- Allegorism in the interpretation of Scripture
- Subordination of the Divine Persons
- The theory of successive trials and a final restoration.

Before examining how far Origen is responsible for these theories, a word must be said of the directive principle of his theology.

The Church and the Rule of Faith

In the preface to the "De principiis" Origen laid down a rule thus formulated in the translation of Rufinus: "Illa sola credenda est veritas quae in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione". The same norm is expressed almost in equivalent terms and many other passages, e.g., "non debemus credere nisi quemadmodum per successionem Ecclesiae Dei tradiderunt nobis (In Matt., ser. 46, Migne, XIII, 1667). In accordance with those principles Origen constantly appeals to ecclesiastical preaching, ecclesiastical teaching, and the ecclesiastical rule of faith (*kanon*). He accepts only four

Canonical Gospels because tradition does not receive more; he admits the necessity of baptism of infants because it is in accordance with the practice of the Church founded on Apostolic tradition; he warns the interpreter of the Holy Scripture, not to rely on his own judgment, but "on the rule of the Church instituted by Christ". For , he adds, we have only two lights to guide us here below, Christ and the Church; the Church reflects faithfully the light received from Christ, as the moon reflects the rays of the sun. The distinctive mark of the Catholic is to belong to the Church, to depend on the Church outside of which there is no salvation; on the contrary, he who leaves the Church walks in darkness, he is a heretic. It is through the principle of authority that Origen is wont to unmask and combat doctrinal errors. It is the principle of authority, too, that he invokes when he enumerates the dogmas of faith. A man animated with such sentiments may have made mistakes, because he is human, but his disposition of mind is essentially Catholic and he does not deserve to be ranked among the promoters of heresy.

Scriptural allegorism

The principal passages on the inspiration, meaning, and interpretation of the Scriptures are preserved in Greek in the first fifteen chapters of the "Philocalia". According to Origen, Scripture is inspired because it is the word and work of God. But, far from being an inert instrument, the inspired author has full possession of his faculties, he is conscious of what he is writing; he is physically free to deliver his message or not; he is not seized by a passing delirium like the pagan oracles, for bodily disorder, disturbance of the senses, momentary loss of reason are but so many proofs of the action of the evil spirit. Since Scripture is from God, it ought to have the distinctive characteristics of the Divine works: truth, unity, and fullness. The word of God cannot possibly be untrue; hence no errors or contradictions can be admitted in Scripture (*Commentary on John* X.3). The author of the Scriptures being one, the Bible is less a collection of books than one and the same book (Philoc., V, iv-vii), a perfect harmonious instrument (Philoc., VI, i-ii). But the most Divine note of Scripture is its fullness: "There is not in the Holy Books the smallest passage (*cheraia*) but reflects the wisdom of God" (Philoc., I, xxviii, cf. X, i). True there are imperfections in the Bible: antilogies,

repetitions, want of continuity; but these imperfections become perfections by leading us to the allegory and the spiritual meaning (Philoc., X, i-ii).

At one time Origen, starting from the Platonic trichotomy, distinguishes the *body*, the *soul*, and the *spirit* of Holy Scripture; at another, following a more rational terminology, he distinguishes only between the letter and the spirit. In reality, the *soul*, or the psychic signification, or *moral* meaning (that is the *moral* parts of Scripture, and the *moral applications* of the other parts) plays only a very secondary rôle, and we can confine ourselves to the antithesis: *letter* (or *body*) and *spirit*. Unfortunately this antithesis is not free from equivocation. Origen does not understand by letter (or body) what we mean today by the literal sense, but the grammatical sense, the proper as opposed to the figurative meaning. Just so he does not attach to the words spiritual meaning the same signification as we do: for him they mean the spiritual sense properly so called (the meaning added to the literal sense by the express wish of God attaching a special signification to the fact related or the manner of relating them), or the figurative as contrasted with the proper sense, or the accommodative sense, often an arbitrary invention of the interpreter, or even the literal sense when it is treating of things spiritual. If this terminology is kept in mind there is nothing absurd in the principle he repeats so often: "Such a passage of the Scripture as no corporal meaning." As examples Origen cites the anthropomorphisms, metaphors, and symbols which ought indeed to be understood figuratively.

Though he warns us that these passages are the exceptions, it must be confessed that he allows too many cases in which the Scripture is not to be understood according to the letter; but, remembering his terminology, his principle is unimpeachable. The two great rules of interpretation laid sown by the Alexandria catechist, taken by themselves and independently of erroneous applications, are proof against criticism. They may be formulated thus:

- Scripture must be interpreted in a manner worthy of God, the author of Scripture.
- The corporal sense or the letter of Scripture must not be adopted,

when it would entail anything impossible, absurd, or unworthy of God.

The abuse arises from the application of these rules. Origen has recourse too easily to allegorism to explain purely apparent antilogies or antinomies. He considers that certain narratives or ordinances of the Bible would be unworthy of God if they had to be taken according to the letter, or if they were to be taken *solely* according to the letter. He justifies the allegorism by the fact that otherwise certain accounts or certain precepts now abrogated would be useless and profitless for the reader: a fact which appears to him contrary to the providence of the Divine inspirer and the dignity of Holy Writ. It will thus be seen that though the criticisms directed against his allegorical method by St. Epiphanius and St. Methodius were not groundless, yet many of the complaints arise from a misunderstanding.

Subordination of the divine persons

The three Persons of the Trinity are distinguished from all creatures by the three following characteristics: absolute immateriality, omniscience, and substantial sanctity. As is well known many ancient ecclesiastical writers attributed to created spirits an aerial or ethereal envelope without which they could not act. Though he does not venture to decide categorically, Origen inclines to this view, but, as soon as there is a question of the Divine Persons, he is perfectly sure that they have no body and are not in a body; and this characteristic belongs to the Trinity alone (*De Principiis* IV.27, I.6, II.2.2, II.4.3, etc.). Again the knowledge of every creature, being essentially limited, is always imperfect and capable of being increased. But it would be repugnant for the Divine Persons to pass from the state of ignorance to knowledge. How could the Son, who is the Wisdom of the Father, be ignorant of anything (*Commentary on John* I.27; *Against Celsus* VI.17). Nor can we admit ignorance in the Spirit who "searcheth the deep things of God" (*De Principiis* I.5.4, I.6.2, I.7.3; "In Num. him.", XI, 8 etc.). As substantial holiness is the exclusive privilege of the Trinity so also is it the only source of all created holiness. Sin is forgiven only by the simultaneous concurrence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; no one is sanctified at baptism save through their common action; the soul in which the Holy Ghost indwells possesses likewise the Son and the Father. In a word the three

Persons of the Trinity are indivisible in their being, their presence, and their operation.

Along with these perfectly orthodox texts there are some which must be interpreted with diligence, remembering as we ought that the language of theology was not yet fixed and that Origen was often the first to face these difficult problems. It will then appear that the subordination of the Divine Persons, so much urged against Origen, generally consists in differences of appropriation (the Father creator, the Son redeemer, the Spirit sanctifier) which seem to attribute to the Persons an unequal sphere of action, or in the liturgical practice of praying the Father *through* the Son in the Holy Ghost, or in the theory so widespread in the Greek Church of the first five centuries, that the Father has a pre-eminence of rank (*taxis*) over the two other Persons, in as much as in mentioning them He ordinarily has the first place, and of dignity (*axioma*) because He represents the whole Divinity, of which He is the principle (*arche*), the origin (*aitios*), and the source (*pege*). That is why St. Athanasius defends Origen's orthodoxy concerning the Trinity and why St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nazianzus replied to the heretics who claimed the support of his authority that they misunderstood him.

The origin and destiny of rational beings

Here we encounter an unfortunate amalgam of philosophy and theology. The system that results is not coherent, for Origen, frankly recognizing the contradiction of the incompatible elements that he is trying to unify, recoils from the consequences, protests against the logical conclusions, and oftentimes corrects by orthodox professions of faith the heterodoxy of his speculations. It must be said that almost all the texts about to be treated of, are contained in the "De principiis", where the author treads on most dangerous ground. The system may be reduced to a few hypotheses, the error and danger of which were not recognized by Origen.

(1) Eternity of Creation

Whatever exists outside of God was created by Him: the Alexandrian catechist always defended this thesis most energetically against the pagan philosophers who admitted an uncreated matter (*De Principiis* II.1.5; "In Genes.", I, 12, in Migne, XII, 48-9). But he

believes that God created from eternity, for "it is absurd", he says, "to imagine the nature of God inactive, or His goodness inefficacious, or His dominion without subjects" (*De Principiis* III.5.3). Consequently he is forced to admit a double infinite series of worlds before and after the present world.

(2) Original Equality of the Created Spirits.

"In the beginning all intellectual natures were created equal and alike, as God had no motive for creating them otherwise" (*De Principiis* II.9.6). Their present differences arise solely from their different use of the gift of free will. The spirits created good and happy grew tired of their happiness (op. cit., I, iii, 8), and, though carelessness, fell, some more some less (I, vi, 2). Hence the hierarchy of the angels; hence also the four categories of created intellects: angels, stars (supposing, as is probable, that they are animated, *De Principiis* I.7.3), men, and demons. But their rôles may be one day changed; for what free will has done, free will can undo, and the Trinity alone is essentially immutable in good.

(3) Essence and Raison d'Être of Matter

Matter exists only for the spiritual; if the spiritual did not need it, matter would not exist, for its finality is not in itself. But it seems to Origen - though he does not venture to declare so expressly - that created spirits even the most perfect cannot do without an extremely diluted and subtle matter which serves them as a vehicle and means of action (*De Principiis* II.2.1, I.6.4, etc.). Matter was, therefore, created simultaneously with the spiritual, although the spiritual is logically prior; and matter will never cease to be because the spiritual, however perfect, will always need it. But matter which is susceptible of indefinite transformations is adapted to the varying condition of the spirits. "When intended for the more imperfect spirits, it becomes solidified, thickens, and forms the bodies of this visible world. If it is serving higher intelligences, it shines with the brightness of the celestial bodies and serves as a garb for the angels of God, and the children of the Resurrection" (*De Principiis* II.2.2).

(4) Universality of the Redemption and the Final Restoration

Certain Scriptural texts, e.g., 1 Corinthians 15:25-28, seem to extend to all rational beings the benefit of the Redemption, and Origen

allows himself to be led also by the philosophical principle which he enunciates several times, without ever proving it, that the end is always like the beginning: "We think that the goodness of God, through the mediation of Christ, will bring all creatures to one and the same end" (*De Principiis* I.6.1-3). The universal restoration (*apokatastasis*) follows necessarily from these principles.

On the least reflection, it will be seen that these hypotheses, starting from contrary points of view, are irreconcilable: for the theory of a final restoration is diametrically opposed to the theory of successive indefinite trials. It would be easy to find in the writings of Origen a mass of texts contradicting these principles and destroying the resulting conclusions. He affirms, for instance, that the charity of the elect in heaven does not fail; in their case "the freedom of the will will be bound so that sin will be impossible" (In Roman., V, 10). So, too, the reprobate will always be fixed in evil, less from the inability to free themselves from it, than because they wish to be evil (*De Principiis* I.8.4), for malice has become natural to them, it is as a second nature in them (In Joann., xx, 19). Origen grew angry when accused of teaching the eternal salvation of the devil. But the hypotheses which he lays down here and there are none the less worthy of censure. What can be said in his defence, if it be not with St. Athanasius (De decretis Nic., 27), that we must not seek to find his real opinion in the works in which he discusses the arguments for and against doctrine as an intellectual exercise or amusement; or, with St. Jerome (Ad Pammach. Epist., XLVIII, 12), that it is one thing to dogmatize and another to enunciate hypothetical opinions which will be cleared up by discussion?

Origenist controversies

The discussions concerning Origen and his teaching are of a very singular and very complex character. They break out unexpectedly, at long intervals, and assume an immense importance quite unforeseen in their humble beginnings. They are complicated by so many personal disputes and so many questions foreign to the fundamental subject in controversy that a brief and rapid *expose* of the polemics is difficult and well-nigh impossible. Finally they abate so suddenly that one is forced to conclude that the controversy was superficial and that Origen's orthodoxy was not the sole point in dispute.

First Origenist Crisis

It broke out in the deserts of Egypt, raged in Palestine, and ended at Constantinople with the condemnation of St. Chrysostom (392-404). During the second half of the fourth century the monks of Nitria professed an exaggerated enthusiasm for Origen, whilst the neighbouring brethren of Sceta, as a result of an unwarranted reaction and an excessive fear of allegorism, fell into Anthropomorphism. These doctrinal discussions gradually invaded the monasteries of Palestine, which were under the care of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, who, convinced of the dangers of Origenism, had combatted it in his works and was determined to prevent its spread and to extirpate it completely. Having gone to Jerusalem in 394, he preached vehemently against Origen's errors, in presence of the bishop of that city, John, who was deemed an Origenist. John in turn spoke against Anthropomorphism, directing his discourse so clearly against Epiphanius that no one could be mistaken. Another incident soon helped to embitter the dispute. Epiphanius had raised Paulinian, brother of St. Jerome, to the priesthood in a place subject to the See of Jerusalem. John complained bitterly of this violation of his rights, and the reply of Epiphanius was not of a nature to appease him.

Two new combatants were now ready to enter the lists. From the time when Jerome and Rufinus settled, one at Bethlehem and the other at Mt. Olivet, they had lived in brotherly friendship. Both admired, imitated, and translated Origen, and were on most amicable terms with their bishop, when in 392 Aterbius, a monk of Sceta, came to Jerusalem and accused them of both of Origenism. St. Jerome, very sensitive to the question of orthodoxy, was much hurt by the insinuation of Aterbius and two years later sided with St. Epiphanius, whose reply to John of Jerusalem he translated into Latin. Rufinus learnt, it is not known how, of this translation, which was not intended for the public, and Jerome suspected him of having obtained it by fraud. A reconciliation was effected sometime later, but it was not lasting. In 397 Rufinus, then at Rome, had translated Origen's "De principiis" into Latin, and in his preface followed the example of St. Jerome, whose dithyrambic eulogy addressed to the Alexandrian catechist he remembered. The solitary of Bethlehem, grievously hurt at this action, wrote to his friends to refute the perfidious implication of Rufinus,

denounced Origen's errors to Pope Anastasius, tried to win the Patriarch of Alexandria over to the anti-Origenist cause, and began a discussion with Rufinus, marked with great bitterness on both sides.

Until 400 Theophilus of Alexandria was an acknowledged Origenist. His confident was Isidore, a former monk of Nitria, and his friends, "the Tall Brothers", the accredited leaders of the Origenist party. He had supported John of Jerusalem against St. Epiphanius, whose Anthropomorphism he denounced to Pope Siricius. Suddenly he changed his views, exactly why was never known. It is said that the monks of Sceta, displeased with his paschal letter of 399, forcibly invaded his episcopal residence and threatened him with death if he did not chant the palinody. What is certain is that he had quarreled with St. Isidore over money matters and with "the Tall Brothers", who blamed his avarice and his worldliness. As Isidore and "the Tall Brothers" had retired to Constantinople, where Chrysostom extended his hospitality to them and interceded for them, without, however, admitting them to communion till the censures pronounced against them had been raised, the irascible Patriarch of Alexandria determined on this plan: to suppress Origenism everywhere, and under this pretext ruin Chrysostom, whom he hated and envied. For four years he was mercilessly active: he condemned Origen's books at the Council of Alexandria (400), with an armed band he expelled the monks from Nitria, he wrote to the bishops of Cyprus and Palestine to win them over to his anti-Origenist crusade, issued paschal letters in 401, 402, and 404 against Origen's doctrine, and sent a missive to Pope Anastasius asking for the condemnation of Origenism. He was successful beyond his hopes; the bishops of Cyprus accepted his invitation. Those of Palestine, assembled at Jerusalem, condemned the errors pointed out to them, adding that they were not taught amongst them. Anastasius, while declaring that Origen was entirely unknown to him, condemned the propositions extracted from his books. St. Jerome undertook to translate into Latin the various elucubrations of the patriarch, even his virulent diatribe against Chrysostom. St. Epiphanius, preceding Theophilus to Constantinople, treated St. Chrysostom as temerarious, and almost heretical, until the day the truth began to dawn on him, and suspecting that he might have been deceived, he suddenly left Constantinople and died at sea before arriving at Salamis.

It is well known how Theophilus, having been called by the emperor to explain his conduct towards Isidore and "the Tall Brothers", cleverly succeeded by his machinations in changing the roles. Instead of being the accused, he became the accuser, and summoned Chrysostom to appear before the conciliabule of the Oak (ad Quercum), at which Chrysostom was condemned. As soon as the vengeance of Theophilus was satiated nothing more was heard of Origenism. The Patriarch of Alexandria began to read Origen, pretending that he could cull the roses from among the thorns. He became reconciled with "the Tall Brothers" without asking them to retract. Hardly had the personal quarrels abated when the spectre of Origenism vanished.

Second Origenistic Crisis

In 514 certain heterodox doctrines of a very singular character had already spread among the monks of Jerusalem and its environs. Possibly the seeds of the dispute may have been sown by Stephen Bar-Sudaili, a troublesome monk expelled from Edessa, who joined to an Origenism of his own brand certain clearly pantheistic views. Plotting and intriguing continued for about thirty years, the monks suspected of Origenism being in turn expelled from their monasteries, then readmitted, only to be driven out anew. Their leaders and protectors were Nonnus, who till his death in 547 kept the party together, Theodore Askidas and Domitian who had won the favour of the emperor and were named bishops, one to the See of Ancyra in Galatia, the other to that of Caesarea in Cappadocia, though they continued to reside at court (537). In these circumstances a report against Origenism was addressed to Justinian, by whom and on what occasion it is not known, for the two accounts that have come down to us are at variance (Cyrillus of Scythopolis, "Vita Sabae"; and Liberatus, "Breviarium", xxiii). At all events, the emperor then wrote his "Liber adversus Origenem", containing in addition to an *exposé* of the reasons for condemning it twenty-four censurable texts taken from the "De principiis", and lastly ten propositions to be anathematized. Justinian ordered the patriarch Mennas to call together all the bishops present in Constantinople and make them subscribe to these anathemas. This was the local synod (*synodos endemousa*) of 543. A copy of the imperial edict had been addressed to the other

patriarchs, including Pope Vigilius, and all gave their adhesion to it. In the case of Vigilius especially we have the testimony of Liberatus (Breviar., xxiii) and Cassiodorus (Institutiones, 1).

It had been expected that Domitian and Theodore Askidas, by their refusal to condemn Origenism, would fall into disfavour at Court; but they signed whatever they were asked to sign and remained more powerful than ever. Askidas even took revenge by persuading the emperor to have Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was deemed the sworn enemy of Origen, condemned (Liberatus, "Breviar .", xxiv; Facundas of Hermianus, "Defensio trium capitul.", I, ii; Evagrius, "Hist.", IV, xxxviii). Justinian's new edict, which is not extant, resulted in the assembling of the fifth ecumenical council, in which Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ibas, and Theodoretus were condemned (553).

Were Origen and Origenism anathematized? Many learned writers believe so; an equal number deny that they were condemned; most modern authorities are either undecided or reply with reservations. Relying on the most recent studies on the question it may be held that:

1. It is certain that the fifth general council was convoked exclusively to deal with the affair of the Three Chapters, and that neither Origen nor Origenism were the cause of it.
2. It is certain that the council opened on 5 May, 553, in spite of the protestations of Pope Vigilius, who though at Constantinople refused to attend it, and that in the eight conciliary sessions (from 5 May to 2 June), the Acts of which we possess, only the question of the Three Chapters is treated.
3. Finally it is certain that only the Acts concerning the affair of the Three Chapters were submitted to the pope for his approval, which was given on 8 December, 553, and 23 February, 554.
4. It is a fact that Popes Vigilius, Pelagius I (556-61), Pelagius II (579-90), Gregory the Great (590-604), in treating of the fifth council deal only with the Three Chapters, make no mention of Origenism, and speak as if they did not know of its condemnation.

5. It must be admitted that before the opening of the council, which had been delayed by the resistance of the pope, the bishops already assembled at Constantinople had to consider, by order of the emperor, a form of Origenism that had practically nothing in common with Origen, but which was held, we know, by one of the Origenist parties in Palestine. The arguments in corroboration of this hypothesis may be found in Dickamp (op. cit., 66-141).
6. The bishops certainly subscribed to the fifteen anathemas proposed by the emperor (ibid., 90-96); and admitted Origenist, Theodore of Scythopolis, was forced to retract (ibid., 125-129); but there is no proof that the approbation of the pope, who was at that time protesting against the convocation of the council, was asked.
7. It is easy to understand how this extra-conciliary sentence was mistaken at a later period for a decree of the actual ecumenical council.

Chapter 8

St. Basil the Great

St. Basil was the Bishop of Caesarea, and one of the most distinguished Doctors of the Church. Born probably 329; died 1 January, 379. He ranks after Athanasius as a defender of the Oriental Church against the heresies of the fourth century. With his friend Gregory of Nazianzus and his brother Gregory of Nyssa, he makes up the trio known as "The Three Cappadocians", far outclassing the other two in practical genius and actual achievement.

Life

St. Basil the Elder, father of St. Basil the Great, was the son of a Christian of good birth and his wife, Macrina (Acta SS., January, II), both of whom suffered for the faith during the persecution of Maximinus Galerius (305-314), spending several years of hardship in the wild mountains of Pontus. St. Basil the Elder was noted for his virtue (Acta SS, May, VII) and also won considerable reputation as a teacher in Caesarea. He was not a priest (Cf. Cave, Hist. Lit., I, 239). He married Emmelia, the daughter of a martyr and became the father of ten children. Three of these, Macrina, Basil, and Gregory are honoured as saints; and of the sons, Peter, Gregory, and Basil attained the dignity of the episcopate.

Under the care of his father and his grandmother, the elder Macrina, who preserved the traditions of their countryman, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (c. 213-275) Basil was formed in habits of piety and study. He was still young when his father died and the family moved to the estate of the elder Macrina at Annesi in Pontus, on the banks of the Iris. As a boy, he was sent to school at Caesarea, then "a metropolis of letters", and conceived a fervent admiration for the local bishop, Dianius. Later, he went to Constantinople, at that time "distinguished for its teachers of philosophy and rhetoric", and thence to Athens. Here he became the inseparable companion of Gregory of Nazianzus, who, in his famous panegyric on Basil (Or. xliii), gives a most interesting description of their academic experiences. According to him, Basil was already distinguished for brilliancy of mind and seriousness of character and associated only with the most earnest students. He was able, grave, industrious, and well advanced in rhetoric, grammar, philosophy, astronomy, geometry, and medicine. (As to his not knowing Latin, see Fialon, *Etude historique et littéraire sur St. Basile*, Paris, 1869). We know the names of two of Basil's teachers at Athens - Prohaeresius, possibly a Christian, and Himerius, a pagan. It has been affirmed, though probably incorrectly, that Basil spent some time under Libanius. He tells us himself that he endeavoured without success to attach himself as a pupil to Eustathius (Ep., I). At the end of his sojourn at Athens, Basil being laden, says St. Gregory of Nazianzus "with all the learning attainable by the nature of man", was well equipped to be a teacher. Caesarea took possession of him gladly "as a founder and second patron" (Or. xliii), and as he tells us (ccx), he refused the splendid offers of the citizens of Neo-Caesarea, who wished him to undertake the education of the youth of their city.

To the successful student and distinguished professor, "there now remained", says Gregory (Or. xliii), "no other need than that of spiritual perfection". Gregory of Nyssa, in his life of Macrina, gives us to understand that Basil's brilliant success both as a university student and a professor had left traces of worldliness and self-sufficiency on the soul of the young man. Fortunately, Basil came again in contact with Dianius, Bishop of Caesarea, the object of his boyish affection, and Dianius seems to have baptized him, and ordained him Reader soon after his return to Caesarea. It was at the same time also that

he fell under the influence of that very remarkable woman, his sister Macrina, who had meanwhile founded a religious community on the family estate at Annesi. Basil himself tells us how, like a man roused from deep sleep, he turned his eyes to the marvellous truth of the Gospel, wept many tears over his miserable life, and prayed for guidance from God: "Then I read the Gospel, and saw there that a great means of reaching perfection was the selling of one's goods, the sharing of them with the poor, the giving up of all care for this life, and the refusal to allow the soul to be turned by any sympathy towards things of earth" (Ep. ccxxiii). To learn the ways of perfection, Basil now visited the monasteries of Egypt, Palestine, Coele-Syria, and Mesopotamia. He returned, filled with admiration for the austerity and piety of the monks, and founded a monastery in his native Pontus, on the banks of the Iris, nearly opposite Annesi. (Cf. Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor*, London, 1890, p. 326). Eustathius of Sebaste had already introduced the eremitical life into Asia Minor; Basil added the cenobitic or community form, and the new feature was imitated by many companies of men and women. (Cf. Sozomen, *Church History* VI.27; Epiphanius, Haer., lxxv, 1; Basil, Ep. ccxxiii; Tillemont, Mém., IX, Art. XXI, and note XXVI.) Basil became known as the father of Oriental monasticism, the forerunner of St. Benedict. How well he deserved the title, how seriously and in what spirit he undertook the systematizing of the religious life, may be seen by the study of his Rule. He seems to have read Origen's writings very systematically about this time, for in union with Gregory of Nazianzus, he published a selection of them called the "Philocalia".

Basil was drawn from his retreat into the area of theological controversy in 360 when he accompanied two delegates from Seleucia to the emperor at Constantinople, and supported his namesake of Ancyra. There is some dispute as to his courage and his perfect orthodoxy on this occasion (cf. Philostorgius, Hist. Eccl., IV, xii; answered by Gregory of Nyssa, *Answer to Eunomius' Second Book* I, and Maran, Proleg., vii; Tillemont, Mém., note XVIII). A little later, however, both qualities seem to have been sufficiently in evidence, as Basil forsook Dianius for having signed the heretical creed of Rimini. To this time (c. 361) may be referred the "Moralia"; and a little later came two books against Eunomius (363) and some correspondence with Athanasius. It is possible, also, that Basil wrote

his monastic rules in the briefer forms while in Pontus, and enlarged them later at Caesarea. There is an account of an invitation from Julian for Basil to present himself a court and of Basil's refusal, coupled with an admonition that angered the emperor and endangered Basil's safety. Both incident and correspondence however are questioned by some critics.

Basil still retained considerable influence in Caesarea, and it is regarded as fairly probable that he had a hand in the election of the successor of Dianius who died in 362, after having been reconciled to Basil. In any case the new bishop, Eusebius, was practically placed in his office by the elder Gregory of Nazianzus. Eusebius having persuaded the reluctant Basil to be ordained priest, gave him a prominent place in the administration of the diocese (363). In ability for the management of affairs Basil so far eclipsed the bishop that ill-feeling rose between the two. "All the more eminent and wiser portion of the church was roused against the bishop" (Greg. Naz., Or. xliii; Ep. x), and to avoid trouble Basil again withdrew into the solitude of Pontus. A little later (365) when the attempt of Valens to impose Arianism on the clergy and the people necessitated the presence of a strong personality, Basil was restored to his former position, being reconciled to the bishop by St. Gregory of Nazianzus. There seems to have been no further disagreement between Eusebius and Basil and the latter soon became the real head of the diocese. "The one", says Gregory of Nazianzus (Or. xliii), "led the people the other led their leader". During the five years spent in this most important office, Basil gave evidence of being a man of very unusual powers. He laid down the law to the leading citizens and the imperial governors, settled disputes with wisdom and finality, assisted the spiritually needy, looked after "the support of the poor, the entertainment of strangers, the care of maidens, legislation written and unwritten for the monastic life, arrangements of prayers, (liturgy?), adornment of the sanctuary" (op. cit.). In time of famine, he was the saviour of the poor.

In 370 Basil succeeded to the See of Caesarea, being consecrated according to tradition on 14 June. Caesarea was then a powerful and wealthy city (Sozomen, *Church History* V.5). Its bishop was Metropolitan of Cappadocia and Exarch of Pontus which embraced more than half of Asia Minor and comprised eleven provinces. The

see of Caesarea ranked with Ephesus immediately after the patriarchal sees in the councils, and the bishop was the superior of fifty chorepiscopi (Baert). Basil's actual influence, says Jackson (Prolegomena, XXXII) covered the whole stretch of country "from the Balkans to the Mediterranean and from the Aegean to the Euphrates". The need of a man like Basil in such a see as Caesarea was most pressing, and he must have known this well. Some think that he set about procuring his own election; others (e.g. Maran, Baronius, Ceillier) say that he made no attempt on his own behalf. In any event, he became Bishop of Caesarea largely by the influence of the elder Gregory of Nazianzus. His election, says the younger Gregory (loc. cit.), was followed by disaffection on the part of several suffragan bishops "on whose side were found the greatest scoundrels in the city". During his previous administration of the diocese Basil had so clearly defined his ideas of discipline and orthodoxy, that no one could doubt the direction and the vigour of his policy. St. Athanasius was greatly pleased at Basil's election (Ad Pallad., 953; Ad Joann. et Ant., 951); but the Arianizing Emperor Valens, displayed considerably annoyance and the defeated minority of bishops became consistently hostile to the new metropolitan. By years of tactful conduct, however, "blending his correction with consideration and his gentleness with firmness" (Greg. Naz., Or. xliii), he finally overcame most of his opponents.

Basil's letters tell the story of his tremendous and varied activity; how he worked for the exclusion of unfit candidates from the sacred ministry and the deliverance of the bishops from the temptation of simony; how he required exact discipline and the faithful observance of the canons from both laymen and clerics; how he rebuked the sinful, followed up the offending, and held out hope of pardon to the penitent. (Cf. Epp. xliv, xlv, and xlvi, the beautiful letter to a fallen virgin, as well as Epp. liii, liv, lv, clxxxviii, cxcix, ccxvii, and Ep. clxix, on the strange incident of Glycerius, whose story is well filled out by Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1893, p. 443 sqq.) If on the one hand he strenuously defended clerical rights and immunities (Ep. civ), on the other he trained his clergy so strictly that they grew famous as the type of all that a priest should be (Epp. cii, ciii). Basil did not confine his activity to diocesan affairs, but threw himself vigorously into the troublesome theological disputes then

rending the unity of Christendom. He drew up a summary of the orthodox faith; he attacked by word of mouth the heretics near at hand and wrote tellingly against those afar. His correspondence shows that he paid visits, sent messages, gave interviews, instructed, reproved, rebuked, threatened, reproached, undertook the protection of nations, cities, individuals great and small. There was very little chance of opposing him successfully, for he was a cool, persistent, fearless fighter in defence both of doctrine and of principles. His bold stand against Valens parallels the meeting of Ambrose with Theodosius. The emperor was dumbfounded at the archbishop's calm indifference to his presence and his wishes. The incident, as narrated by Gregory of Nazianzus, not only tells much concerning Basil's character but throws a clear light on the type of Christian bishop with which the emperors had to deal and goes far to explain why Arianism, with little court behind it, could make so little impression on the ultimate history of Catholicism.

While assisting Eusebius in the care of his diocese, Basil had shown a marked interest in the poor and afflicted; that interest now displayed itself in the erection of a magnificent institution, the Ptochoptopheion, or Basileiad, a house for the care of friendless strangers, the medical treatment of the sick poor, and the industrial training of the unskilled. Built in the suburbs, it attained such importance as to become practically the centre of a new city with the name of *he kaine polis* or "Newtown". It was the motherhouse of like institutions erected in other dioceses and stood as a constant reminder to the rich of their privilege of spending wealth in a truly Christian way. It may be mentioned here that the social obligations of the wealthy were so plainly and forcibly preached by St. Basil that modern sociologists have ventured to claim him as one of their own, though with no more foundation than would exist in the case of any other consistent teacher of the principles of Catholic ethics. The truth is that St. Basil was a practical lover of Christian poverty, and even in his exalted position preserved that simplicity in food and clothing and that austerity of life for which he had been remarked at his first renunciation of the world.

In the midst of his labours, Basil underwent suffering of many kinds. Athanasius died in 373 and the elder Gregory in 374, both of them leaving gaps never to be filled. In 373 began the painful

estrangement from Gregory of Nazianzus. Anthimus, Bishop of Tyana, became an open enemy, Apollinaris "a cause of sorrow to the churches" (Ep. cclxiii), Eustathius of Sebaste a traitor to the Faith and a personal foe as well. Eusebius of Samosata was banished, Gregory of Nyssa condemned and deposed. When Emperor Valentinian died and the Arians recovered their influence, all Basil's efforts must have seemed in vain. His health was breaking, the Goths were at the door of the empire, Antioch was in schism, Rome doubted his sincerity, the bishops refused to be brought together as he wished. "The notes of the church were obscured in his part of Christendom, and he had to fare on as best he might,- admiring, courting, yet coldly treated by the Latin world, desiring the friendship of Rome, yet wounded by her reserve,- suspected of heresy by Damasus, and accused by Jerome of pride" (Newman, The Church of the Fathers). Had he lived a little longer and attended the Council of Constantinople (381), he would have seen the death of its first president, his friend Meletius, and the forced resignation of its second, Gregory of Nazianzus. Basil died 1 January, 379. His death was regarded as a public bereavement; Jews, pagans, and foreigners vied with his own flock in doing him honour. The earlier Latin martyrologies (Hieronymian and Bede) make no mention of a feast of St. Basil. The first mention is by Usuard and Ado who place it on 14 June, the supposed date of Basil's consecration to the episcopate. In the Greek "Menaea" he is commemorated on 1 January, the day of his death. In 1081, John, Patriarch of Constantinople, in consequence of a vision, established a feast in common honour of St. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom, to be celebrated on 30 January. The Bollandists give an account of the origin of this feast; they also record as worthy of note that no relics of St. Basil are mentioned before the twelfth century, at which time parts of his body, together with some other very extraordinary relics were reputed to have been brought to Bruges by a returning Crusader. Baronius (c. 1599) gave to the Naples Oratory a relic of St. Basil sent from Constantinople to the pope. The Bollandists and Baronius print descriptions of Basil's personal appearance and the former reproduce two icons, the older copied from a codex presented to Basil, Emperor of the East (877-886).

By common consent, Basil ranks among the greatest figures in church history and the rather extravagant panegyric by Gregory of

Nazianzus has been all but equalled by a host of other eulogists. Physically delicate and occupying his exalted position but a few years, Basil did magnificent and enduring work in an age of more violent world convulsions than Christianity has since experienced. (Cf. Newman, *The Church of the Fathers*). By personal virtue he attained distinction in an age of saints; and his purity, his monastic fervour, his stern simplicity, his friendship for the poor became traditional in the history of Christian asceticism. In fact, the impress of his genius was stamped indelibly on the Oriental conception of religious life. In his hands the great metropolitan see of Caesarea took shape as the sort of model of the Christian diocese; there was hardly any detail of episcopal activity in which he failed to mark out guiding lines and to give splendid example. Not the least of his glories is the fact that toward the officials of the State he maintained that fearless dignity and independence which later history has shown to be an indispensable condition of healthy life in the Catholic episcopate.

Some difficulty has arisen out of the correspondence of St. Basil with the Roman See. That he was in communion with the Western bishops and that he wrote repeatedly to Rome asking that steps be taken to assist the Eastern Church in her struggle with schismatics and heretics is undoubted; but the disappointing result of his appeals drew from him certain words which require explanation. Evidently he was deeply chagrined that Pope Damasus on the one hand hesitated to condemn Marcellus and the Eustathians, and on the other preferred Paulinus to Meletius in whose right to the See of Antioch St. Basil most firmly believed. At the best it must be admitted that St. Basil criticized the pope freely in a private letter to Eusebius of Samosata (Ep. ccxxxix) and that he was indignant as well as hurt at the failure of his attempt to obtain help from the West. Later on, however, he must have recognized that in some respects he had been hasty; in any event, his strong emphasis of the influence which the Roman See could exercise over the Eastern bishops, and his abstaining from a charge of anything like usurpation are great facts that stand out obviously in the story of the disagreement. With regard to the question of his association with the Semi-Arians, Philostorgius speaks of him as championing the Semi-Arian cause, and Newman says he seems unavoidably to have Arianized the first thirty years of his life. The

explanation of this, as well as of the disagreement with the Holy See, must be sought in a careful study of the times, with due reference to the unsettled and changeable condition of theological distinctions, the lack of anything like a final pronouncement by the Church's defining power, the "lingering imperfections of the Saints" (Newman), the substantial orthodoxy of many of the so-called Semi-Arians, and above all the great plan which Basil was steadily pursuing of effecting unity in a disturbed and divided Christendom.

Writings

Dogmatic

Of the five books against Eunomius (c. 364) the last two are classed as spurious by some critics. The work assails the equivalent Arianism of Eunomius and defends the Divinity of the Three Persons of the Trinity; it is well summarized by Jackson (Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, Series II, VIII). The work *On the Holy Spirit*, or treatise on the Holy Spirit (c. 375) was evoked in part by the Macedonian denial of the Divinity of the Third Person and in part by charges that Basil himself had "slurred over the Spirit" (Gregory Naz., Ep. lviii), that he had advocated communion with all such a should admit simply that the Holy Ghost was not a creature (Basil, Ep. cxiii), and that he had sanctioned the use of a novel doxology, namely, "Glory be to the Father with the Son together with the Holy Ghost" (De Sp. S., I, i) The treatise teaches the doctrine of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, while avoiding the phrase "God, the Holy Ghost" for prudential reasons (Greg. Naz., Or . xliii). Wuilcknis and Swete affirm the necessity of some such reticence on Basil's part. (Cf. Jackson, op. cit., p. XXIII, note.) With regard to Basil's teaching on the Third Person, as expressed in his work against Eunomius (III, i), a controversy arose at the Council of Florence between the Latins and the Greeks; but strong arguments both external and internal, availed to place Basil on the side of the "Filioque". The dogmatic writings were edited separately by Goldhorn, in his "S. Basilii Opera Dogmatica Selecta" (Leipzig, 1854). The *On the Holy Spirit*, was translated into English by Johnston (Oxford, 1892); by Lewis in the Christian Classic Series (1888); and by Jackson (op. cit.).

Exegetical

These include nine homilies "On the Hexaemeron" and thirteen (Maran) genuine homilies on particular Psalms. A lengthy commentary on the first sixteen chapters of Isaias is of doubtful authenticity (Jackson), though by a contemporary hand. A commentary on Job has disappeared. "The Hexaemeron" was highly admired by Gregory of Nazianzus (Or . xliii, no. 67). It is translated entire by Jackson (op. cit.). The homilies on the Psalms are moral and hortatory rather than strictly exegetical. In interpreting the Scripture, Basil uses both the literal and the allegorical methods, but favours the literal system of Antioch. His second homily contains a denunciation of usury which has become famous.

Homiletical

Twenty-four sermons, doctrinal, moral, and panegyrical in character, are looked upon as generally genuine, certain critical difficulties, however, remaining still unsolved. Eight of these sermons were translated into Latin by Rufinus. The discourses place Basil among the very greatest of Christian preachers and evince his special gift for preaching upon the responsibilities of wealth. The most noteworthy in the collection are the homilies on the rich (vi and vii) copied by St. Ambrose (De Nabuthe Jez., v, 21-24), and the homily (xxii) on the study of pagan literature. The latter was edited by Fremion (Paris, 1819, with French translation), Sommer (Paris, 1894), Bach (Münster , 1900), and Maloney (New York, 1901). With regard to Basil's style and his success as a preacher much has been written. (Cf. Villemain, "Tableau deloq. Chrét. au IVe siècle", Paris, 1891; Fialon, "Etude Litt. sur St. B.", Paris, 1861); Roux, "Etude sur la prédication de B. le Grand", S trasburg, 1867; Croiset, "Hist. de la litt. Grecque", Paris, 1899.)

Moral and ascetical

This group contains much of spurious or doubtful origin. Probably authentic are the latter two of the three prefatory treatises, and the five treatises: "Morals", "On the Judgment of God", "On Faith", "The Longer Monastic Rules", "The Shorter Monastic Rules". The twenty-four sermons on morals are a cento of extracts from the writings of Basil made by Simeon Metaphrastes. Concerning the authenticity of

the Rules there has been a good deal of discussion. As is plain from these treatises and from the homilies that touch upon ascetical or moral subjects, St. Basil was particularly felicitous in the field of spiritual instruction.

Correspondence

The extant letters of Basil are 366 in number, two-thirds of them belonging to the period of his episcopate. The so-called "Canonical Epistles" have been assailed as spurious, but are almost surely genuine. The correspondence with Julian and with Libanius is probably apocryphal; the correspondence with Apollinarus is uncertain. All of the 366 letters are translated in the "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers". Some of the letters are really dogmatic treatises, and others are apologetic replies to personal attacks. In general they are very useful for their revelation of the saint's character and for the pictures of his age which they offer.

Liturgical

A so-called "Liturgy of St. Basil" exists in Greek and in Coptic. It goes back at least to the sixth century, but its connexion with Basil has been a matter of critical discussion (Brightman, "Litur gies, Eastern and Western", Oxford, 1896, I; Probst, "Die Litur gie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform", Münster, 1893, 377-412).

Editions of St. Basil

The *editio princeps* of the original text of the extant works of Basil appeared at Basle, 1551, and the first complete Latin translation at Rome, 1515 (autograph manuscript in the British Museum). The best edition is that of the Maurist Benedictines, Garnier and Maran (Paris, 1721-30), republished with appendixes by Migne (P.G., XXIX-XXXII). For fragments attributed to Basil with more or less certainty, and edited by Matthaei, Mai, Pitra, and others, see Bardenhewer, "Patrologie" (Freibur g, 1901), 247. Portions of letters recently discovered in Egyptian papyri were published by H. Landwehr, "Grieschische Handschriften aus Fayûm", in "Philologus", XLIII (1884).

Chapter 9

St. John Chrysostom

John Chrysostom (*Chrysostomos*, "golden-mouthed" so called on account of his eloquence, is the Doctor of the Church, born at Antioch, c. 347; died at Commana in Pontus, 14 September, 407. John - whose surname "Chrysostom" occurs for the first time in the "Constitution" of Pope Vigilius (cf. P.L., LX, 217) in the year 553 - is generally considered the most prominent doctor of the Greek Church and the greatest preacher ever heard in a Christian pulpit. His natural gifts, as well as exterior circumstances, helped him to become what he was.

Life

At the time of Chrysostom's birth, Antioch was the second city of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. During the whole of the fourth century religious struggles had troubled the empire and had found their echo at Antioch. Pagans, Manichaeans, Gnostics, Arians, Apollinarians, Jews, made their proselytes at Antioch, and the Catholics were themselves separated by the schism between the bishops Meletius and Paulinus. Thus Chrysostom's youth fell in troubled times. His father, Secundus, was an officer of high rank in the Syrian

army. On his death soon after the birth of John, Anthusa, his wife, only twenty years of age, took the sole charge of her two children, John and an elder sister. Fortunately she was a woman of intelligence and character. She not only instructed her son in piety, but also sent him to the best schools of Antioch, though with regard to morals and religion many objections could be urged against them. Beside the lectures of Andragatius, a philosopher not otherwise known, Chrysostom followed also those of Libanius, at once the most famous orator of that period and the most tenacious adherent of the declining paganism of Rome. As we may see from the later writings of Chrysostom, he attained then considerable Greek scholarship and classical culture, which he by no means disowned in his later days. His alleged hostility to classical learning is in reality but a misunderstanding of certain passages in which he defends the *philosophia* of Christianity against the myths of the heathen gods, of which the chief defenders in his time were the representatives and teachers of the *sophia ellenike*.

Chrysostom as lector and monk

It was a very decisive turning-point in the life of Chrysostom when he met one day (about 367) the bishop Meletius. The earnest, mild, and winning character of this man captivated Chrysostom in such a measure that he soon began to withdraw from classical and profane studies and to devote himself to an ascetic and religious life. He studied Holy Scripture and frequented the sermons of Meletius. About three years later he received Holy Baptism and was ordained lector. But the young cleric, seized by the desire of a more perfect life, soon afterwards entered one of the ascetic societies near Antioch, which was under the spiritual direction of Carterius and especially of the famous Diodorus, later Bishop of Tarsus, manual labour and the study of Holy Scripture were his chief occupations, and we may safely suppose that his first literary works date from this time, for nearly all his earlier writings deal with ascetic and monastic subjects [cf. below Chrysostom writings: (1) “Opuscuia”]. Four years later, Chrysostom resolved to live as an anchorite in one of the caves near Antioch. He remained there two years, but then as his health was quite ruined by indiscreet watchings and fastings in frost and cold, he prudently returned to Antioch to regain his health, and resumed his office as lector in the church.

Chrysostom as deacon and priest at Antioch

As the sources of the life of Chrysostom give an incomplete chronology, we can but approximately determine the dates for this Antiochene period. Very probably in the beginning of 381 Meletius made him deacon, just before his own departure to Constantinople, where he died as president of the Second Ecumenical Council. The successor of Meletius was Flavian. Ties of sympathy and friendship connected Chrysostom with his new bishop. As deacon he had to assist at the liturgical functions, to look after the sick and poor, and was probably charged also in some degree with teaching catechumens. At the same time he continued his literary work, and we may suppose that he composed his most famous book, “On the Priesthood”, towards the end of this period (c. 386) or at latest in the beginning of his priesthood (c. 387, as Nairn with good reasons puts it, in his edition of “De Sacerd.”, xii-xv). There may be some doubt if it was occasioned by a real historical fact, viz., that Chrysostom and his friend Basil were requested to accept bishoprics (c. 372). All the earliest Greek biographers seem not to have taken it in that sense. In the year 386 Chrysostom was ordained priest by Flavian, and from that dates his real importance in ecclesiastical history. His chief task during the next twelve years was that of preaching, which he had to exercise either instead of or with Bishop Flavian. But no doubt the larger part of the popular religious instruction and education devolved upon him. The earliest notable occasion which showed his power of speaking and his great authority was the Lent of 387, when he delivered his sermons “On the Statues” (P .G., XLVIII, 15, xxx.). The people of Antioch, excited by the levy of new taxes, had thrown down the statues of Emperor Theodosius. In the panic and fear of punishment which followed, Chrysostom delivered a series of twenty or twenty-one (the nineteenth is probably not authentic) sermons, full of vigour, consolatory, exhortative, tranquilizing, until Flavian, the bishop, brought back from Constantinople the emperor’s pardon. But the usual preaching of Chrysostom consisted in consecutive explanations of Holy Scripture. To that custom, unhappily no longer in use, we owe his famous and magnificent commentaries, which offer us such an inexhaustible treasure of dogmatic, moral, and historical knowledge of the transition from the fourth to the fifth century. These years, 386-98, were the period of the greatest theological productivity of

Chrysostom, a period which alone would have assured him for ever a place among the first Doctors of the Church. A sign of this may be seen in the fact that in the year 392 St. Jerome already accorded to the preacher of Antioch a place among his *Viri illustres* ("De Viris ill.", 129, in P.L., XXIII, 754), referring expressly to the great and successful activity of Chrysostom as a theological writer. From this same fact we may infer that during this time his fame had spread far beyond the limits of Antioch, and that he was well known in the Byzantine Empire, especially in the capital.

St. Chrysostom as bishop of Constantinople

In the ordinary course of things Chrysostom might have become the successor of Flavian at Antioch. But on 27 September 397, Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, died. There was a general rivalry in the capital, openly or in secret, for the vacant see. After some months it was known, to the great disappointment of the competitors, that Emperor Areadius, at the suggestion of his minister Eutropius, had sent to the Prefect of Antioch to call John Chrysostom out of the town without the knowledge of the people, and to send him straight to Constantinople. In this sudden way Chrysostom was hurried to the capital, and ordained Bishop of Constantinople on 26 February, 398, in the presence of a great assembly of bishops, by Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had been obliged to renounce the idea of securing the appointment of Isidore, his own candidate. The change for Chrysostom was as great as it was unexpected. His new position was not an easy one, placed as he was in the midst of an upstart metropolis, half Western, half Oriental, in the neighbourhood of a court in which luxury and intrigue always played the most prominent parts, and at the head of the clergy composed of most heterogeneous elements, and even (if not canonically, at least practically) at the head of the whole Byzantine episcopate. The first act of the new bishop was to bring about a reconciliation between Flavian and Rome. Constantinople itself soon began to feel the impulse of a new ecclesiastical life.

The necessity for reform was undeniable. Chrysostom began "sweeping the stairs from the top" (Palladius, op. cit., v). He called his *oeconomus*, and ordered him to reduce the expenses of the episcopal household; he put an end to the frequent banquets, and

lived little less strictly than he had formerly lived as a priest and monk. With regard to the clergy, Chrysostom had at first to forbid them to keep in their houses *syneisactoe*, i.e. women housekeepers who had vowed virginity. He also proceeded against others who, by avarice or luxury, had given scandal. He had even to exclude from the ranks of the clergy two deacons, the one for murder and the other for adultery. Of the monks, too, who were very numerous even at that time at Constantinople, some had preferred to roam about aimlessly and without discipline. Chrysostom confined them to their monasteries. Finally he took care of the ecclesiastical widows. Some of them were living in a worldly manner: he obliged them either to marry again, or to observe the rules of decorum demanded by their state. After the clergy, Chrysostom turned his attention to his flock. As he had done at Antioch, so at Constantinople and with more reason, he frequently preached against the unreasonable extravagances of the rich, and especially against the ridiculous finery in the matter of dress affected by women whose age should have put them beyond such vanities. Some of them, the widows Marsa, Castricia, Eugraphia, known for such preposterous tastes, belonged to the court circle. It seems that the upper classes of Constantinople had not previously been accustomed to such language. Doubtless some felt the rebuke to be intended for themselves, and the offence given was the greater in proportion as the rebuke was the more deserved. On the other hand, the people showed themselves delighted with the sermons of their new bishop, and frequently applauded him in the church (Socrates, *Church History* VI). They never forgot his care for the poor and miserable, and that in his first year he had built a great hospital with the money he had saved in his household. But Chrysostom had also very intimate friends among the rich and noble classes. The most famous of these was Olympias, widow and deaconess, a relation of Emperor Theodosius, while in the Court itself there was Brison, first usher of Eudoxia, who assisted Chrysostom in instructing his choirs, and always maintained a true friendship for him. The empress herself was at first most friendly towards the new bishop. She followed the religious processions, attended his sermons, and presented silver candlesticks for the use of the churches (Socrates, op. cit., VI, 8; Sozomenus, op. cit., VIII, 8).

Unfortunately, the feelings of amity did not last. At first Eutropius, the former slave, now minister and consul, abused his influence. He

deprived some wealthy persons of their property, and prosecuted others whom he suspected of being adversaries of rivals. More than once Chrysostom went himself to the minister to remonstrate with him, and to warn him of the results of his own acts, but without success. Then the above-named ladies, who immediately surrounded the empress, probably did not hide their resentment against the strict bishop. Finally, the empress herself committed an injustice in depriving a widow of her vineyard (Marcus Diac., "Vita Porphyrii", V, no. 37, in P.G., LXV, 1229). Chrysostom interceded for the latter. But Eudoxia showed herself offended. Henceforth there was a certain coolness between the imperial Court and the episcopal palace, which, growing little by little, led to a catastrophe. It is impossible to ascertain exactly at what period this alienation first began; very probably it dated from the beginning of the year 401. But before this state of things became known to the public there happened events of the highest political importance, and Chrysostom, without seeking it, was implicated in them. These were the fall of Eutropius and the revolt of Gainas.

In January, 399, Eutropius, for a reason not exactly known, fell into disgrace. Knowing the feelings of the people and of his personal enemies, he fled to the church. As he had himself attempted to abolish the immunity of the ecclesiastical asylums not long before, the people seemed little disposed to spare him. But Chrysostom interfered, delivering his famous sermon on Eutropius, and the fallen minister was saved for the moment. As, however, he tried to escape during the night, he was seized, exiled, and some time later put to death. Immediately another more exciting and more dangerous event followed. Gainas, one of the imperial generals, had been sent out to subdue Tribigild, who had revolted. In the summer of 399 Gainas united openly with Tribigild, and, to restore peace, Arcadius had to submit to the most humiliating conditions. Gainas was named commander-in-chief of the imperial army, and even had Aurelian and Saturninus, two men of the highest rank at Constantinople, delivered over to him. It seems that Chrysostom accepted a mission to Gainas, and that, owing to his intervention, Aurelian and Saturninus were spared by Gainas, and even set at liberty. Soon afterwards, Gainas, who was an Arian Goth, demanded one of the Catholic churches at Constantinople for himself and his soldiers. Again Chrysostom made so energetic an opposition that Gainas yielded. Meanwhile the people of Constantinople had become excited, and in one night several

thousand Goths were slain. Gainas however escaped, was defeated, and slain by the Huns. Such was the end within a few years of three consuls of the Byzantine Empire. There is no doubt that Chrysostom's authority had been greatly strengthened by the magnanimity and firmness of character he had shown during all these troubles. It may have been this that augmented the jealousy of those who now governed the empire - a clique of courtiers, with the empress at their head.

These were now joined by new allies issuing from the ecclesiastical ranks and including some provincial bishops - Severian of Gabala, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and, for some time, Acacius of Beroea - who preferred the attractions of the capital to residence in their own cities (Socrates, op. cit., VI, 11; Sozomenus, op. cit., VIII, 10). The most intriguing among them was Severian, who flattered himself that he was the rival of Chrysostom in eloquence. But so far nothing had transpired in public. A great change occurred during the absence of Chrysostom for several months from Constantinople. This absence was necessitated by an ecclesiastical affair in Asia Minor, in which he was involved. Following the express invitation of several bishops, Chrysostom, in the first months of 401, had come to Ephesus, where he appointed a new archbishop, and with the consent of the assembled bishops deposed six bishops for simony. After having passed the same sentence on Bishop Gerontius of Nicomedia, he returned to Constantinople.

Meanwhile disagreeable things had happened there. Bishop Severian, to whom Chrysostom seems to have entrusted the performance of some ecclesiastical functions, had entered into open enmity with Serapion, the archdeacon and *oeconomus* of the cathedral and the episcopal palace. Whatever the real reason may have been, Chrysostom, found the case so serious that he invited Severian to return to his own see. It was solely owing to the personal interference of Eudoxia, whose confidence Serapion possessed, that he was allowed to come back from Chalcedon, whither he had retired. The reconciliation which followed was, at least on the part of Severian, not a sincere one, and the public scandal had excited much ill-feeling. The effects soon became visible. When in the spring of 402, Bishop Porphyrius of Gaza went to the Court at Constantinople to obtain a favour for his diocese, Chrysostom answered that he could do nothing for him, since he was himself in disgrace with the empress.

Nevertheless, the party of malcontents were not really dangerous, unless they could find some prominent and unscrupulous leader. Such a person presented himself sooner than might have been expected. It was the well-known Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria. He appeared under rather curious circumstances, which in no way foreshadowed the final result. Theophilus, toward the end of the year 402, was summoned by the emperor to Constantinople to apologize before a synod, over which Chrysostom should preside, for several charges, which were brought against him by certain Egyptian monks, especially by the so-called four "tall brothers". The patriarch, their former friend, had suddenly turned against them, and had them persecuted as Origenists (Palladius, "Dialogus", xvi; Socrates, op. cit., VI, 7; Sozomenus, op. cit., VIII, 12).

However, Theophilus was not easily frightened. He had always agents and friends at Constantinople, and knew the state of things and the feelings at the court. He now resolved to take advantage of them. He wrote at once to St. Epiphanius at Cyprus, requesting him to go to Constantinople and prevail upon Chrysostom at to condemn the Origenists. Epiphanius went. But when he found that Theophilus was merely using him for his own purposes, he left the capital, dying on his return in 403. At this time Chrysostom delivered a sermon against the vain luxury of women. It was reported to the empress as though she had been personally alluded to. In this way the ground was prepared. Theophilus at last appeared at Constantinople in June, 403, not alone, as he had been commanded, but with twenty-nine of his suffragan bishops, and, as Palladius (ch. viii) tells us, with a good deal of money and all sorts of gifts. He took his lodgings in one of the imperial palaces, and held conferences with all the adversaries of Chrysostom. Then he retired with his suffragans and seven other bishops to a villa near Constantinople, called *epi dryn*. A long list of the most ridiculous accusations was drawn up against Chrysostom, who, surrounded by forty-two archbishops and bishops assembled to judge Theophilus in accordance with the orders of the emperor, was now summoned to present himself and apologize. Chrysostom naturally refused to recognize the legality of a synod in which his open enemies were judges. After the third summons Chrysostom, with the consent of the emperor, was declared to be deposed. In order to avoid useless bloodshed, he surrendered himself on the third day to the soldiers who awaited him. But the threats of the excited

people, and a sudden accident in the imperial palace, frightened the empress (Palladius, "Dialogus", ix). She feared some punishment from heaven for Chrysostom's exile, and immediately ordered his recall. After some hesitation Chrysostom re-entered the capital amid the great rejoicings of the people. Theophilus and his party saved themselves by flying from Constantinople. Chrysostom's return was in itself a defeat for Eudoxia. When her alarms had gone, her rancour revived. Two months afterwards a silver statue of the empress was unveiled in the square just before the cathedral. The public celebrations which attended this incident, and lasted several days, became so boisterous that the offices in the church were disturbed. Chrysostom complained of this to the prefect of the city, who reported to Eudoxia that the bishop had complained against her statue. This was enough to excite the empress beyond all bounds. She summoned Theophilus and the other bishops to come back and to depose Chrysostom again. The prudent patriarch, however, did not wish to run the same risk a second time. He only wrote to Constantinople that Chrysostom should be condemned for having re-entered his see in opposition to an article of the Synod of Antioch held in the year 341 (an Arian synod). The other bishops had neither the authority nor the courage to give a formal judgment. All they could do was to urge the emperor to sign a new decree of exile. A double attempt on Chrysostom's life failed. On Easter Eve, 404, when all the catechumens were to receive baptism, the adversaries of the bishop, with imperial soldiers, invaded the baptistery and dispersed the whole congregation. At last Arcadius signed the decree, and on 24 June, 404, the soldiers conducted Chrysostom a second time into exile.

Exile and death

They had scarcely left Constantinople when a huge conflagration destroyed the cathedral, the senate-house, and other buildings. The followers of the exiled bishop were accused of the crime and prosecuted. In haste Arsacius, an old man, was appointed successor of Chrysostom, but was soon succeeded by the cunning Atticus. Whoever refused to enter into communion with them was punished by confiscation of property and exile. Chrysostom himself was conducted to Cucusus, a secluded and rugged place on the east frontier of Armenia, continually exposed to the invasions of the Isaurians. In the following year he had even to fly for some time to the castle of

Arabissus to protect himself from these barbarians. Meanwhile he always maintained a correspondence with his friends and never gave up the hope of return. When the circumstances of his deposition were known in the West, the pope and the Italian bishops declared themselves in his favour. Emperor Honorius and Pope Innocent I endeavoured to summon a new synod, but their legates were imprisoned and then sent home. The pope broke off all communion with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch (where an enemy of Chrysostom had succeeded Flavian), and Constantinople, until (after the death of Chrysostom) they consented to admit his name into the diptychs of the Church. Finally all hopes for the exiled bishop had vanished. Apparently he was living too long for his adversaries. In the summer, 407, the order was given to carry him to Pithyus, a place at the extreme boundary of the empire, near the Caucasus. One of the two soldiers who had to lead him caused him all possible sufferings. He was forced to make long marches, was exposed to the rays of the sun, to the rains and the cold of the nights. His body, already weakened by several severe illnesses, finally broke down. On 14 September the party were at Comanan in Pontus. In the morning Chrysostom had asked to rest there on the account of his state of health. In vain; he was forced to continue his march. Very soon he felt so weak that they had to return to Comana. Some hours later Chrysostom died. His last words were: *Doxa to theo panton eneken* (Glory be to God for all things) (Palladius, xi, 38). He was buried at Comana. On 27 January, 438, his body was translated to Constantinople with great pomp, and entombed in the church of the Apostles where Eudoxia had been buried in the year 404.

The writings of St. Chrysostom

Chrysostom has deserved a place in ecclesiastical history, not simply as Bishop of Constantinople, but chiefly as a Doctor of the Church. Of none of the other Greek Fathers do we possess so many writings. We may divide them into three portions, the "opuscula", the "homilies", and the "letters".

(1) The chief "opuscula" all date from the earlier days of his literary activity. The following deal with monastical subjects: "Comparatio Regis cum Monacho" ("Opera", I, 387-93, in P.G., XLVII-LXIII), "Adhortatio ad Theodorum (Mopsuestensem?)

lapsum" (ibid., 277-319), "Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae" (ibid., 319-87). Those dealing with ascetical subjects in general are the treatise "De Compunctione" in two books (ibid., 393-423), "Adhortatio ad S tagirium" in three books (ibid., 433-94), "Adversus Subintroductas" (ibid., 495-532), "De Virginitate" (ibid., 533-93), "De Sacerdotio" (ibid., 623-93). (2) Among the "homilies" we have to distinguish commentaries on books of Holy Scripture, groups of homilies (sermons) on special subjects, and a great number of single homilies. (a) The chief "commentaries" on the Old Testament are the sixty-seven homilies "On Genesis" (with eight sermons on Genesis, which are probably a first recension).

(IV, 21 sqq., and ibid., 607 sqq.); fifty-nine homilies "On the Psalms" (4-12, 41, 43-49, 108-1 17, 119-150) (V, 39-498). The fragments on Job (XIII, 503-65) are spurious; the authenticity of the fragments on the Proverbs (XIII, 659-740), on Jeremias and Daniel (VI, 193-246), and the Synopsis of the Old and the New Testament (ibid., 313 sqq.), is doubtful. The chief commentaries on the New Testament are first the ninety homilies on "St. Matthew" (about the year 390; VII), eighty-eight homilies on "St. John" (c. 389; VIII, 23 sqq. - probably from a later edition), fifty-five homilies on "the Acts" (as preserved by stenographers, IX, 13 sqq.), and homilies "On all Epistles of St. Paul" (IX, 391 sqq.). The best and most important commentaries are those on the Psalms, on St. Matthew, and on the Epistle to the Romans (written c. 391). The thirty-four homilies on the Epistle to the Galatians also very probably comes to us from the hand of a second editor. (b) Among the "homilies forming connected groups", we may especially mention the five homilies "On Anna" (IV, 631-76), three "On David" (ibid., 675-708), six "On Ozias" (VI, 97-142), eight "Against the Jews" (II, 843-942), twelve "De Incomprehensibili Dei Naturæ" (ibid., 701-812), and the seven famous homilies "On St. Paul" (III, 473-514). (c) A great number of "single homilies" deal with moral subjects, with certain feasts or saints. (3) The "Letters" of Chrysostom (about 238 in number: III, 547 sqq.) were all written during his exile. Of special value for their contents and intimate nature are the seventeen letters to the deaconess Olympias. Among the numerous "Apocrypha" we may mention the liturgy attributed to Chrysostom, who perhaps modified, but did not compose the ancient text. The most famous *apocryphon* is the "Letter to Caesarius" (III, 755-760). It contains a passage on the holy Eucharist which seems to favour the theory of

"impanatio", and the disputes about it have continued for more than two centuries. The most important spurious work in Latin is the "Opus imperfectum", written by an Arian in the first half of the fifth century.

Chrysostom's theological importance

Chrysostom as orator

The success of Chrysostom's preaching is chiefly due to his great natural facility of speech, which was extraordinary even to Greeks, to the abundance of his thoughts as well as the popular way of presenting and illustrating them, and, last but not least, the whole-hearted earnestness and conviction with which he delivered the message which he felt had been given to him. Speculative explanation did not attract his mind, nor would they have suited the tastes of his hearers. He ordinarily preferred moral subjects, and very seldom in his sermons followed a regular plan, nor did he care to avoid digressions when any opportunity suggested them. In this way, he is by no means a model for our modern thematic preaching, which, however we may regret it, has to such a great extent supplanted the old homiletic method. But the frequent outbursts of applause among his congregation may have told Chrysostom that he was on the right path.

Chrysostom as an exegete

As an exegete Chrysostom is of the highest importance, for he is the chief and almost the only successful representative of the exegetical principles of the School of Antioch. Diodorus of Tarsus had initiated him into the grammatico-historical method of that school, which was in strong opposition to the eccentric, allegorical, and mystical interpretation of Origen and the Alexandrian School. But Chrysostom rightly avoided pushing his principles to that extreme to which, later on, his friend Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, carried them. He did not even exclude all allegorical or mystical explanations, but confined them to the cases in which the inspired author himself suggests this meaning.

Chrysostom as dogmatic theologian

As has already been said, Chrysostom's was not a speculative mind, nor was he involved in his lifetime in great dogmatic controversies. Nevertheless it would be a mistake to underrate the

great theological treasures hidden in his writings. From the very first he was considered by the Greeks and Latins as a most important witness to the Faith. Even at the Council of Ephesus (431) both parties, St. Cyril and the Antiochians, already invoked him on behalf of their opinions, and at the Seventh Ecumenical Council, when a passage of Chrysostom had been read in favour of the veneration of images, Bishop Peter of Nicomedia cried out: "If John Chrysostom speaks in the way of the images, who would dare to speak against them?" which shows clearly the progress his authority had made up to that date.

Strangely enough, in the Latin Church, Chrysostom was still earlier invoked as an authority on matters of faith. The first writer who quoted him was Pelagius, when he wrote his lost book "De Nature" against St. Augustine (c. 415). The Bishop of Hippo himself very soon afterwards (421) claimed Chrysostom for the Catholic teaching in his controversy with Julian of Eclanum, who had opposed to him a passage of Chrysostom (from the "Hom. ad Neophytos", preserved only in Latin) as being against original sin. Again, at the time of the Reformation there arose long and acrid discussions as to whether Chrysostom was a Protestant or a Catholic, and these polemics have never wholly ceased. It is true that Chrysostom has some strange passages on our Blessed Lady, that he seems to ignore private confession to a priest, that there is no clear and any direct passage in favour of the primacy of the pope. But it must be remembered that all the respective passages contain nothing positive against the actual Catholic doctrine. On the other side Chrysostom explicitly acknowledges as a rule of faith tradition (XI, 488), as laid down by the authoritative teaching of the Church (I, 813). This Church, he says, is but one, by the unity of her doctrine (V, 244; XI, 554); she is spread over the whole world, she is the one Bride of Christ (III, 229, 403; V, 62; VIII, 170). As to Christology, Chrysostom holds clearly that Christ is God and man in one person, but he never enters into deeper examination of the manner of this union. Of great importance is his doctrine regarding the Eucharist. There cannot be the slightest doubt that he teaches the Real Presence, and his expressions on the change wrought by the words of the priest are equivalent to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Chapter 10

St. Ephraem

Ephraem (Ephraim) was born at Nisibis, then under Roman rule, early in the fourth century; died June, 373. The name of his father is unknown, but he was a pagan and a priest of the goddess Abnil or Abizal. His mother was a native of Amid. Ephraem was instructed in the Christian mysteries by St. James, the famous Bishop of Nisibis, and was baptized at the age of eighteen (or twenty-eight). Thenceforth he became more intimate with the holy bishop, who availed himself of the services of Ephraem to renew the moral life of the citizens of Nisibis, especially during the sieges of 338, 346, and 350. One of his biographers relates that on a certain occasion he cursed from the city walls the Persian hosts, whereupon a cloud of flies and mosquitoes settled on the army of Sapor II and compelled it to withdraw. The adventurous campaign of Julian the Apostate, which for a time menaced Persia, ended, as is well known, in disaster, and his successor, Jovianus, was only too happy to rescue from annihilation some remnant of the great army which his predecessor had led across the Euphrates. To accomplish even so much the emperor had to sign a disadvantageous treaty, by the terms of which Rome lost the Eastern provinces conquered at the end of the third century; among the cities retroceded

to Persia was Nisibis (363). To escape the cruel persecution that was then raging in Persia, most of the Christian population abandoned Nisibis *en masse.* Ephraem went with his people, and settled first at Beit-Garbaya, then at Amid, finally at Edessa, the capital of Osrhoene, where he spent the remaining ten years of his life, a hermit remarkable for his severe asceticism. Nevertheless he took an interest in all matters that closely concerned the population of Edessa. Several ancient writers say that he was a deacon; as such he could well have been authorized to preach in public. At this time some ten heretical sects were active in Edessa; Ephraem contended vigorously with all of them, notably with the disciples of the illustrious philosopher Bardesanes. To this period belongs nearly all his literary work; apart from some poems composed at Nisibis, the rest of his writings-sermons, hymns, exegetical treatises-date from his sojourn at Edessa. It is not improbable that he is one of the chief founders of the theological "School of the Persians", so called because its first students and original masters were Persian Christian refugees of 363. At his death St. Ephraem was borne without pomp to the cemetery "of the foreigners". The Armenian monks of the monastery of St. Sergius at Edessa claim to possess his body.

The aforesaid facts represent all that is historically certain concerning the career of Ephraem. All details added later by Syrian biographers are at best of doubtful value. To this class belong not only the legendary and occasionally puerile traits so dear to Oriental writers, but also others seemingly reliable, e.g. an alleged journey to Egypt with a sojourn of eight years, during which he is said to have confuted publicly certain spokesmen of the Arian heretics. The relations of St. Ephraem and St. Basil are narrated by very reliable authors, e.g. St. Gregory of Nyssa (the Pseudo?) and Sozomen, according to whom the hermit of Edessa, attracted by the great reputation of St. Basil, resolved to visit him at Caesarea. He was warmly received and was ordained deacon by St. Basil; four years later he refused both the priesthood and the episcopate that St. Basil offered him through delegates sent for that purpose to Edessa. Though Ephraem seems to have been quite ignorant of Greek, this meeting with St. Basil is not improbable; some good critics, however, hold the evidence insufficient, and therefore reject it, or at least withhold their adhesion. The life of St. Ephraem, therefore, offers not a few obscure

problems; only the general outline of his career is known to us. It is certain, however, that while he lived he was very influential among the Syrian Christians of Edessa, and that his memory was revered by all, Orthodox, Monophysites, and Nestorians. They call him the "sun of the Syrians," the "column of the Church", the "harp of the Holy Spirit". More extraordinary still is the homage paid by the Greeks who rarely mention Syrian writers. Among the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa (P.G., XLVI, 819) is a sermon (though not acknowledged by some) which is a real panegyric of St. Ephraem. Twenty years after the latter's death St. Jerome mentions him as follows in his catalogue of illustrious Christians: "Ephraem, deacon of the Church of Edessa, wrote many works [*opuscula*] in Syriac, and became so famous that his writings are publicly read in some churches after the Sacred Scriptures. I have read in Greek a volume of his on the Holy Spirit; though it was only a translation, I recognized therein the sublime genius of the man" (*Illustrious Men* 115). Theodoret of Cyrus also praised his poetic genius and theological knowledge (Hist. Eccl., IV, xxvi). Sozomen pretends that Ephraem wrote 3,000,000 verses, and gives the names of some of his disciples, some of whom remained orthodox, while others fell into heresy (*Church History* III.16). From the Syrian and Byzantine Churches the fame of Ephraem spread among all Christians. The Roman Martyrology mentions him on 1 February. In their menologies and synaxaria Greeks and Russians, Jacobites, Chaldeans, Copts, and Armenians honour the holy deacon of Edessa.

Works of St. Ephraem

The works of this saint are so numerous and important that it is impossible to treat them here in detail. Let it suffice to consider briefly: (1) the text and the principal versions and editions of his writings; (2) his exegetical writings; (3) his poetical writings.

Texts and principal versions and editions

The Syriac original of Ephraem's writings is preserved in many manuscripts, one of which dates from the fifth century. Through much transcription, however, his writings, particularly those used in the various liturgies, have suffered no little interpolation. Moreover, many of his exegetical works have perished, or at least have not yet been found in the libraries of the Orient. Numerous versions, however,

console us for the loss of the originals. He was still living, or at least not long dead, when the translation of his writing into Greek was begun. Armenian writers seem to have undertaken the translation of his Biblical commentaries. The Mechitarists have edited in part those commentaries and hold the Armenian versions as very ancient (fifth century). The Monophysites, it is well known, were wont from an early date to translate or adapt many Syriac works. The writings of Ephraem were eventually translated into Arabic and Ethiopian (translations as yet unedited). In medieval times some of his minor works were translated from the Greek into Slavonic and Latin. From these versions were eventually made French, German, Italian, and English adaptations of the ascetic writings of St. Ephraem. The first printed (Latin) edition was based on a translation from the Greek done by Ambrogio Traversari (St. Ambrose of Camaldoli), and issued from the press of Bartholomew Guldenbeek of Sultz, in 1475. A far better edition was executed by Gerhard Vossius (1589-1619), the learned provost of Tongres, at the request of Gregory XIII. In 1709 Edward Thwaites edited, from the manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, the Greek text, hitherto known only in fragments. The Syriac original was unknown in Europe until the fruitful Oriental voyage (1706-07) of the Maronites Gabriel Eva, Elias, and especially Joseph Simeon Assemani (1716-17), which resulted in the discovery of a precious collection of manuscripts in the Nitrian (Egypt) monastery of Our Lady. These manuscripts found their way at once to the Vatican Library. In the first half of the nineteenth century the British Museum was notably enriched by similar fortunate discoveries of Lord Prudhol (1828), Curzon (1832), and Tattam (1839, 1841). All recent editions of the Syriac original of Ephraem's writings are based on these manuscripts. In the Bibliotheque Nationale (Paris) and the Bodleian (Oxford) are a few Syriac fragments of minor importance. Joseph Simeon Assemani hastened to make the best use of his newly found manuscripts and proposed at once to Clement XII a complete edition of the writings of Ephraem in the Syriac original and the Greek versions, with a new Latin version of the entire material. He took for his own share the edition of the Greek text. The Syriac text was entrusted to the Jesuit Peter Mobarak (Benedictus), a native Maronite. After the death of Mobarak, his labours were continued by Stephanus Evodius Assemani. Finally this monumental edition of the works of Ephraem appeared at Rome (1732-46) in six folio volumes. It was completed

by the labours of Overbeck (Oxford, 1865) and Bickell (Carmina Nisibena, 1866), while other savants edited newly found fragments (Zingerle, P. Martin, Rubens Duval). A splendid edition (Mechlin, 1882-1902) of the hymns and sermons of St. Ephraem is owing to the late Monsignor T. J. Lamy. However, a complete edition of the vast works of the great Syriac doctor is yet to be executed.

Exegetical writings

Ephraem wrote commentaries on the entire Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, but much of his work has been lost. There is extant in Syriac his commentary on Genesis and on a large portion of Exodus; for the other books of the Old Testament we have A Syriac abridgment, handed down in a catena of the ninth century by the Syriac monk Severus (851-61). The commentaries on Ruth, Esdras, Nehemias, Esther, the Psalms, Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesiasticus are lost. Of his commentaries on the New Testament there has survived only an Armenian version. The Scriptural canon of Ephraem resembles our own very closely. It seems doubtful that he accepted the deuterocanonical writings; at least no commentary of his on these books has reached us. On the other hand he accepted as canonical the apocryphal Third Epistle to the Corinthians, and wrote a commentary on it. The Scriptural text used by Ephraem is the Syriac Peshito, slightly differing, however, from the printed text of that very ancient version. The New Testament was known to him, as to all Syrians, both Eastern and Western, before the time of Rabulas, in the harmonized "Diatessaron" of Tatian; it is also this text which serves as the basis of his commentary. His text of the Acts of the Apostles appears to have been one closely related to that call the "Occidental". (J.R. Harris, "Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron", London, 1905; J. H. Hill, "A Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary of St. Ephraem the Syrian", Edinburgh, 1896; F. C. Burkitt, "St Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel, Corrected and Arranged", in "Texts and Studies", Cambridge, 1901, VII, 2.) The exegesis of Ephraem is that of the Syriac writers generally, whether hellenized or not, and is closely related to that of Aphraates, being, like the latter, quite respectful of Jewish traditions and often based on them. As an exegete, Ephraem is sober, exhibits a preference for the literal sense, is discreet in his use of allegory; in a word, he inclines strongly to the Antiochene

School, and reminds us in particular of Theodoret. He admits in Scripture but few Messianic passages in the literal sense, many more, however, prophetic of Christ in the typological sense, which here is to be carefully distinguished from the allegorical sense. It is not improbable that most of his commentaries were written for the Christian Persian school (*Schola Persarum*) at Nisibis; as seen above, he was one of its founders, also one of its most distinguished teachers.

Poetical writings

Most of Ephraem's sermons and exhortations are in verse, though a few sermons in prose have been preserved. If we put aside his exegetical writings, the rest of his works may be divided into homilies and hymns. The homilies (Syriac *memre*, i.e. discourses) are written in seven-syllable verse, often divided into two parts of three and four syllables respectively. He celebrates in them the feast of Our Lord and of the saints; sometimes he expounds a Scriptural narrative or takes up a spiritual or edifying theme. In the East the Lessons for the ecclesiastical services were often taken from the homilies of Ephraem. The hymns (Syriac *madrashê*, i.e. instructions) offer a greater variety both of style and rhythm. They were written for the choir service of nuns, and were destined to be chanted by them; hence the division into strophes, the last verses of each strophe being repeated in a kind of refrain. This refrain is indicated at the beginning of each hymn, after the manner of an antiphon; there is also an indication of the musical key in which the hymn should be sung. The following may serve as an illustration. It is taken from an Epiphany hymn (ed. Lamy, I, p. 4).

Air: Behold the month.

Refrain: Glory to Thee from Thy flock on the day of Thy manifestation.

Strophe: He has renewed the heavens, because the foolish ones had adored all the stars / He has renewed the earth which had lost its vigour through Adam / A new creation was made by His spittle / And He Who is all-powerful made straight both bodies and minds

Refrain: Glory to Thee etc.

Mgr. Lamyu, the learned editor of the hymns; noted seventy-five different rhythms and airs. Some hymns are acrostic, i.e., sometimes

each strophe begins with a letter of the alphabet, as in the case with several (Hebrew) metrical pieces in the Bible, or again the fist letters of a number of verses or strophes form a given word. In the latter way Ephraem signed several of his hymns. In Syriac poetry St. Ephraem is a pioneer of genius, the master often imitated but never equalled. He is not, however, the inventor of Syriac poetry; this honour seems due to the aforesaid heretic Bardesanes of Edessa. Ephraem himself tells us that in the neighbourhood of Nisibis and Edessa the poems of this Gnostic and his son Harmonius contributed efficaciously to the success of their false teachings. Indeed, if Ephraem entered the same field, it was with the hope of vanquishing heresy with its own weapons perfected by himself. The Western reader of the hymns of Ephraem is inclined to wonder at the enthusiasm of his admirers in the ancient Syriac Church. His “lyricism” is by no means what we understand by that term. His poetry seems to us prolix, tiresome, colourless, lacking in the person note, and in general devoid of charm. To be just, however, it must be remembered that his poems are known to most readers only in versions, from which of course the original rhythm has disappeared - precisely the charm and most striking feature of this poetry. These hymns, moreover, were not written for private reading, but were meant to be sung by alternating choirs. We have only to compare the Latin psalms as sung in the choir of a Benedictine monastery with the private reading of them by the priest in the recitation of his Breviary. Nor must we forget that literary taste is not everywhere and at all times the same. We are influenced by Greek thought more deeply than we are aware or like to admit: In literature we admire most the qualities of lucidity, sobriety, and varied action. Orientals, on the other hand, never weary of endless repetition of the same thought in slightly altered form; they delight in pretty verbal niceties, in the manifold play of rhythm and accent, rhyme and assonance, and acrostic. In this respect it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader of the well-known peculiarities and qualities of Arabic poetry.