

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 04341 8276



## JOHN M. KELLY LIBRARY



Donated by  
**The Redemptorists of  
the Toronto Province**  
from the Library Collection of  
Holy Redeemer College, Windsor

University of  
St. Michael's College, Toronto

TRANSFERRED  
HOLY REDEEMER LIBRARY, WINDSOR





A MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY

VOL. I.

TRANSFERRED  
HOLY REDEEMER LIBRARY, WINDSOR



A MANUAL  
OF  
CHURCH HISTORY

BY  
DR. E. X. FUNK

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN

SECOND IMPRESSION OF THE  
AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION  
FROM THE 5TH GERMAN EDITION

BY  
LUIGI CAPPADelta



VOL.-I.

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.  
LONDON

*Nihil obstat.*

J. P. ARENDZEN

*Censor Deputatus*

*Imprimatur.*

EDMUNDUS CANONICUS SURMONT

*Vicarius generalis*

*Westmonasterii, die 16 Maii, 1910*

## FOREWORD

IN composing this Manual our aim was to cast into handy form those main facts of Church History with which every well-trained theological student should be familiar. To attain this end it was necessary, whilst neglecting nothing of importance, to eliminate everything irrelevant or of minor interest, to be content with the briefest possible descriptions, and to arrange our matter in such wise as to make our studious youth thoroughly at home in the vast region of the History of the Church. In the hope of giving an impulse to deeper study, we have been at pains to name the best and most recent works on each subject, and to refer at some length to the more famous points of controversy. In what concerns antiquity, in order to cultivate the spirit of research, we deemed it well, so far as considerations of space permitted, to refer in the footnotes to the original works. To have attempted more would have enlarged this work beyond all reasonable proportions, and increased correspondingly the labour of the student. Every teacher knows by experience how much depends on due measure, and several historians (*e.g.* Alzog), who, in beginning, were unmindful of this need, were ultimately compelled to abridge their more ponderous works to suit the convenience of colleges.

The desire of being, before all else, brief, explains why we have allowed the facts to speak for themselves, and have, so far as possible, refrained from comment. A philosophy of history presupposes a full knowledge of the facts, and where brevity is needed, it is best to confine oneself to the facts.

The first edition of this work was published in 1886. On

mature consideration we were, however, convinced that the desire to be brief had led us to omit too much, and that some sections might with advantage be enlarged, without detriment to our principles; that such enlargement would make some parts of our work clearer, and that it would still be possible to show the relative importance of different paragraphs by the use of different type. We accordingly made such alterations as seemed called for in the three subsequent editions (1890, 1898, 1902), on the second of which was made a French translation, which has been several times republished (6th ed. Paris, 1904), whilst the fourth was also rendered into Italian (Rome, 1903-04).

This present (fifth) edition, although it has been abbreviated here and there, is, on the whole, larger than its predecessors. It has been entirely recast and variously improved. There were also a few recent events to chronicle, and some account had to be given of the latest research.

Simultaneously with the appearance of the third edition of this work, we began to publish a series of special Studies (*Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*), of which, so far, two volumes have been issued, whilst a third is in the press. These Studies have for their object the elucidation of a certain number of points which are only touched on in the present Manual. They are also designed to furnish students with an object-lesson in scientific research. Owing to the third volume of the Studies not being as yet out of the press, our references will be given to the sections and not to the pages.

## TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

No alterations, save a few of small importance (*e.g.* the explanation in brackets Vol. I, p. 373) have been made in the body of the text. The Translator is, however, responsible for the references to English translations scattered among the footnotes. The Index at the end of Vol. II has been greatly enlarged so as to include the authors mentioned in the notes, and, when necessary, initials have been added to facilitate identification.



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD . . . . .	v
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE . . . . .	vii
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS . . . . .	xv
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
1. The Meaning of Church History . . . . .	I
2. Division of Church History . . . . .	3
3. The Sources of Church History . . . . .	4
4. Sciences Auxiliary to Church History . . . . .	8
5. The Literature of Church History . . . . .	10

### I.—CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY

CHAPTER I. THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH—HER DEVELOPMENT AND PERSECUTIONS . . . . .	17
6. The Preparation of the Olden World for the Coming of the Redeemer . . . . .	17
7. Christ, Saviour of the World and Founder of the Church . . . . .	20
8. The First Whitsuntide, the Birth of the Church, the Death of James the Greater . . . . .	22
9. The Apostle Paul . . . . .	24
10. The Apostle Peter . . . . .	27
11. The Council of Jerusalem and the Dispute at Antioch . . . . .	29
12. John, James the Less, and the other Apostles . . . . .	31
13. The Spread of Christianity . . . . .	33
14. The Reasons of the Rapid Spread of Christianity . . . . .	35
15. Obstacles encountered by Christianity, the Causes of the Persecutions . . . . .	37
16. The Ten Great Persecutions in the Roman Empire . . . . .	39
17. The Struggle against Christianity with the Weapons of the Mind . . . . .	50

	PAGE
CHAPTER II. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	52
18. The Clergy . . . . .	52
19. The Preparation, Selection, and Means of Subsistence of the Clergy . . . . .	56
20. Dioceses and Provinces . . . . .	58
21. The Oneness of the Church and the Roman Primacy . . . . .	59
CHAPTER III. WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS . . . . .	62
22. Baptism, the Apostles' Creed, Rebaptism . . . . .	62
23. The Eucharist, the Agape, the <i>Disciplina Arcani</i> . . . . .	65
24. The Penitential Discipline . . . . .	68
25. Festivals and Fast-days; the Paschal Quarrel . . . . .	71
26. The Christian Morals . . . . .	74
CHAPTER IV. HERESIES AND SCHISMS . . . . .	78
27. The Meaning of Heresy and Schism—Simon Magus and Menander . . . . .	78
28. The Judaizing Christians—The Ebionites, Cerinthus, the Elkasaites . . . . .	80
29. Gnosticism, its Origin and General Characteristics . . . . .	82
30. Individual Gnostics . . . . .	84
31. Manichæism . . . . .	90
32. The Monarchians . . . . .	92
33. Millenarianism or Chiliasm . . . . .	95
34. Montanism . . . . .	96
35. The Schisms of Novatian, Felicissimus, and Meletius . . . . .	97
CHAPTER V. ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE . . . . .	100
36. The Growth of Ecclesiastical Literature . . . . .	100
37. The Apostolic Fathers . . . . .	101
38. The Apologists and other Writers of the Second Century . . . . .	106
39. Greek Writers of the Third Century . . . . .	109
40. The Latin Literature . . . . .	114

## II.—CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY

CHAPTER I. THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE RISE OF ISLAM . . . . .	117
41. The Spread of Christianity and the Decline of Paganism in the Roman Empire . . . . .	117
42. Christianity in Asia and Africa . . . . .	123
43. Christianity among the Germans . . . . .	125
44. The British Isles . . . . .	129
45. The Islam . . . . .	131
CHAPTER II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINE— THEOLOGICAL DISSENSIONS, HERESIES, AND SCHISMS . . . . .	134
46. Summary of the Matters in Dispute . . . . .	134
47. The Beginning of the Arian Controversy; the First General Council . . . . .	135
48. The Further History and End of Arianism . . . . .	138

# Contents

xi

	PAGE
CHAPTER II.— <i>continued.</i>	
49. The Pneumatomachic Quarrel and the Second General Council . . . . .	142
50. Disputes connected with, or contemporaneous with, the Arian Quarrel . . . . .	145
51. Origenism . . . . .	148
52. The Donatist Schism . . . . .	151
53. The Beginning of the Christological Controversy— Apollinaris of Laodicea . . . . .	153
54. Nestorianism—the Third General Council, 431 . . . . .	154
55. Monophysitism and the Fourth General Council, 451 . . . . .	157
56. The Three Chapters and the Fifth General Council, 553 . . . . .	161
57. Monothelism and the Sixth General Council, 680–81 . . . . .	163
58. The Anthropological Controversy . . . . .	166
CHAPTER III. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	
59. Church Offices . . . . .	173
60. Concerning the Education, Election, Maintenance, and Duties of the Clergy . . . . .	174
61. The Legal Situation of the Clergy, the Clerical Privilege . . . . .	177
62. The Rise of Parishes . . . . .	179
63. New Patriarchates . . . . .	181
64. The Roman Church and its Primacy . . . . .	182
65. The Councils . . . . .	186
CHAPTER IV. WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS . . . . .	
66. Baptism and the Catechumenate . . . . .	189
67. Liturgy, Communion, and Eulogies . . . . .	192
68. Penance . . . . .	196
69. Festivals and Fast-days . . . . .	197
70. Saint and Image Worship ; Pilgrimages . . . . .	202
71. Sacred Buildings, Vessels, and Vestments . . . . .	205
72. Monasticism . . . . .	209
73. Christian Influence in the Social and Moral Life . . . . .	214
CHAPTER V. ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE . . . . .	
74. General Character of the Literature of the Period . . . . .	218
75. Eastern Writings of the Fourth and Fifth Century . . . . .	219
76. The Latins of the Fourth and Fifth Century . . . . .	225
77. Greek Writers of the Sixth and Seventh Century . . . . .	229
78. Latin Writers of the Sixth and Seventh Century . . . . .	231

## I.—THE MIDDLE AGES

CHAPTER I. PROGRESS AND VICISSITUDES OF CHRISTIANITY . . . . .	
79. The Alemanni, Bavarians, Thuringians, and Frisians . . . . .	234
80. St. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans . . . . .	237
81. The Saxons . . . . .	240
82. The Scandinavian Races . . . . .	241
83. The Slavs and Hungarians . . . . .	243
84. The Mohammedans in Spain and Sicily . . . . .	247

	PAGE
CHAPTER II. THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE . . . . .	249
85. The Beginning of the Papal States and the Re-establishment of the Empire of the West—The Popes of the Eighth Century . . . . .	249
86. The Popes of the Carolingian Period . . . . .	254
87. The Tenth Century—the Ottonians and Crescentians . . . . .	257
88. The Eleventh Century—Tusculan and German Popes . . . . .	261
CHAPTER III. EARLY MEDIÆVAL HERESIES AND CONTROVERSIES	265
89. The Paulicians and Bogomiles . . . . .	265
90. The Image-breakers and the Seventh General Council . . . . .	267
91. Controversies concerning the Filioque and Adoptionism . . . . .	271
92. Gottschalk and the Predestinarian Controversy . . . . .	272
93. The Eucharistic Controversy . . . . .	273
94. Photius—Legality of Fourth Marriages—Eighth General Council, 869-70 . . . . .	275
95. The Greek Schism . . . . .	279
CHAPTER IV. THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	281
96. Archdeacons, Deans, Lay Patronage, Testes Synodales, and Canons . . . . .	281
97. Legal Status of the Clergy—Princely Nominations to Church Offices . . . . .	283
98. The Church's Property and Revenues—Tithes—Ecclesiastical Advocates . . . . .	285
99. The False Decretals and Later Collections of Canons . . . . .	287
CHAPTER V. WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS . . . . .	290
100. Liturgy, Communion, Preaching, and Chant . . . . .	290
101. The Penitential Discipline—Church Penalties . . . . .	293
102. Feast-days and Fasts . . . . .	295
103. Saint and Relic Worship . . . . .	297
104. Monasticism . . . . .	298
105. Religion and Morals . . . . .	300
CHAPTER VI. LITERATURE AND EDUCATION . . . . .	303
106. Greek Literature . . . . .	303
107. Latin Literature . . . . .	304
108. Formation of the Clergy . . . . .	307

## II.—THE MIDDLE AGES

CHAPTER I. THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE . . . . .	309
109. The Quarrel about Investiture—Ninth General Council, 1123 . . . . .	309
110. The Schism of Anacletus—Tenth General Council, 1139—The Roman Republic . . . . .	317
111. The Schism of Barbarossa—Eleventh General Council, 1179—Thomas Becket and Henry II of England . . . . .	319
112. Innocent III—Twelfth General Council, 1215 . . . . .	325

CHAPTER I.— <i>continued.</i>	
113. The Papacy under the Last Members of the Staufen House—Thirteenth General Council, 1245 . . . . .	328
114. The Last Popes of the Thirteenth Century—Reunion with the Easterns—Fourteenth General Council, 1274 . . . . .	332
CHAPTER II. THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND CONFLICT WITH THE ISLAM . . . . .	
115. Conversion of North-Eastern Europe—Missions to the East . . . . .	336
116. The Crusades . . . . .	339
117. Conflict with the Islam in Europe . . . . .	348
CHAPTER III. SECTS AND HERESIES . . . . .	
118. Cathari and Albigenses . . . . .	350
119. The Waldensians . . . . .	352
120. Smaller Sects . . . . .	354
121. The Inquisition . . . . .	357
CHAPTER IV. THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	
122. The Roman See . . . . .	359
123. The College of Cardinals . . . . .	362
124. Cathedral Chapters and Episcopal Elections—Vicars General and Titular Bishops . . . . .	364
125. The Corpus Iuris Canonici . . . . .	365
126. Sacerdotal Celibacy . . . . .	366
127. Monasticism . . . . .	368
CHAPTER V. WORSHIP, MORALS, AND CHRISTIAN ART . . . . .	
128. Prayer and Worship . . . . .	379
129. Church Festivals . . . . .	382
130. Ethico-Religious Status of the Period . . . . .	384
131. Architecture: the Romanesque Style . . . . .	385
CHAPTER VI. CHURCH LITERATURE . . . . .	
132. Scholasticism and Mysticism—Realism and Nominalism . . . . .	388
133. The Universities . . . . .	389
134. The First of the Scholastics . . . . .	391
135. The Heyday of Scholasticism . . . . .	393
136. The Mystics . . . . .	395



## ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<i>A.</i>	<i>Archiv.</i>
<i>Abh.</i>	<i>Abhandlungen.</i>
<i>Abh.</i>	<i>Göttingen, Leipzig, München = Abhandlungen der kgl. Ges. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, der kgl. sächsischen Ges. d. W. zu Leipzig, der Akademie d. W. in München, hist. Kl.</i>
<i>Abp.</i>	<i>Archbishop.</i>
<i>An. Boll.</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana.</i>
<i>Antv.</i>	<i>Antwerp.</i>
<i>Acta SS.</i>	<i>Acta Sanctorum, ed. Bollandus.</i>
<i>A. T.</i>	<i>Altes Testament.</i>
<i>Aug. Vind.</i>	<i>Augsburg.</i>
<i>A. u. U.</i>	<i>Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen.</i>
<i>Bp.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>
<i>Bg.</i>	<i>Biography.</i>
<i>CG.</i>	<i>Konziliengeschichte.</i>
<i>Col.</i>	<i>Cologne.</i>
<i>c.</i>	<i>chapter, canon, circa.</i>
<i>d.</i>	<i>deutsch or German article.</i>
<i>Flor.</i>	<i>Florence.</i>
<i>f.</i>	<i>für.</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>Geschichte.</i>
<i>H.E.</i>	<i>Historia ecclesiastica.</i>
<i>H.F.</i>	<i>Hist. Franc.</i>
<i>H.</i>	<i>Historia or Haereses.</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historisch.</i>
<i>J.</i>	<i>Jahrbuch.</i>
<i>J. Th. St.</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies.</i>
<i>K.</i>	<i>Kirche, König, Kaiser, King.</i>
<i>k.</i>	<i>kirchlich katholisch.</i>
<i>Kath.</i>	<i>Katholik (published at Mainz).</i>
<i>KG.</i>	<i>Kirchengeschichte.</i>
<i>KL.</i>	<i>Kirchenlexikon by Wetzer and Welte, 2nd ed.</i>
<i>KR.</i>	<i>Kirchenrecht.</i>
<i>Lips.</i>	<i>Leipzig.</i>
<i>Lon.</i>	<i>London.</i>
<i>Ludg.</i>	<i>Lyons.</i>
<i>MA.</i>	<i>Mittelalter, Middle Ages.</i>
<i>Med.</i>	<i>Milan.</i>
<i>Mg.</i>	<i>Monography.</i>
<i>MG.</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae.</i>
<i>MICE.</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung.</i>
<i>Nachr.</i>	<i>Nachrichten.</i>
<i>N.A.</i>	<i>Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde</i>
<i>N.F.</i>	<i>New series.</i>
<i>N.T.</i>	<i>Neues Testament, New Testament.</i>

O.T.	Old Testament.
Par.	Paris.
P.G.	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> , ed. Migne, <i>series graeca</i> .
P.L.	Item. <i>series latina</i> .
P.	Pope, part.
R.	Royal.
RE. der chr. A.	= <i>Real-Encyclopädie der christlichen Altertümer</i> , ed. Kraus.
RE. f. pr. Th.	= <i>Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie</i> .
R. Qu.	<i>Römische Quartalschrift</i> .
RHE.	<i>Rev. d'histoire ecclésiastique</i> .
Rquh.	<i>Rev. des questions historiques</i> .
SB. Berlin, Wien, München	= <i>Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Wien, München, philos. hist. Kl.</i>
St. a. ML.	<i>Stimmen aus Maria-Laach</i> .
St. Bened.	<i>Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Cisterzienerorden</i> .
St. u. Kr.	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i> .
Th.	<i>Theologie</i> .
Th. Qu.	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i> .
T. u. U.	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i> , ed. O. v. Gebhardt and A. Harnack.
u.	und.
Ven.	Venice.
Vind.	Vienna.
W.	<i>Wissenschaft</i> .
W.G.	<i>Weltgeschichte</i> .
WW.	Werke.
Z.	<i>Zeitschrift</i> .

\* Works published, or in course of publication, in the *Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Eccl. Lat.*, or by the Prussian Academy of Sciences.

† Date of death.

‡ Acts published by Ruinart.

A MANUAL  
OF  
CHURCH HISTORY

INTRODUCTION <sup>1</sup>

§ 1

**The Meaning of Church History**

ON the Church, as a society instituted by our Redeemer for the salvation of the world, there devolved the duty of preaching to all nations the religion proclaimed by Christ. To accomplish this task she had to undergo a certain development in both space and time, a development which might appropriately be called the *outward* History of the Church. This history tells us how Christianity grew, was fostered here, and set back there; it tells us of her varying fortunes, of her persecutions, and of her ever-changing relations to the State; for the Church at her very inception encountered opposition, and was withstood by a notable portion of that world to which she brought her good news, whilst the nations and princes, even after their conversion, by no means continued to regard her with feelings of unalterable esteem.

But, like the grain of mustard seed, which was to become a great tree (*Matt.* xiii. 31), the Church has a deeper history. The tree does not merely spread its boughs over the earth; it is in itself a structure of mighty complexity, which, nevertheless, however different it may seem, remains fundamentally

<sup>1</sup> DE SMEDT, *Introductio generalis ad historiam eccl. critice tractandam*, 1876; *Principes de la critique historique*, 1883; NIRSCHL, *Propädeutik der KG.* 1888; MOELLER, *Traité des études historiques*, 1888; E. BERNHEIM, *Lehrbuch d. hist. Methode*, 4th ed. 1903; H. KIHN, *Enzyklopädie u. Methodologie d. Th.* 1892.

identical with the seed from which it sprang. So is it with the Church, who is at once the harbinger of a definite body of doctrine, and an institution with a well-defined constitution, worship, and discipline. Her Founder laid, indeed, the groundwork of all this whilst He tarried on earth, but the fuller construction was to be the work of time, and it is in the description of this gradual achievement that the true *inward* History of the Church consists. Though the Gospel is indeed God's Word, and as such is substantially unchangeable, this does not exclude a certain mutability in the Church. Thus by each succeeding heresy she was forced to give a clearer meaning to her teaching, that the truth might be disengaged from error. With the increase of her power and with the successive changes in the secular government, she was herself called upon to modify her organisation. Ecclesiastical functionaries called into being in one period, disappeared in the next, or changed circumstances rendered their duties more, or less, comprehensive. So was it also with worship and discipline, so likewise with philosophy, all of which cling so closely to doctrine. Institutions which suited the Church in her infancy were, later on, allowed to grow obsolete, or else were transformed, their substance alone remaining under a different shape. Bearing in mind the twofold movement which is characteristic of the life of the Church, we may therefore define her History as *the scientific exposition of the outward and inward development of the society established by Christ.*

The word 'Church' (German, *Kirche*) seems to have come from the Greek Κυριακόν (*scil.* οἰκεῖον), which was already in use at the beginning of the fourth century to denote the Church as the House of God. It is found among the Goths (*kureikô*), from whom it passed into all Germanic languages, and even into those of the Slavonic branch. The derivation of the word from the Celtic *cyrch*, *cylch*=a circle or place of assembly, or from yet other roots, has little to commend it; cp. KLUGE, *Wörterbuch d. deutschen Sprache*, 6th ed. 1898, p. 206; E. GLASER, *Woher kommt d. Wort 'Kirche'?* 1901. The equivalent expression in use among the Romance nations (*église, iglesia, chiesa*) is likewise derived from a Greek word (ἐκκλησία).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As Duchesne (*Hist. anc. de l'Église*, I, p. 52) points out, *ecclesia* is practically a synonym of *synagoga*. Trans.

## § 2

## Division of Church History

To obtain a clear view of the eventful history of the Church during the nineteen centuries of her existence, we must needs divide up its contents, combining like with like, and finally reuniting the different series thus formed, as constituent parts of a whole. Now, seeing that the Church is not only very ancient, but is also a highly complex organism, it follows that this division may be made equally well on the basis of the sequence of the events in time, or on that of their logical connection. The first method will result in chronological sections or periods.

The importance of these chronological sections varies according to the moment of the events comprised in each. It is customary to split Church History into three portions—into Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modern times—each section being subdivided into shorter periods. As to the limits of these divisions, historians do not agree; on the whole, it seems to us most reasonable to bring Antiquity to a close with the Sixth General Council, of which the Council *in Trullo* (692) was the natural complement. In this period, during which the Church's constitution received the form which it was to preserve, it is among the Greeks and Romans, who were also the first to assimilate the Gospel, that we find the principal confessors of the Faith. The Middle Ages, during which the neo-Latin and Germanic nations play the greatest part, extends to the time of the Great Schism of the West. Among its outstanding features may be mentioned the schism between East and West, and the political supremacy of the Popes. Modern times, which have witnessed the dissolution of Western Christendom into a plurality of sects, and the gradual restriction of the political power of the Papacy, comprise the Church's history from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the present day. As to the subdivision of these periods, both Antiquity and Modern times fall naturally into two portions, the former being halved by the Edict of Milan (313), whilst the latter is divided into unequal parts by the French Revolution (1789). Lastly, the Middle Ages form three sub-periods, the first ending

with the death of Alexander II (1073), the second beginning with Gregory VII and ending with Celestine V (1294), and the third beginning with the pontificate of Boniface VIII and closing with the end of the Great Schism of the West.

In special sections or chapters, which we shall devote to considering the materials bearing on particular points within each period, we shall discuss the different aspects of ecclesiastical life, the spread of the Gospel, the Church's constitution, &c.

It is customary, especially in bulkier works, to call the first century the Apostolic Period, and to deal with it apart. Some bring Antiquity to a close with the death of Gregory the Great in 604 (Kraus), others prolong it until the year 800, when the Empire of the West was re-established (Hase). There is the utmost divergence of opinion as to the limits of the mediæval periods. By many the first modern period is halved by the year of the Peace of Westphalia. One author (Kraus) proposed to consider the fall of Constantinople (1453) as marking the commencement of Modern times.

### § 3

#### The Sources of Church History

The sources of Church History are those writings which give us information concerning the Christian past. Of these, some are *original*—written documents, giving narratives of eye-witnesses, or contemporary accounts written on hearsay, inscriptions, monuments, and other like testimonies dating from the time when the events in question occurred. Others are *derivative*; such are ancient accounts based on documents, now altogether or partially lost. Some sources are *official*, emanating from public men writing in that quality; others are *private*, given by private individuals, or by public men in their private capacity. Of all the kinds of sources, the official, being by their nature original, are to be deemed the weightiest. So far as Church History is concerned, the documents which have the first claim to consideration are *Conciliar Acts* and Decrees; *Papal enactments*, Bulls and Briefs; *Episcopal Charges* and Pastoral Letters; *Civil laws* dealing with the Church, compromises and *Concordats* made between Church and State; likewise *Liturgies* and other documents

dealing with Divine Worship, *Confessions of Faith*, and *Rules of Religious Orders*, as well as some of the more trustworthy of the *Acts of the Martyrs* and *Lives of the Saints*. But even all these would not suffice, and they must consequently be supplemented by a judicious use of private sources,—in the first instance of those which are original; in their default, of derivative accounts.

Documents of this description have, in order to facilitate reference and research, been collected, and the same has been done for the ecclesiastical literature, both of ancient and mediæval times. A third category of collections comprises the sources of the History of the Church in particular regions.

The most noteworthy collections are the following:—

I. **Inscriptions and Monuments.**—DE ROSSI, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae, septimo saeculo antiquiores*, I-II, 1857-88. LE BLANT, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, 3 vol. 1856-92. HÜBNER, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae*, 1871, *Supplementum* 1900; *Inscr. Britanniae Christ.* 1876. F. X. KRAUS, *Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande*, 2 vol. 1890-94. F. PIPER, *Einleitung in die monumentale Theologie*, 1867.

II. **Conciliar Decrees.**—LABBE and COSSART, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, 17 fol. Par. 1674; ed. COLETTI, 23 fol. Ven. 1728-34; *Suppl.* 6 fol. (down to 1720) ed. MANSI, Luccae, 1748-52. J. HARDUIN, *Acta conciliorum et epistolae decretales ac constitutiones summorum pontificum, ab an. Christi 34 usque ad an. 1714*, II fol. Par. 1715. J. D. MANSI, *Sacr. concil. nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 fol. (down to 1439) Flor. et Ven. 1759-98; Par. 1901 ff. (cp. QUENTIN, *J. D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires*, 1900); *Collectio Lacensis, Acta et decreta S. conciliorum recentiorum*, 7 vol. 1870-90. J. B. MARTIN et L. PETIT, *Collectio conciliorum recentiorum ecclesiae universae*, I (1723-35), 1905. SIRMOND-LA LANDE, *Concilia antiqua Galliae*, 4 fol. 1629-66. ODESPUN, *Concilia novissima Galliae*, 1646. AGUIRRE, *Collectio max. conciliorum Hispaniae*, 4 fol. 1693. WILKINS, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, 4 fol. 1734. HADDAN-STUBBS, *Councils and Eccl. Documents rel. to Great Britain*, I-III, 1869-78. HARTZHEIM, *Concilia Germaniae*, II fol. 1749-90. C. J. v. HEFELE, *Konzilien-geschichte*, 7 vol. 1855-71, vol. I-VI, second ed. (vol. V-VI by KNÖPFLER) 1873-90. Vol. VIII-IX by HERGENRÖTHER, 1887-90. [English Trans. *A History of the Christian Councils* by CLARK and OXENHAM, 5 vol. Edinb. 1871-96.]

III. **Papal Documents.**—*Bullarium Romanum*, several editions, none of which is either complete or trustworthy; the least unsatisfactory is that of COQUELINES, 19 fol. Rom. 1739-44 (down

to 1740, or even down to Pius VIII, if we reckon its continuation, 15 vol. 4to, Prato, 1843 ff.). The Turin edition is a reprint of Coquelines' with a short appendix added (23 vol. 4to, 1857-72). *Pontif. Rom. a S. Clemente I usque ad S. Leonem M. epistolae genuinae*, ed. COUSTANT, 1721 (SCHOENEMANN, 1796); *a S. Hilario usque ad S. Hormisdam*, ed. A. THIEL, 1868. *Regesta pontif. Rom. ab condita ecclesia ad an. 1198*, ed. JAFFÉ, 1851; ed. 2a cur. LOEWENFELD, KALTENBRUNNER, EWALD, 1885-88; *inde ab an. 1198 ad an. 1304*, ed. A. POTTHAST, 1874-75. *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. RICHTER, 1833; FRIEDBERG, 1879-81. K. MIRBT, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, 2nd ed. 1901. A. GALANTE, *Fontes iuris canonici selecti*, 1906. The Registers of several Pontiffs of the latter portion of the Middle Ages have been recently published, or are now in course of publication. Such are those of Honorius III-IV, Gregory IX-X, John XXI, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Urban IV, Clement IV-V, Nicholas III-IV, Martin IV, Boniface VIII, Benedict XI, Leo X.

IV. **Civil Laws and Concordats.**—*Codex Theodosianus cum perpet. commentariis Jac. Gothofredi*, ed. I. D. RITTER, 6 fol. Lips. 1739-43, ed. HAENAL, 1842. *Corpus iuris civilis*, ed. DION GOTHOFREDUS, 6 fol. Lugd. 1589; ed. MOMMSEN and KRÜGER, 2 vol. 1877. *Monumenta Germaniae histor.*, ed. PERTZ, *Leges*, I-V, 1835-89. E. v. MÜNCH, *Vollständige Sammlung aller älteren u. neueren Konkordate*, 2 vol. 1830-31. WALTER, *Fontes iuris eccl. antiqui et hodierni*, 1862. NUSSI, *Conventiones*, 1870.

V. **Liturgies.**—E. RENAUDOT, *Liturg. orient. coll.* 2 vol. Par. 1716. MURATORI, *Liturgia Rom. vetus*, 2 vol. Ven. 1748. I. A. ASSEMANI, *Codex liturgicus eccles. univ.* 13 vol. Rom. 1749. DANIEL, *Codex liturgicus eccl. univ.* 4 vol. Lips. 1847-53. DENZINGER, *Ritus orientalium*, 2 vol. 1863-64. SWAINSON, *The Greek Liturgies*, 1884. BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I, 1896. F. CABROL and H. LECLERCQ, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, I, 1902. F. CABROL, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 1903 ff.

VI. **Confessions of Faith.**—H. DENZINGER, *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum quae de rebus fidei et morum a conciliis œcum. et summis pontificibus emanarunt*, 1854; ed. 9a cur. STAHL, 1905; 10a ed. BANNWART, 1908. A. HAHN, *Bibliothek der Symbole u. Glaubensregeln d. alten K.* 1842; 3rd ed. (L. HAHN) 1897. P. SCHAFF, *Bibliotheca symbolica eccl. universalis: The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, 3 vol. 4th ed. 1884. J. MICHALCESCU, *Die Bekenntnisse u. d. wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griechisch-orient. K.* 1904.

VII. **Rules of Religious Orders.**—LUC. HOLSTENIUS, *Codex regularum monast. et canon.* 4 fol. Rom. 1661; auctus a MAR. BROCKIE, 6 fol. Aug. Vind. 1759.

VIII. **Acts of the Martyrs and Lives of the Saints.**—SURIUS, *De probatis SS. vitis*, 6 fol. Col. 1570-75, and often since. T.

RUINART, *Acta primorum martyrum*, Par. 1689; ed. GALURA, 3 vol. Aug. Vind. 1802; ed. Ratisbon, 1859. BOLLANDUS, &c., *Acta Sanctorum*, Antv. 1643 ff.; the saints being dealt with in the order in which they stand in the Roman calendar; the last vol. (LXIII), so far published, appeared in 1894, and carries the work to Nov. 4th. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1882 ff. MABILLON, *Acta SS. O. Bened.* 9 fol. (500-1100) 1668-1701.

**IX. Collected Works of the Fathers.**—*Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*, &c. 27 fol. Lugd. 1677-1707. This collection extends down to the sixteenth century, but it is incomplete so far as the writers from the thirteenth century downwards are concerned; another defect is that it gives the Greek works only in a Latin translation.

*Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*, &c., ed. GALLANDI, 14 fol. Ven. 1765-81, reaching to 1200.

*Patrologiae cursus completus*, ed. MIGNE, *Patr. latina*, 221 tom. *usque ad Innocentium III*, Par. 1844-55; *Patr. graeca*, 162 tom. *usque ad saec. XV*, 1857-66. HOROY continued the Latin series under the title *Medii Aevi Bibliotheca patristica*, but only succeeded in publishing five vol. (1879-83).

*Corpus scriptorum ecl. lat.*, Vindob. 1866 ff. In this Manual an asterisk (\*) will be put against the names of those Fathers whose works have been or are being published in this series. The Greek Christian writers of the first three centuries who have had their works edited by the Patristic Commission of the R. Prussian Academy of Sciences (1897 ff.) will likewise be indicated by an asterisk.

**X. Local Histories.**—*Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. L. MURATORI, 25 fol. Med., 1723-51; *Suppl.* 3 fol. new ed. 1900 ff.

*Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum scriptores*, in the French, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. BOUQUET, &c., 23 fol. Par. 1738-1876; 19 fol. 1869-80, new series, 1899 ff.

*Monumenta Germaniae historica*, ed. G. H. PERTZ, &c. Amongst other divisions this work comprises: *Scriptores*, 30 fol. 1826 ff., continued in 4to 1903 ff.; *Auctores antiquissimi*, 14 tom. 1878-1905; *Scriptores rerum Merovingiarum* I-IV, 1884 ff.; *Leges*, 5 fol. 1835-89; *Leg. IV*, sectio I-V, 1892 ff.; *Diplomata regum et imper.* I-III, 1879 ff.; *Concilia* I-II, 1893 ff. We must also mention: *Archiv d. Gesellschaft f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 12 vol. 1820-74; *Neues Archiv. d. G. f. ä. d. G.* 1876 ff.; *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 26 vol. 1862-86.

*Fontes rerum Austriacarum: Scriptores* 8 vol. 1855-75. *Diplomataria et acta*, I-VII, 1849-1904. *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, 1848 ff.

*Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores*, Lond. 1858-93, ninety-eight different works, some in several vol.

*Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*, ed. NIEBUHR, &c. 50 vol. Bonn, 1829-97.

For the purpose of ascertaining the sources, the following will

be found useful: A. POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca hist. med. aevi*, 1867-68; ed. 2a 1896. W. WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im M.A. bis zur Mitte des 13 Jahrh.* 1858; 7th ed. 2 vol. ed. E. DÜMMLER and HOLDER-EGGER, 1904 ff. O. LORENZ, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im M.A. von der Mitte des 13 Jahrh. bis zum Ende des 14 Jahrh.* 1870; 3rd ed. 2 vol. 1886-87. F. C. DAHLMANN, *Quellenkunde der d. Gesch.* 7th ed. cur. STEINDORFF, 1905-6. U. CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen-âge*; *Bio-Bibliographie*, 1877-86; *Suppl.* 1888, 2nd ed. I, 1905; *Topo-Bibliographie*, 1894-1903. A. MOLINIER, *Les sources de l'histoire de France jusqu'en 1789*, I-V, 1901-5. C. CROSS, *The Sources and Literature of English History to about 1485*, 1900.

#### § 4

### Sciences Auxiliary to Church History

The sources of Church History furnish us with our materials, the auxiliary sciences enable us to understand aright the sources.

**I. Diplomatics** enables us to test the value of ancient documents.

MABILLON, *De re diplomatica*, Par. 1681; 2nd ed. 1709. (TOUSTAIN et TASSIN) *Nouveau traité de diplomatique*, 6 vol. Par. 1750-65. SCHÖNEMANN, *Vollst. System der allg. Dipl.* 1818. H. BRESSLAU, *Hdb. d. Urkundenlehre f. Deutschland u. Italien*, I. 1888. GIRY, *Manuel de diplomatique*, 1894. WATTENBACH, *Das Schriftwesen im M.A.*; 3rd ed. 1896.

**II. Palaeography** tells us how to read old MSS. and how to determine their date.

B. MONTFAUCON, *Palaeographia Graeca*, 1708. ZANGEMEISTER et WATTENBACH, *Exempla cod. lat. litt. maiusc. script.* 1876. WATTENBACH et VELSEN, *Exempla cod. graec. litt. min. script.* 1878. GARDTHAUSEN, *Griech. P.* 1879. THOMPSON, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeogr.* 1893. REUSENS, *Éléments de Pal.* 1898. CAPELLI, *Lexicon Abbreviaturarum*, 1901. CHROUST, *Monumenta Palaeographica*, 1900 ff.

**III. Epigraphics** aids us to understand and interpret inscriptions.

J. B. DE ROSSI, *Inscript. Christ.* t. 1. pp. xli-cxxiii. R. CAGNAT, *Cours d'épigraphie lat.*; 3rd ed. 1898. S. RICCI, *Epigrafia latina*, 1898.

**IV. Numismatics** deals with coins and medals, and informs us of their bearing on history.

ECKHEL, *Doctrina nummorum veterum*, 8 vol. 1792-99. BLANCHET, *Numismatique du moyen-âge et moderne*, 3 vol. 1890.

V. **Philology** furnishes the key for understanding old texts, in that it explains the language in which they are written.

DU FRESNE (DU CANGE), *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*, Par. 1678. This work has been frequently reissued with additions, for instance by HENSCHEL, 7 vol. 1840-50; by FAVRE, 10 vol. 1882-87; *Gloss. ad script. med. et infimae graecitatis*, 2 fol. Lugd. 1688; I. C. SUICER, *Thesaurus eccl. e patr. graecis*, 2 fol. Amst. 1682; 2nd ed. 1728.

VI. **Geography** affords information concerning the theatre of the events narrated by history.

NEHER, *Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, 3 vol. 1864-68. SPRUNER-MENKE, *Handatlas f. d. Gesch. d. MA. u. d. neueren Zeit*, 1880; ed. SIEGLIN, 1893 ff. O. WERNER, *Kath. Missionsatlas*, 2nd ed. 1885; *Kath. Kirchenatlas*, 1888. DROYSEN, *Allg. hist. Handatlas*, 1886. HEUSSI and MULERT, *Atlas zur KG*. 1905.

VII. **Chronology** helps us to learn the different fashions in which facts are dated in the sources, and the various reckonings adopted in different countries.

SCALIGER, *De emendatione temporum*, 1583. PETAVIUS, *Opus de doctrina temporum*, 1627; *L'art de vérifier les dates, &c.*, 5 vol. Par. 1750, 1818-44. L. IDELER, *Hdb. d. math. u. techn. Chronologie*, 2 vol. 1825-26; *Lehrb.* 1831. GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters u. d. Neuzeit*, 2 vol. 1891-98. BRINCKMEIER, *Hdb. d. hist. Chr.* 2nd ed. 1882. MAS LATRIE, *Trésor de chronol. et d'hist. et de géogr. pour l'étude et l'emploi des documents du moyen-âge*, 1889. RÜHL, *Chronologie des MA. u. d. Neuzeit*, 1897. LERSCH, *Einleitung in d. Chron.* 2nd ed. 1899.

The best known methods of **reckoning time** are:—

(a) The reckoning from the year of the **building of Rome**, *Anno Urbis Conditae*, A.U.C. (753 B.C.), or by the Roman consulate and post-consulate years. A list of the Roman Consuls will be found in Brinckmeier, pp. 380-409; Schram in his *Hilfstabellen* (1883) gives the same, but in alphabetical order.

(b) The **Era of the Seleucidae**, which began with the battle of Gaza (312, or 311, B.C.), and is still in use for ecclesiastical purposes among the Christians of Syria.

(c) The **Spanish Era**, beginning 38 B.C., which was used in the Iberian Peninsula until the fourteenth century.

(d) The **Aera Diocletiana**, or **Era of the Martyrs**, commencing with the beginning of Diocletian's reign, August 29, 284.

(e) The **Cyclus Indictionum**, a recurring cycle of fifteen years, in use from the time of Constantine down to the sixteenth century.

(f) The **Armenian Era**, which begins on July 11, 552 A.D.

(g) The **World Era**, calculated from the time of Creation, in use in several forms. For instance, the Byzantines considered Creation to have taken place 5509 B.C.; their reckoning was used by the Russians until the time of Peter the Great (1700), and by the Greeks, Serbs, and Rumanians until the nineteenth century.

The Alexandrians differed, dating Creation in 5492, whilst the Jews placed it yet later, viz. 3761 B.C.

(h) The **Christian Era** begins with the birth of Christ. It was introduced by Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, for which reason it is sometimes called the Dionysian Era. It gradually ousted all other eras in the West. According to this reckoning, Christ was born in the year 753 A.U.C., and the year 754 is thus the first year of the Christian Era. But as Christ was born in Herod's reign, and as that monarch died at Easter, 750 A.U.C., we must set back the date of our Saviour's birth, probably to 749.

Not only were different eras in vogue in former times, there was even a divergency of view as to when the **Year** should begin. According to the localities the year commenced either on January 1, or on March 1 (Russia), or on September 1 (Constantinople), or at Christmas, or at Easter, or on Lady-Day, and in the latter case, some took the feast previous (*Calculus Pisanus*), others that subsequent (*Calculus Florentinus*), to January 1.

It was only in the sixteenth century that January 1 came to be generally adopted as the beginning of the year.

Finally, with regard to the length of the year; until the sixteenth century, the calendar of Julius Cæsar was everywhere used. But the Julian year exceeded the true solar year by 11' 12". Hence, in 1582, Gregory XIII readjusted the calendar, by striking out ten days from that year and enacting that October 5 should be reckoned as the 15th. To provide against a recurrence of the same error, he also ordained the suppression, in every four hundred years, of three leap-years. The Gregorian calendar was adopted by the Protestants only in the eighteenth century, whilst the Greeks and Russians still retain, even now, the Julian calendar, the 'Old-style' (O.S.), as it is called, to distinguish it from the Gregorian, or 'New-style' (N.S.).

## § 5

### The Literature of Church History<sup>1</sup>

I. In the last quarter of the second century, under P. Eleutherus, **Hegesippus** either wrote or published a book of memorable events (*Ἱστορικὰ*), but this work, of which a few fragments remain,<sup>2</sup> can only have been a collection of

<sup>1</sup> F. OVERBECK, *Über die Anfänge der Kirchengeschichtschreibung*, 1892; STANG, *Historiographia eccl.* 1897; for the Bibliography of the question, see A. POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca*, and CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, as above, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> They will be found in GRABE, *Spicilegium*, 1700, II, 203-214; ROUTH, *Reliquiæ sacrae*, ed. 2a, 1846-48, t. I; P. G. t. V; Z. f. wiss. Th. 1876, pp. 177-229; ZAHN, *Forschungen*, VI (1900), pp. 228-49.

memorable local traditions. The real father of Church History was **Eusebius**, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. Not only did he compile a *Chronicle*,<sup>1</sup> which has been preserved in an Armenian version and in the Latin translation of Jerome—though the latter confines itself to the second book, which it supplements by carrying it down to 378—he also composed a regular Church History<sup>2</sup> in ten books, dealing with the whole period down to 324. This History, on account of the documents which it quotes, and the plentiful extracts it gives from lost works, is of priceless worth. In the fifth century the undertaking was pursued further by two lawyers of Constantinople, **Sozomen** (to A.D. 423) and **Socrates** (to A.D. 439),<sup>3</sup> and also by **Theodoret** of Cyrus in Syria (to A.D. 428).

The work of these writers was proceeded with and brought down to the end of the sixth century by another lawyer, **Evagrius** of Antioch. Before this, the Constantinopolitan Lector Theodore had already continued the history to the times of the emperor Justin I, in the form of an abstract from the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; unfortunately the work of Theodore—apart from two books of the *Historia tripartita*, which have not yet been printed, and some other fragments—has been lost. A like misfortune overtook the Church History of Philip Sidetes, which in thirty-six books described the story of the world from the beginning to the writer's own time (440), and that of the Eunomian **Philostorgius**, which dealt with the period 300–423. Of the last, however, a considerable part has been preserved in the abstract made by **Photius**. The writings of these different worthies were published by Robert Stephen (1544) and by H. Valesius (3 fol. 1659–73).<sup>4</sup>

The Latin Church counts two ancient historians. **Rufinus**

<sup>1</sup> The most recent edition of the Chronicle is that of SCHÖNE, 2 vol. 1866–1875. See also A. SCHÖNE, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius*, 1900, in which it is shown that Eusebius prepared two recensions of his work.

<sup>2</sup> Recent editions are those of LÄMMER, 1862; HEINICHEN, 1868–70; E. SCHWARTZ, 1903 ff. (Engl. Trans. 1890 ff.). The fourth-century Syriac translation has been edited by BEDJAN, 1897, and by WRIGHT and McLEAN, 1898; the Armenian translation was published at Venice, 1877.

<sup>3</sup> English Trans. Sozomen and Socrates: 1890.

<sup>4</sup> *Theodoreti H. E.* ed. GAISFORD, 1854 (Engl. Trans. 1892); *Evagrii H. E.* ed. BIDEZ et PARMENTIER, 1899 (Engl. Trans. of Philostorgius and Evagrius: Bohn, 1851 ff.).

translated Eusebius's Church History,<sup>1</sup> and, by the addition of two more books, carried it seventy years further. **Sulpicius Severus** compiled two books of Chronicles, reaching from the beginning of the world to the end of the fourth century (Engl. Trans. 1895). To these ancient Latin historians we must add the later writer **Cassiodorus**, who, in his *Historia tripartita*, gives a series of excerpts from the works of the three followers of Eusebius—Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret—and carries the work of Rufinus still further.

II. In the Middle Ages very few works dealing with universal Church History saw the light, the older histories being esteemed sufficient. Among the Greeks we find only one important and representative ecclesiastical historian, namely, **Nicephorus Callisti** († 1341), whose work brings us down to the year 610. In the West, **Haymo of Halberstadt** († 853) compiled a *Breviarium Historiae eccl.*, dealing with the first four centuries, but almost all his material is drawn from Rufinus. Among others who brought the history down to their own times must be mentioned the Roman Librarian, **Anastasius** († 886, *Historia eccl.*, also called *Chronographia tripartita*, because it was composed of extracts from the three Byzantine historians, Nicephorus, George Syncellus, and Theophanes); **Orderic Vitalis**, abbot of St. Evroult in Normandy († c. 1142, *Hist. eccl.*); the Dominican Bartholomæus (better known as **Tolomeo**) of Lucca († 1327, *Hist. eccl.*); and the archbishop **Antoninus** of Florence († 1459, *Summa historialis*, beginning with the Creation). In most of the historical works of this period we find merely the history of particular Churches, and, as a rule, even this is largely intermingled with the history of concomitant political events.

III. A great change in the manner of writing Church History is noticeable when we reach the end of the fifteenth century. With the new birth of science, historical criticism, which in the Middle Ages had almost been swamped, again made its appearance, and, in consequence of the Reformation, soon assumed a position of importance. It is true that during the ensuing period confessional and party preoccupations often led to history being falsified, but in spite of all the mistakes

<sup>1</sup> His translation has been edited by MOMMSEN, 1903 ff., in conjunction with SCHWARTZ's edition of Eusebius.

then made, the net result was that many historical truths came to light, and as, with the lapse of time, religious prejudice began to dwindle, historical science was able to make great strides.

The earliest work belonging to this time is the *Ecclesiastica historia congesta per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica* (13 fol. Basil. 1559-74), a work covering thirteen centuries, one folio being devoted to each, and composed by a learned society of the city of Magdeburg, headed by the Illyrian M. Flacius. The work is now usually known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*. The manifest animus of the Centuriators against the Catholic Church soon called forth a number of refutations. Of these, the most important by far was the *Annales ecclesiastici* of the Oratorian Cardinal, **Cæsar Baronius**, which is valuable mainly for the mine of precious documents which it contains (12 fol. Rom. 1588-1607). The original work extended to 1198. It was frequently reprinted, and was soon taken in hand by other workers, who continued it to the sixteenth and seventeenth century; for instance by Spondanus, bishop of Pamiers (2 fol. 1647, down to 1646), by the Dominican Bzovius (9 fol. 1629-72, down to 1572), but best of all by Baronius's own associates, the Oratorians Raynald (9 fol. 1646-77, down to 1565), Laderchi (3 fol. 1728-38, down to 1571), and Aug. Theiner (3 fol. 1856, down to 1585). A critique, partly correcting, partly supplementing the work of Baronius, was composed by the French Franciscans (Antoine and François) Pagi (4 fol. 1689-1705). This work was incorporated in the edition of Baronius and Raynald, brought out by Mansi (38 fol. Lucc. 1738-59).

The energy manifested in the historical field during the sixteenth century was followed by a period of comparative idleness, during which it was thought sufficient to popularise the works of the Centuriators and of Baronius, by republishing them in a more compendious form. It is in France, where, towards the end of the seventeenth century, science took a new lease of life, that we next meet with original work of importance. **Natalis Alexander** produced a *Historia ecclesiastica* dealing with sixteen centuries of the Church's life, which was remarkable for its critical acumen, and was supplemented by special dissertations on all the more debatable points (26 vol.

1676-88). This great work has been often reprinted, and in Roncaglia's edition (9 fol. Lucc. 1743) was provided with notes to counteract the Gallican tendencies of its author. **Tillemont** wrote his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, a Church History in the shape of a series of monographs (16 vol. 1693-1712), dealing with events prior to 513, which is to some extent also supplemented by the same author's *Histoire des empereurs* (6 vol. 1690 ff.). Another important work is the *Histoire ecclésiastique* of **Fleury** (20 vol. 1691-1720, down to 1414; continued by Claude Fabre in 16 vols., down to 1595, and in the Latin translation, down to 1768 [Engl. Trans. by **NEWMAN** and **KAY**, 3 vol. A.D. 381-456, Oxf. 1842 ff.]). Nor must we forget to mention the *Histoire de l'église* of **BÉRAULT-BERCASTEL** (24 vol. 1778-90, down to 1721, and continued by others). At about the same time, in Italy, the Dominican Cardinal Orsi acquired a certain fame by his *Storia ecclesiastica* (20 vol. 1746-61), a history of the first six centuries of the Christian era; his work was continued down to 1378 by his religious associate **Becchetti** (17 vol. 1770 ff.), who also added to the original his own *Istoria degli ultimi quattro secoli della chiesa* (9 vol. 1788 ff.), bringing the history down to the Council of Trent.

In the seventeenth century the Reformed Churches of Switzerland and the Netherlands produced a few works of note. **I. Casaubon** published a detailed criticism of **Baronius's** *Annals* (1615); somewhat later, **J. H. Hottinger** wrote an extensive *Historia eccl. N.T.* (9 vol. 1651-67); he was followed by **Fr. Spanheim**, with his *Summa hist. eccl.* (1689); by **Basnage**, with his *Histoire de l'église* (2 vol. 1699), and **S. Spanheim**, with the *Annales politico-eccl. annorum 645 a Caesare Augusto ad Phocam usque* (3 fol. 1706).

Considerable commotion was caused in Protestant Germany by the publication of **G. Arnold's** *Impartial History of the Churches and Heretics* (1699), in which orthodox Lutheranism was sharply taken to task. For works of a more permanent value we have to wait till the second half of the eighteenth century, when we find **Mosheim's** *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae* (1755); this was translated into German, and proceeded with, by **J. A. C. von Einem** (7 vol. 1769-78), and by **Schlegel-Fraas** (7 vol. 1770-96 [Engl. Trans. by **MURDOCK**,

*Institutes of Eccl. Hist.*, Boston, 1892]), and J. M. Schröckh's comprehensive Church History in 45 volumes (1788-1812). To the nineteenth century there belongs the *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, of A. NEANDER (5 vol. 1825-45, down to 1294; in later editions down to 1431 [Engl. Trans., Edinburgh, 9 vols. 2nd ed. 1851]), the Church Histories of J. K. L. Gieseler, which abounds in extracts from original sources (5 vol. 1823-55), and of F. Chr. Baur, the head of the critical school of Tübingen (5 vol. 1853-63, Engl. Trans. 1873 ff.); F. Böhringer's *Church of Christ and its Witnesses, or a Church History in Biographies* (2 vol. 1842-58; 12 vol. 2nd ed. 1873-79); and the Manuals of K. Hase (1834; 11th ed. 1886, Engl. Trans. New York, 1855), of J. H. Kurtz (1849; 13th ed. by Bonwetsch and Tschakert, 1890, Engl. Trans. 3 vols. 1886), of J. J. Herzog (3 vol. 1876-82; 2nd ed. by Koffmane, 2 vol. 1890-92), of Zöckler (3rd ed. 1889), of Möller-Kawerau (I-III, 1889-94; Engl. Trans. 3 vol. 1892-1900), and of K. Müller (I-II, 1892-1902).

The closing years of the eighteenth century witnessed the advent of a number of German workers in the Catholic field. As, however, their work was more or less superficial, and lacked that quality of stability which only research can give, it had no lasting influence. F. L. zu Stolberg was the first to give an impulse to critical studies by his *History of the Religion of Jesus Christ*, a work reaching to 430 (15 vol. 1806-18), which, after the author's death, was continued by F. von Kerz (30 vol. 1825-48), and afterwards by J. N. Brischar (8 vol. 1850-64, down to 1245). The good example thus set was soon followed by Th. Katerkamp, though he, too, was obliged to leave his work unfinished (5 vol. 1819-34, down to 1253). Among the best-known manuals we may allude to those of Hortig (2 vol. 1826-28), J. J. Ritter (3 vol. 1826-35, 6th ed. by Ennen, 2 vol. 1862), J. Alzog (1840; 10th ed. by Kraus, 2 vol. 1882 [Engl. Trans. *Man. of Univ. Church History*, Dublin, 4 vol. 2nd ed. 1885]), J. A. Möhler (3 vol. 1867-68; ed. by Gams), J. Hergenröther (3 vol. 1876; 4th ed. by J. P. Kirsch, 1902 ff.), J. J. Döllinger (2 vol. 2nd ed. 1843, down to 1517 [Engl. Trans. by Cox, 1840 ff.]), H. Brück (1874; 5th ed. by J. Schmitt, 1906 [Engl. Trans. *Hist. of the Cath. Church*, 2 vol. New York, 1884]), F. X. Kraus (1875; 4th ed. 1896), A

Knöpfler (1895; 4th ed. 1906), J. Marx (1903; 3rd ed. 1906). This is also the place to mention B. **Jungmann's** *Dissertationes selectae in historiam ecclesiasticam* (7 vol. 1880-87).

In France **Rohrbacher** composed a bulky *Histoire universelle de l'église catholique* (29 vol. 1842-49), a work which was translated into German, and partially recast by Hülskamp, Rump, and others. A more pretentious work is the *Histoire de l'église* of Darras, continued by Bareille and Fèvre (44 vol. 1861-88); compared with the excellent work done by France in the past, this last History marks a notable retrogression. As we write, **Duchesne** is engaged in publishing his *Histoire ancienne de l'église* (I, 1906 [Engl. Trans. *Early History of the Christian Church*, 1909]; II, 1907). Of late the Eastern Church has also contributed two Histories, the *Ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστικὴ* of Diomedes Kyriakos (3 vol. 1898, down to 1872), and that of Philaretos Bapheides (2 vol. 1884-86, down to 1453).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller list of modern Greek historians, see ΚΥΡΙΑΚΟΣ *Ἱστ. ἐκκλ.* Vol. I, p. 20. Trans.

# I. CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY

## FIRST PERIOD

FROM THE INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH TO THE EDICT OF MILAN

### CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH—HER DEVELOPMENT  
AND PERSECUTIONS

#### § 6

#### The Preparation of the Olden World for the Coming of the Redeemer<sup>1</sup>

CHRISTIANITY did not come into the world unexpectedly. Christ, according to the words of Holy Writ (*Gal.* iv. 4; *Eph.* i. 10), came in the fulness of time, *i.e.* when mankind had, by God's Providence, been disposed for the advent of its Saviour. God's judgments being incomprehensible and His ways unsearchable (*Rom.* xi. 33), the working of His Providence must remain, to some extent, shrouded in darkness, albeit that it does not altogether escape the notice of an attentive observer, for, in truth, God reveals Himself in history not less than in Creation.

By manifold inducements, by the mission of the Prophets, by various visitations and trials, the chosen nation of the Hebrews was confirmed in its belief in God and reclaimed from the evil ways into which the example of the surrounding heathen occasionally led it. When at length the appointed time for the arrival of the Redeemer drew nigh, there came, in the person of John the Baptist, that last and greatest of the

<sup>1</sup> DÖLLINGER, *Heidentum u. Judentum. Vorhalle zur Gesch. des Christentums*, 1857 (Engl. Trans. *Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ*, 1862); E. SCHÜRER, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes z. Zeit J. Chr.* 3rd ed. 1898-1901 (Engl. Trans. *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 5 vol. 1891), W. BOUSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums im neuzeit. Zeitalter*, 1903.

Prophets, who was to make straight the way of the Messiah. This long preparation was not in vain. With the lapse of time, the expectation of the Messiah grew keener and more definite, and though it included much which was of a merely political character—the nation's hope being set on the restoration of its independence, and on its liberation from the Roman yoke, under which it had been groaning since 37 B.C.—nevertheless it still had for its object the long-promised Saviour.

The Jewish people had already long ago been scattered far beyond its national frontiers. The Assyrian and Babylonian captivities had begun this dispersal, and, little by little, the Jew had invaded nearly the whole known world. Some of the Jews of the Dispersion, like Philo of Alexandria († c. 60), felt, indeed, the influence of the surroundings amidst which they lived, and did not hesitate to supplement Revealed doctrine by adding to it new elements derived from elsewhere, especially from the then prevalent Platonic philosophy. But it is not less true that the heathen world, too, felt the presence of the Jews in its midst, and that many of the best pagan minds were drawn to them. Owing to the scorn in which the Hebrews were generally held, very few pagans dared to become complete converts by submitting to be circumcised; but many were brought at least to esteem the worship of Jahve, to believe in God, and to observe some of the Jewish commandments. Pagans such as these are, in the New Testament, called *σεβόμενοι* or *φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν*, and among them Christian missionaries were to find a rich field, for whilst the Gospel brought to them what they desired, it also dispensed them from those very laws to which they took exception.

Besides its changed attitude towards Judaism, the heathen world had another reason to hail the advent of Christianity. Its religion, which, so long as it retained its force and vitality, was able in some measure, and through the elements of truth which it contained, to still the cravings of the human heart, had been perceived to be wanting, and had already lost all its credit among the better minds. Philosophy might, indeed, have taken the place of religion, though at its best it could only have done so among the cultured classes, but philosophy, too, was in a state of bankruptcy. The ideas of Plato († 348 B.C.) and Aristotle († 322), the two great leaders of philosophic thought,

were still upheld by some ; but the adherents of Epicure († 271) and Zeno († 260)—of whom the former had placed man's highest good in pleasure, whilst the latter, the founder of the Stoics, had taught that the world was subject to the blind and unalterable rule of destiny—were by far the more numerous. Many others, owing allegiance to the Sceptics, professed to have abandoned all hope of ever attaining to the truth. Finally, the political and civic life of the ancient world, which formerly had held so large a place in the minds of its citizens, was now on the wane. The charming Greek Republics with their fervent patriots had disappeared. The Roman Empire itself had come to the end of its career of conquest. There was nothing left to attract men's hearts. They were now disengaged, and truth could enter freely, sure beforehand of a welcome from those to whom her search had cost so much vain toil.

There were, moreover, certain points of contact between Christianity and Paganism. Paganism was an evil thing, without being wholly evil. Its philosophy, amidst much falsehood, contained many elements of truth, and thus provided many of the pagans with a bridge over which they could pass to Christianity. Plato's doctrine, for instance, was in several ways in harmony with the Christian conception of the world, whilst the ethics of the last of the Stoics, of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius agreed in much with the ethical code established by Christ. These were doubtless the points which Clement of Alexandria had in his mind when he said : ' As the Law was given to the Jews, so philosophy was given to the heathen to lead them to Christ ' (*Strom.* I, 5, i ; VI, 6, i).

Certain other things, too, have to be taken into consideration. By the expansion of the Roman Empire a large part of the world had been brought under a single rule, and thereby the wall of partition dividing nation from nation had been removed, whilst the all but universal use of the Greek language set aside another barrier which had hindered free intercourse. There was then in existence a world-empire and a world-language, and these were, both of them, as Origen acknowledged with respect to the first of them, willed by God to subserve the new world-religion.

## § 7

**Christ, Saviour of the World and Founder of the Church**

‘When the fulness of the time was come, God sent his son, made of a woman, made under the law; that he might redeem them who were under the law; that we might receive the adoption of sons.’ In these few words the Apostle Paul (*Gal.* iv. 4-5) admirably, albeit briefly, sums up the reason and end of the Redeemer’s mission. The Son of God came to make an end of the old Covenant, and to lay the foundation of a new, to establish a covenant of mercy in the stead of a covenant of Law. To effect this object, thirty years after being miraculously born of the Virgin Mary, He began to teach, travelling throughout Palestine with twelve chosen disciples, preaching everywhere the new doctrine and confirming it with signs and wonders. ‘He came unto his own, and his own received him not’ (*John* i. 11). The two powerful Jewish parties, the fanatic Pharisees and the rationalist and epicurean Sadducees, both came into conflict with Him, and, after a short public ministry (whether of one year or of three years, it is difficult to say), He ended His life on the Cross. But even His death was a witness to His mission from on high, for it too was accompanied by wonders. The veil of the Temple was torn asunder, to signify that the olden Covenant made by God with the Jews had reached its term, and that a new dispensation had begun, in which all men were called upon to share. Christ, as He had foretold, rose again from the grave after three days, and consorted with His chosen ones for yet a space of forty days before finally ascending to the Father.

The Gospels form the principal source of our knowledge of Christ’s life. The latest Catholic writers who have dealt with the life of Christ are: J. Sepp (7 vol. 1843-46; 4th ed. 1899 ff.), Grimm (7 vol. 1876-99; 3rd ed. recast by J. Zahn, 1906 ff.), Le Camus (Engl. Trans. New York, 1906 ff.), Friedlieb (1887), H. Schell (1903 [Engl. Trans. *Ideals of the Gospel*, 1909]), Fouard (Engl. Trans. 2nd ed. 1908), Didon (Engl. Trans. 1891, 1908).

The most ancient non-Christian witnesses to Christ are the Latin writers (see below, § 16), Tacitus (54-119), Suetonius (75-160), and Pliny (c. 112). Two other writers must also be named: the Syrian **Mara**, in his epistle to his son Serapion,

speaks of the 'wise King of the Jews,' after whose death the Jews lost their kingdom, but who still lives in His laws. The date of the epistle is uncertain. Cureton, who edited it (*Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. xiii-xv, 70-76), ascribed it to the time of Marcus Aurelius; others, though without justification, date it as far back as 73. The Jew **Josephus** Flavius alludes to Christ in two passages. In the *Antiquities of the Jews* (XX, 9, 1, § 200, ed. NIESE), a work written c. 94, he mentions James as the ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ (the brother of Jesus who is called the Christ). In an earlier passage (*Ant.* XVIII, 3, iii, §§ 63-64) we read as follows: 'Now there was about this time, Jesus a wise man [if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was] a doer of wonderful works [a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure]. He drew over to him many both of the Jews and of the Gentiles. He was (*i.e.* was considered, looked upon as) the Messias, and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him [for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the Divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him]. And the tribe of the Christians, so named after him, are not extinct to this day.' The words which, in the above, we have put in square brackets would appear to be interpolations made by a Christian hand. They were read by Eusebius (*H. E.* I, 11; *Demonst. evang.* III, 5), but do not seem to have been in the MS. used by Origen. Cp. G. A. MÜLLER, *Christus bei Josephus*, 1890; 2nd ed. 1895. GUTSCHMID, *Kleine Schriften*, IV (1893), 352; REINACH, in *Rev. des études juives*, 1897, pp. 1-18. Some consider the whole passage to be spurious, for instance NIESE, in *Indices Lectionum Acad. Marburg*, 1893-94, and ZAHN, *Forschungen*, VI, 302. Others (F. BOLE, 1896; *St. a. ML.* 1897) contend for the genuineness of the whole.

In Eusebius (*H. E.* I, 13) and in the *Doctrine of Addai*, ed. PHILIPPS (Lond. 1876, p. 4), we find a letter of K. **Abgar** of Edessa to Christ. In the latter Christ's reply is reported to have been made by word of mouth; in the former the reply also is given in epistolary form. This correspondence (cp. *Z. f. wiss. Th.* 1900, pp. 422-86) has found defenders in the *Th. Qu.* 1842; *Z. f. hist. Th.* 1843; *Kath.* 1896, II; but its spuriousness scarcely admits of doubt. With regard to Pilate's report to Tiberius (THILO, *Cod. apocr. N. T.* 1832, p. 803 ff.), and the epistle of Lentulus to the Roman Senate (DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder*, 1899), there is no doubt whatever as to their apocryphal character.

The **Essenes**, a third party among the Jews, are not alluded to in the story of our Lord. They were governed by a rule very like that of a religious order; they renounced marriage and the possession of private property; they lodged and took their meals in common, and were rigorous in their preliminary ablutions.

Some dwelt in colonies in the desert of Engedi near the Dead Sea, others lived in towns or villages. All of them refrained from consorting with the other Jews, refusing to associate with them even in the Temple services and sacrifices. Cp. REGEFFE, *La secte des Esséniens*, 1898; *Rquh.* 1906, pp. 11-56.

Another sect which has recently been the subject of much discussion, that of the **Therapeutae**, had its headquarters on Lake Mareotis, near Alexandria; its members renounced their possessions and devoted themselves to the worship of God in common; in other respects their sect differed entirely from that of the Essenes. They are known to us through Philo's work, *De Vita Contemplativa*, of which the authenticity has been questioned, though, most probably, wrongly. Cp. CONYBEARE, *Philo about the Contemplative Life*, 1895; P. WENDLAND, *Die Therapeuten*, 1896 (*J. f. klass. Philologie*, 22 Suppl. vol. pp. 695-770).

## § 8

### The First Whitsuntide, the Birth of the Church, the Death of James the Greater<sup>1</sup>

Before taking His departure, Christ had promised His disciples to send them the spirit of truth, the Comforter, who should abide with them and teach them all truth (*John* xiv. 16; xvi. 13). Ten days after His Ascension, when the Apostles had already chosen Matthias to fill the place left empty by the traitor Judas, the Holy Ghost descended on them all, making its presence felt by the signs which followed. The disciples began to speak in divers tongues, and by a single sermon of St. Peter's, 3,000 Jews were brought over to Christianity (*Acts* i-ii).

Other conversions soon followed those of Pentecost, and the spread of the new religion next demanded the establishment of some sort of organisation. Those among the Faithful who were in needy circumstances had been helped so generously by their brethren, that, in the words of *Acts*, all things were held in common. The distribution of the gifts and the direction of all the works of charity was in the hands of the Apostles, but as

<sup>1</sup> DÖLLINGER, *Christentum u. Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*, 2nd ed. 1868 (Engl. Trans. *The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, 3rd ed. 1877); NEANDER, *Gesch. der Pflanzung u. Leitung der christl. K. durch die Apostel*, 2 vol. 4th ed. 1847 (Engl. Trans. *History of the Planting . . . of the Christian Church*, Pohn, 1846); WEIZSÄCKER, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, 3rd ed. 1902 (English Trans.).

the community increased their task grew out of all proportion to their strength. The business of waiting at table, *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, proved especially irksome, and when the Hellenists, or foreign-born and Greek-speaking Jews, began to complain that their widows were relegated to the lowest places at table, the Apostles willingly relinquished their ungrateful task, and selected seven men, amongst whom were Stephen and Philip, to whom they entrusted this part of their ministry (*Acts vi*).

Though the Faithful, by continuing to worship in the Temple, had preserved a certain affinity with Judaism, yet the chiefs of the Jews were by no means inclined to view with equanimity an increase in their numbers. On two occasions the Apostles were imprisoned, scourged, and forbidden to preach. Out of fear for the common people, or in consequence of Gamaliel's warning to avoid precipitation, no further steps were taken against the Christians. When, however, Stephen began to proclaim the abrogation of the Old Law, a new outburst of rage was the result, and he paid for his rashness with his life, whilst the remaining Christians, with the exception of the Apostles, were compelled to quit the city (*Acts iii-viii*).

The dispersal of the Faithful helped to spread the Faith. The Gospel had already been preached beyond the borders of Judæa. The deacon Philip now went as missionary into Samaria, whose inhabitants, though sharing the monotheistic belief of the Jews and the Jewish hope in a coming Messiah, were estranged from their countrymen in worship, and were considered by the more orthodox Jews as but little better than the heathen. As soon as the news of Philip's success reached the city, Peter and John betook themselves in his company to impose hands on his converts that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Not long after this Peter succeeded in effecting the conversion of a real pagan, the Centurion Cornelius of Cæsarea, whom he received into the Church without further formality, as soon as he had been convinced by a vision that it was unnecessary for the heathen to enter Christianity by the gateway of Judaism (*Acts x, xi*). In Antioch, the capital of Syria, there soon arose a Church wholly composed of former pagans. This Church was put under the authority of Barnabas, and it was here that the followers of Christ first became known as Christians (*Acts xi. 26*) ; hitherto they had been called by

outsiders Galileans or Nazarenes (i. 11.; xxiv. 5), whilst, among themselves, 'Brethren,' 'Saints,' or 'Disciples of the Lord,' were the appellations in common use (*Acts* i. 15, vi. 1, 2, 7; *Rom.* i. 7).

Blood again began to flow at Jerusalem, when, to please the Jews, Herod Agrippa sentenced to death **James the Greater**, the brother of John. Peter, who was to have undergone a like penalty, escaped it only by a miracle. *Acts* describes this event as taking place at Easter; it must have been in the year 43, since Herod died soon after, and we know that his death occurred in 44 (*Acts* xii).

## § 9

### The Apostle Paul<sup>1</sup>

It was about this time that one who had been the most bitter foe of the Christian name, but who at a later date was able to say that he had done more for it than any other Apostle (*1 Cor.* xv. 10), began to labour openly in the cause of the Gospel. This was Saul, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, and a scion of the house of Benjamin, more commonly known by the name of Paul, which is bestowed on him by the compiler of *Acts*, in that portion of the history dealing with the events subsequent to the conversion of Sergius Paulus. Being on his way to Damascus with the object of harassing the Christians there (c. A.D. 33, but, according to *Gal.* i. 18, ii. 1, seventeen years before the Council of Jerusalem), he was suddenly won over to the Faith by a miracle, and after having received baptism at the hands of Ananias, was of a mind to preach forthwith the new doctrine, but was compelled by the machinations of his former brethren to seek a refuge in the deserts of Arabia. Three years later he returned to Jerusalem, passing through Damascus on the way, and after a brief colloquy with Peter and James the Less, the only Apostles he could find, he returned to his home. Eventually

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by F. Chr. BAUR, 1845; 2nd ed. by ZELLER, 1866 (Engl. Trans. 1873); CONYBEARE and HOWSON, 2 vol. 3rd ed. 1864; RENAN, 1869 (Engl. Trans.); BOTALLA, 1869; FOUARD, 2nd ed. 1894 (Engl. Trans. 1901); STOSCH, 2nd ed. 1896; SABATIER, 1896 (Engl. Trans. 1901); RAMSAY, 3rd ed. 1897; FRETTE, 1898; ABBOTT, 1899; C. CLEMEN, 2 vol. 1904; F. X. PÖLZL, 1905; J. BELSER, *Einleitung in das N. T.* 2nd ed. 1905.

he accepted Barnabas's invitation to proceed to Antioch, where his labours in the Lord's vineyard may be said to have begun. His activity was, however, so great as to forbid his remaining long in any one place, and, hearkening to the call of his Master, who enjoined him to carry His name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel (*Acts* ix. 15), he travelled repeatedly through the world, his preaching being everywhere productive of great results. His mission was more especially to the heathen world, and his plan was to emphasise the doctrine of Salvation by Faith in Christ and the uselessness of the works of the Law.

Three of his missionary journeys are known to us in detail.

I. The first, extending over the years 46-49, conducted him to Cyprus—where he converted the proconsul Sergius Paulus—and over a portion of Asia Minor ; here he preached in Perge, Pamphylia, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Lycaonia. He was assisted by Barnabas, and, for a time, by John Mark (*Acts* xiii, xiv).

II. Soon after his return, there occurred the events we shall speak of in § II. Paul next undertook another journey, which must have occupied the years 50-53 ; he was accompanied by Silas, and was afterwards joined by Timothy and Luke, whilst Barnabas, for the sake of his nephew John Mark, deserted him and departed to Cyprus. The Apostle first paid a visit to the Churches of Lycaonia, and then journeyed through Phrygia, Galatia, and Mysia. From Troas he went on through Macedonia and Greece to Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens, where he converted Dionysius the Areopagite. From Corinth, where he stayed a year and a half, he returned *via* Ephesus and Jerusalem to Antioch (*Acts* xv. 36-xviii. 22).

III. On a third journey, which must have followed closely on the second, and may have extended over the years 53-58, he first called on the Churches of Galatia and Phrygia, and then settled down for two and a quarter years at Ephesus. When the disturbance created by Demetrius the silversmith—who foresaw the evil effect which the forsaking of the idols would have on his business—at length forced Paul to leave, he travelled onwards through Macedonia and Greece, probably preaching in Illyricum on his way (*Rom.* xv. 19), whilst, all the while, he was unceasingly labouring for the Gospel with his pen.

It is to this time, in effect, that the greater epistles—*Romans*, *Corinthians*, and *Galatians*—belong (*Acts* xviii. 23–xxi. 15). Returning to Jerusalem, he found a term set to his activity. So bitter were the Jews against one whom they deemed an apostate, that the tribune Lysias had to intervene on Paul's behalf, and send him under escort to the procurator Felix at Cæsarea. On Paul making use of his right as a Roman citizen to appeal to Cæsar, it became necessary to send him to Rome (60 A.D.). His imprisonment did not, however, mean that he was entirely cut off from intercourse with his friends. He was now able to do by word of mouth what he had already done with his pen, and preach the Gospel in the capital of the Roman Empire (*Acts* xxi–xxviii). Many opine that he remained a captive to the end of his days, and perished in the persecution of Nero; but it is more probable that his cause was tried, and that he was set at liberty before this persecution began. At any rate, the Muratorian fragment speaks of a *profectio Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis*; whilst the statement of Clement of Rome (V, 7) that the Apostle had travelled ἐπὶ τὸ πέρας τῆς δύσεως (to the limit of the West), seems to refer to Spain. If Paul did actually undertake such a journey, then, as *Acts* says nothing about it, he must have enjoyed a spell of freedom after the last captivity alluded to in the History. However this may be, the Apostle certainly died in Rome, for, according to the statement of the Roman presbyter Caius (200), he was beheaded on the Ostian Way; this event probably occurred in 67, and was afterwards commemorated by the abbey *Alle Tre Fontane*, erected on this spot.

The year of the Apostle's death is doubtful, and so is the chronology of his whole life, there being no date given on which to establish it. The *terminus a quo* from which we set out to determine the principal dates of his career is furnished by that of his departure from Cæsarea for Rome, this coinciding with the arrival of Festus as procurator in Palestine in the stead of Felix (*Acts* xxiv. 27). This change in the government is, for reasons which seem unanswerable, set by most modern scholars in the year 60 (cp. WIESELER, *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, 1848, pp. 66–99; *Hist. J.* 1887, pp. 199–222<sup>1</sup>). Others, however, prefer to date the change in 55 (56), and believe in consequence that St. Paul's captivity began in 53 (54), he having been apprehended two years previously.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. DUCHESNE, *Hist. anc.* I, p. 27.

Adopting this basis, we should have to antedate all the events in the Apostle's life by some five years (cp. PATRITIUS, *De Evangeliiis*, 1853, I, c. 3, n. 13; JUNGMANN, *Diss. in H. E.* I, 96 ff.; *KL.* IV, 1311 ff.; O. HOLTZMANN, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* 1895; BLASS, *Acta Apost.* 1895; HARNACK, *Gesch. d. altchr. Literatur*, II, I, 1897). Some authors consider the dispute among the Apostles at Antioch to have taken place only after St. Paul's second journey. Cp. NEANDER, *Pflanzung*, 4th ed. I, 351 ff.; RENAN, *St. Paul*, pp. 118 f., 278 f. All writers differ to some extent on the lesser points. Cp. G. HÖNNICKE, *Die Chron. des Lebens des Apostel Paulus*, 1902; *Bibl. Z.* 1905.

## § 10

### The Apostle Peter<sup>1</sup>

Of Peter, whom Christ had chosen as the chief of his Apostles (*Matt.* xvi. 17-19; *John* xxi. 15 f.), we know less than of Paul. *Acts* (i-xi) speaks of his work in Jerusalem and Palestine in the early years after the Ascension, of his sermon at Pentecost, of the healing at the portal of the Temple of the man born lame, of his twofold imprisonment, and of his doings in Samaria and Judæa; beyond this it gives us no information, nor even a hint of the locality to which he betook himself after his miraculous deliverance from prison, merely observing that *καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον* (and going out he went into another place, xii. 17). As Peter is held by tradition to have been the first bishop of Antioch, we must suppose that he went on to northern Syria. At any rate, as his dispute with Paul shows, he was at Antioch at a later date. We find very little concerning Peter elsewhere in the New Testament. From the address in his first Epistle (i. 1) the Fathers gathered that he had preached in the Asiatic provinces there enumerated; others, seemingly with better grounds, argue that he must have visited Corinth, seeing that Paul speaks of the partisans of Cephas living in that city (*1 Cor.* i. 12);<sup>2</sup> from the conclusion of the first epistle of St. Peter (v. 13) we gather that the writer had reached Rome, therein

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by CUCCAGNI, 3 vol. 1777 f.; J. SCHMID (*Petrus in Rom.*), 1892; FOUARD, 3rd ed. 1897 (Engl. Trans. 1892); TAYLOR, 1894; J. ESSER (*Des hl. P. Aufenthalt, Episkopat u. Tod in Rom*), 3rd ed. 1897; A. BRUN, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> The inference is at least doubtful, as the text refers also to Christ in the same words. Trans.

designated by the mystical name of Babylon; <sup>1</sup> the fourth Gospel (*John* xxi. 19) contains an allusion to his martyrdom.

The Fathers have little to say concerning Peter's life, and only speak of the manner of his death. From the testimony of Caius it seems clear that he died at Rome, and not far from the foot of the Vatican Hill, where later a basilica was erected in his honour; according to Origen (*Eus.* III, 1) he was, at his own request, crucified head downwards. A similar account is given by the (Gnostic?) *Acts of St. Peter*.

As to the length of St. Peter's sojourn at Rome, tradition fixes it at twenty-five years (42-67), though it does not actually claim that he resided in Rome the whole of the time, but merely tells us the date of his arrival and that of his martyrdom. Whatever we may think of the length of his stay, we must take it as a fact that the Chief of the Apostles spent a considerable time in the chief city of the Empire, and that he ended his days there during Nero's persecution of the Christians; all this is attested, not only by the authorities just alluded to, and by the universal tradition of both East and West, but also by a series of eminently ancient and respectable writers.

1. Even before the close of the first century, Clement of Rome (c. 5, 6) speaks of Peter and Paul as having both fallen victims to envy and jealousy. As he seems, moreover, to associate them with those who died in the Roman persecution, we may safely infer that he believed them both to have been put to death at Rome.

2. Ignatius of Antioch, at the beginning of the next century, seems to presuppose that the two Apostles had once been present in Rome, when, writing to the Romans, he says (4, 3): *Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν* (I do not enjoin you as did Peter and Paul); for, seeing that we have no reason to surmise that St. Peter ever wrote to the Romans, these words can only indicate that he had preached to them by word of mouth.

3. The testimony of Clement of Alexandria<sup>2</sup> to the composition of St. Mark's Gospel also alludes to Peter's presence at Rome. This testimony is all the more important,

<sup>1</sup> Though some have argued that the locality designated may have been the Egyptian Babylon, of which remains exist near Cairo. Trans.

<sup>2</sup> *Eus.* II, 15: VI, 14.

## Council of Jerusalem and the Dispute at Antioch 29

seeing that it agrees so well with the saying of Papias, the hearer of the Apostles,<sup>1</sup> about the same Gospel; hence both the data would appear to belong to an already ancient tradition.

The later testimonies to Peter's sojourn at Rome, though of less value, are nevertheless important.

1. Dionysius of Corinth, writing to the Romans (c. 170), says that Peter and Paul were put to death together in their city (Eus. II, 25).

2. Irenæus (c. 180) ascribes the foundation of the Church of Rome to the glorious Apostles Peter and Paul (*Adv. Haer.* III, 3, 2).

3. The Roman presbyter Caius (c. 200) mentions the tombs (τρόπαια) at Rome of the two Apostles (Eus. II, 25; cp. *Th. Qu.* 1892, pp. 121-32).

4. Belonging to the same period, we have the witness of Tertullian, who speaks of Peter's preaching and martyrdom at Rome (*De praescr.* 32; *Scorp.* 15).

In favour of the twenty-five years' stay or episcopate of St. Peter in Rome, it is usual to advance the authority of the *Liberian Catalogue* of the Popes (354), and that of St. Jerome (*Chron.*; *Catal.* c. 1); it is possible that the original work of Eusebius also gave the number, but the statement regarding the coming to Rome of the Apostle, as made in the Eusebian *H. E.* (II, 15) is far from clear, whilst the figure and the original wording of the Hieronymian *Chronicle* is doubtful, the Armenian version giving twenty as the number of years of Peter's Roman sojourn. Even were it proved that the words of the *Chronicle* belong to Eusebius rather than to Jerome, we might still ask whether the number was a traditional datum, and was not merely due to the chronological reckoning of Eusebius himself.

### § 11

#### The Council of Jerusalem and the Dispute at Antioch<sup>2</sup>

By the reception into the Church of the centurion Cornelius, the independence of Christianity with respect to Judaism had been settled on one important point. This independence was to be yet further vindicated. Even if the heathen could be lawfully received into the Church without having previously to become Jews, there still remained the question whether they were bound to observe the Law subsequently to their reception into the Church. There came to Antioch

<sup>1</sup> Eus. III, 39, *Patr. apost.* ed. FUNK 1<sup>2</sup> (1901), 358.

<sup>2</sup> SCHENZ, *Das erste allg. Konzil in Jerusalem*, 1869; *Z. f. k. Th.* 1883; K. BÖCKENHOFF, *Das apost. Speisegesetz in den ersten fünf Jahrh.* 1903; G. RESCH, *Das Aposteldekret nach seiner ausserkanonischen Textgestalt untersucht*, 1905 (*T. u. U. N. F.* XIII, 3).

certain brethren from Palestine, who taught that converts from paganism should be circumcised and compelled to observe the Old Testament Law. This view caused a commotion amongst the converts whose spiritual freedom it endangered, and a resolution was taken to send Paul and Barnabas to consult the Church in Jerusalem. The Apostles and the presbyters assembled (A.D. 50), and the Council of Jerusalem, as this assembly came to be called, decided in the main against the necessity of observing the Jewish Law. It simply ordained, and this in order to facilitate intercourse between Hebrews and pagans in the Church, that converts from paganism should abstain from certain deeds which were especially obnoxious to the Jews, from partaking of meats sacrificed to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication (*πορνεία*: *i.e.* not necessarily from concubinage, or from illegal marriage in the Jewish sense. *Acts xv*).

By the decision of the Council converts from paganism were freed from the yoke of the Law. It was now the turn of the Jewish converts. In Antioch, the metropolis of Gentile Christianity, where there was no public opinion as in Palestine to enforce the observance of the Jewish Law, the convert Jews soon shook themselves free; even Peter lived there *ἔθνικῶς* on his return from the Council at Jerusalem, dwelling and eating with the Gentile brethren, regardless of the ancient Law. His conduct was, no doubt, counselled more by condescendence than by a clear insight into the circumstances, for, when it was made a matter of animadversion by the brethren from Judæa, he immediately reverted to the Jewish usage. But this step on his part, the disparagement of the Gentiles, and tacit invitation to them to adopt the Jewish mode of life which it seemed to involve, brought about a crisis. Paul withstood Peter to the face (*Gal. ii. 11*), and his action doubtless drew from Peter a declaration of the entire freedom of the Gentiles. At any rate we find, in the New Testament, no more trace of any effort on the part of Peter to interfere in defence of the old Law.

Of late an attempt has been made to place the dispute at Antioch at a date previous to that of the Council of Jerusalem. *Neue kirchl. Z.* 1894, pp. 435-48; BEISER, *Einleitung*, 2nd ed. 1905, pp. 401-27

## § 12

John, James the Less, and the other Apostles <sup>1</sup>

We have had reason to regret the lack of information regarding St. Peter; of the remaining Apostles, however, we know still less. Of most of them, all that *Acts* records is their name. - We gather, nevertheless, that after the death of James the Greater, the rest of the Apostles, who until then seem to have remained in Palestine, betook themselves to foreign lands. Of two of them history tells us something. **John**, the son of Zebedee and brother of James the Greater, is first mentioned in connection with St. Peter, whom he accompanied at the healing of the man born lame, and, later on, to prison, and, still later, on the mission to Samaria. He must have returned afterwards to Jerusalem, and have tarried there until the death of our Lady, who had been committed to his charge by Christ when dying on the Cross. We find him at a later date at Ephesus, where he superintends the Churches of Asia Minor. Statements to this effect made by ancient writers are, by some moderns, though quite wrongly, put down to a confusion of two persons; it being argued that Papias's testimony not only involves, as Eusebius admits (III, 39), the existence of two Johns, the Apostle and the Presbyter, but that the latter alone dwelt at Ephesus. According to the Apostle's own account (*Apoc.* I, 9), he had been banished (probably under Domitian) to Patmos. According to a tradition of later date, he had first been cast into a cauldron of burning oil, either at Ephesus <sup>2</sup> or at Rome.<sup>3</sup> The *Chronicon Paschale* gives 101 as the date of his death.

**James the Less**, son of Alphæus (*Matt.* x. 3), is apparently one and the same with James the 'Brother of the Lord' (*Gal.* i. 19), whose father was called Clopas or Cleophas, and whose mother was a sister of the Blessed Virgin, and was likewise called Mary (*Mark* xv. 40; *John* xix. 25); the names Alphæus and Clopas may be traced back to the Hebrew אלפי. On

<sup>1</sup> *Acta apost. apocr.* ed. TISCHENDORF, 1851; ed. LIPSIUS and BONNET, 1891-1903. LIPSIUS, *Die apocryphen Apostelgeschichten*, 3 vol. 1882-90; Th. ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutest. Kanons u. d. altkirchl. Literatur*, VI (*Apostel u. Apostelschüler in d. Provinz Asien*), 1900.

<sup>2</sup> ABDIAS, *De hist. apost. cert.* (in *Cod. apocr. N. T.* ed. FABRICIUS, 1703); Cp. ЗАЧН, *Acta Ioannis*, 1880, p. cxx.

<sup>3</sup> TERT. *De praesc.* 36.

account of his relationship with Christ, James was held in high consideration among the Apostles; he it was who proposed the new decree adopted at the Council of Jerusalem; Paul reckons him (*Gal.* ii. 9) as one of the 'Pillars' of the Church; his holiness earned him the surname of the Just<sup>1</sup> According to Hegesippus he was bishop of Jerusalem, a city which he seems never to have quitted.<sup>2</sup> In 62 or 63 he was stoned by order of the high-priest Ananias the Younger.<sup>3</sup> Should, however, the hypothesis which identifies the two disciples named James be wrong, then we know nothing of the Apostle beyond his name, all the data mentioned referring to the 'Brother of the Lord.'

The history of the remaining Apostles is quite unknown. The Acts which deal with their doings are from a Gnostic source, and their contents are legendary rather than traditional. Origen, or, more correctly, Eusebius who appeals to him for confirmation (*III*, 1), tells us that **Thomas** evangelised Parthia, and **Andrew** Scythia, whilst **Bartholomew** preached the Gospel even as far as India—by which, probably, we must understand Southern Arabia (*Eus.* V, 10)—**Matthew** first sought to convert the Jews, and then turned to the Gentiles (*Eus.* III, 24). The pioneer of Church historians has nothing to say of the other Apostles, Philip, Simon the Zealot, Judas Thaddæus or Lebbæus, and Matthias. Of the last mentioned he merely repeats a saying regarding the mortification of the flesh. Polycrates of Ephesus, indeed states that the Apostle **Philip** and two of his maiden daughters lay buried at Hierapolis in Phrygia, but Eusebius, who reports this story (*III*, 31), considers Philip of Hierapolis to have been one of the seven deacons, and the fact that we are told of this Philip (*Acts* xxi. 8, 9) that he had four daughters 'who did prophesy' inclines us to accept Eusebius's surmise as correct.<sup>4</sup>

With regard to those of the Evangelists who were not of the Twelve, **Mark** is believed to have founded the Church of Alexandria, whilst the local traditions of Venice and Aquileia ascribe to him the foundation of these Churches also. Of **Luke** we only know that he was for a long time the companion of St. Paul. Cp. *Col.* iv. 14; *2 Tim.* iv. 11; *Philem.* 24.

<sup>1</sup> *Eus.* II, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* II, 23.

<sup>3</sup> *JOSEPHUS, Ant.* XX, 8. A slightly different version is given by Hegesippus in *Eus.* II, 23.

<sup>4</sup> *DUCHESNE, Hist. anc. de l'Égl.* I, 135.

## § 13

The Spread of Christianity<sup>1</sup>

The long missionary journeys undertaken by St. Paul justify the supposition that even in Apostolic times the Gospel had established itself in most of the provinces of the Roman Empire. Subsequently it found its way also into the other provinces. Before long every large town in the Empire possessed its Christian community.

The most important testimonies to this rapid spread are the following :—

1. The growth of Christianity in **Rome** is attested by Tacitus (*Annal.* XV, 44), who states that under Nero there perished an *ingens multitudo* of Christians; by Pope Cornelius (†253), who speaks of an innumerable host of Roman Christians tended by forty-six priests and about one hundred clerics (*Eus.* VI, 43, 11). A proof of the spread of the Faith in the rest of Italy is furnished by the sixty bishops assembled by Cornelius in a synod at Rome to take steps against the Novatian schism (*Eus.* VI, 43, 2).

2. In **Gaul**, as early as the middle of the second century, we find Churches flourishing in Lyons and Vienne (*Eus.* V, 1-4). A century later, according to the perhaps not altogether trustworthy report of Gregory of Tours (*H. F.* I, 28), seven missionaries were sent thither from Rome, among them Dionysius, the first bishop of Paris. The belief that St. Paul sent his disciple Crescens to Gaul receives no confirmation from 2 *Tim.* iv. 10, even if we read, as in some MSS., Γαλλία instead of Γαλατία, for both words were used indiscriminately to designate both Galatia and Gaul. Cp. DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, I-II, 1894-1900; BELLET, *Les origines des églises de France*, 1898; A. HOUTIN, *La controverse de l'apostolicité des églises de France au XIXe siècle*, 3rd ed. 1903; L. LAUNAY, *Hist. de l'église gauloise depuis les origines jusqu'à la conquête franque* (511), 2 vol. 1906.

3. In **Spain** the Gospel may first have been preached by St. Paul. Irenæus (I, 10, 2) and Tertullian (*Adv. Iud.* 7) speak of Churches already existing there. We have also the letter (*Eph.* 67) sent by Cyprian in the middle of the third century to the Churches of Leon-Astorga and Merida. At the synod of Elvira (A.D. 300 or 306), where it is scarcely credible that the whole of the episcopate could have been assembled, there were, nevertheless, present

<sup>1</sup> MAMACHI, *Origines et antiquitates Christianae*, 1749-55; 1841-51. A. HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrh.* 2nd ed. 2 vol. 1906 (Engl. Trans. *Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 2nd ed. 1908).

nineteen bishops and twenty-four presbyters. Cp. GAMS, *KG. von Spanien*, I; H. LECLERCQ, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, 1906.

4. That the Gospel, even at this period, had already found adherents in **Germany**, or more correctly on the left bank of the Rhine, may be seen from the words of Irenæus (I, 10, 2), who speaks of the Churches in *Germaniis* (sc. *Prima* and *Secunda*), and from the attendance at the synod of Arles (314) of bishop Maternus of Cologne, and of Agricius, bishop of Treves. Testimonies to the introduction of Christianity into the lands bordering on the Danube are to be found in the martyrdom of the two bishops, Victorinus of Pettau in Styria, and Quirinus of Sissek (309), in the *Passio IV Coronatorum*, four Christian quarrymen of Pannonia, put to death under Diocletian (ed. WATTENBACH, 1870; cp. *SB. Berlin*, 1896, pp. 1281-1302), and in the martyrdom of St. Afra in Augsburg at about the same time.

5. So far as **Britain** is concerned, Tertullian is first in the field to allude to the *inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita*. At the synod of Arles (314) there attended the bishops of York, London, and Lincoln. The *Liber Pontificalis* and Venerable Bede (*H.E.* I, 4) even state that the British King Lucius requested Pope Eleutherus (175-89) to send missionaries, and that he himself, with a part of his people, were converted. HARNACK (*SB. Berlin*, 1904, pp. 909 ff.) considers this statement to be based on a confusion with the old tradition that Abgar of Edessa corresponded with Eleutherus.

6. Into **Western Africa** Christianity seems to have been brought from Rome. That it had taken vigorous root in its new soil is evident—whatever allowances we may feel disposed to make for exaggeration—from the words used by Tertullian (*Ad Scap.* 2), who says that the population of the towns was in large part composed of Christians; it is also shown by the great number of African bishops. Cyprian speaks (*Ep.* 59, c. 10) of a heretic having been condemned, long before, by no less than ninety bishops. The synod of Carthage under Agrippinus (c. 220 A.D.) counted seventy, and the third synod held in that city (in 256) actually brought together eighty-seven bishops (LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, 2 vol. 1904).

7. In **Egypt** the first place to attract our attention is naturally Alexandria. From the end of the second century it was the seat of a famous school of catechetics. Before the fourth century the number of dioceses in Egypt had risen to about one hundred, as we see from the synod of Alexandria (in 324 or 321).

8. Christianity made even more rapid progress in Asia, especially in **Asia Minor**. In Bithynia, Pliny (*Ep.* X, 97) found Christians of every age and class. In Phrygia, the Montanist movement led to synods being held as early as 170-80 (*Eus.* V, 16). Of Pontus, Lucian makes the magician Alexander to complain (*Pseudo-mart.* 25) that it is full of Atheists and Christians. The whole

region seems to have been in much the same case. To attest the presence of Christianity in Roman Armenia, we have the instruction on penance sent to the brethren of that country when distracted by the Novatian schism by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus. VI, 46).

9. We have no means of discovering the number of Christians in **Syria**, but they must have been almost as numerous as in Asia Minor, seeing that Antioch was in a sense the Christian metropolis of the whole of Asia.

10. We know that the Faith made its way very early into the countries bordering on Syria. It had invaded the kingdom of Osrhoene, or, at least, its chief city **Edessa**, before the end of the second century; K. Abgar IX (179–216) was a Christian. The legend as it existed, even in the time of Eusebius (I, 13), and which is contained in its entirety in the *Doctrine of Addai*, a work belonging to the beginning of the fifth century (ed. PHILIPPS, 1876), describes the country as having been evangelised in Apostolic times. According to this account, K. Abgar Ukkama, or the Black, requested of Christ to be healed, a service which our Lord promised to perform by a deputy, and which was actually undertaken, after His Ascension, by Addai, one of the seventy. Cp. TIXERONT, *Les origines de l'église d'Édesse*, 1888; J. P. MARTIN, 1889; DUVAL, *Hist. d'Édesse*, 1892.

11. In **Palestine** the Jews were probably able to set many obstacles in the way of the new Faith, but even here it made some progress and contrived to spread its sway into the neighbouring portion of Arabia, as we see from the synod of Bostra (244).

12. **India**, according to tradition, was first evangelised by the Apostle Thomas; hence the title of Christians of St. Thomas borne by the Faithful of that region. We are told by Eusebius (V, 10) that the catechist Pantænus (c. 200) visited it from Alexandria, though it is on the whole more likely that his mission was only to Southern Arabia. However this may be, Cosmas Indicopleustes (§ 77) testifies to the existence of Indian Churches in the sixth century. Cp. GERMAN, *Die Kirche der Thomaschristen*, 1877.

## § 14

### The Reasons of the Rapid Spread of Christianity

Should the reader feel inclined to wonder at the wide and rapid spread of Christianity, he must recall to mind how thoroughly the world had been prepared for its advent (§ 6). Nor must we be unmindful of the inner force of the truth. Christianity imported a doctrine which was at once more comprehensive and more comprehensible than any

wisdom of this world, and which likewise afforded a better answer to those questions which are ever pressing themselves on man's mind, concerning God, the immortality of the soul, and the future life. We know that the Gospel claimed many converts among those who, like Justin, and Dionysius of Alexandria, had vainly sought in philosophy for an answer to these questionings. We must also take into account the numerous signs and wonders which gave testimony to the truth of the new teaching.<sup>1</sup>

The zeal of the Christians for their new faith also explains to some extent its success. Men and women, free men and slaves, ignorant men and scholars, all did their best to advance the Christian cause.<sup>2</sup> Their very life was in itself a sermon to the heathen who surrounded them. Their purity and their mutual charity in the midst of a world filled with vice and hatred,<sup>3</sup> their heroism in shedding their blood for their convictions, all this was a fashion of proclaiming to the pagans the superiority of the Faith. We occasionally even obtain glimpses of the impression then produced on outsiders; Justin ascribes many conversions to the good example set by the Christians. Tertullian records the exclamation to which the pagans gave vent on seeing the extent of the Christians' charity. 'See how they love one another, and how they are ready to die one for the other!' Julian the Apostate ascribes the success of the Christian propaganda mainly to the charity of the Faithful, to their care for the dead, and to their sanctity, albeit he suspects the latter to be mere hypocrisy.<sup>4</sup> The depth of the impression produced by the constancy of the martyrs is witnessed to by Justin,<sup>5</sup> who observes that it was this that finally convinced him of the untruth of the calumnies laid at the door of the Christians; nor was Justin by any means the only one who was led by the example of the martyrs into the bosom of the Church. It was Tertullian who said: *Semen est*

<sup>1</sup> JUST. *Apol.* II, 6; *Dial.* 121. IREN. *Adv. Haer.* II, 32, 4. TERT. *Apol.* 23; *De anima*, 47. ORIG. *Contr. Cels.* I, 46; III, 28. CYPR. *Ad Donat.* &c.

<sup>2</sup> ORIG. *Contr. Cels.* III, 55.

<sup>3</sup> JUST. *Apol.* I, 16; TERT. *Apol.* 39; MIN. FEL. *Oct.* 9, 31; CYPR. *De mortal.*

<sup>4</sup> JUST. *Apol.* I, 16; TERT. *Apol.* 39; JUL. *Ep.* 49.

<sup>5</sup> *Apol.* II, 12.

*sanguis Christianorum*,<sup>1</sup> and we find a similar view expressed by Origen and Lactantius.<sup>2</sup>

## § 15

### Obstacles encountered by Christianity, the Causes of the Persecutions<sup>3</sup>

In antiquity Religion was considered a purely political matter. The Roman State was especially rigorous in upholding the national worship. Vanquished nations were permitted to worship according to their wont, but an exception was made so far as Christians were concerned, for to tell the truth they did not form a nation, but rather a religious association drawing its members from many nations. Their convictions, moreover, prevented them from doing as the heathen, and worshipping side by side with their God the deities of the Romans. Their avowed design of converting the whole world seemed to threaten danger to the established religion, and as religion was considered part and parcel of the State, their efforts seemed to be directed against the State itself. This suspicion was strengthened by the Christians refusing Divine honours to the Emperor, and by the action of some few of them who denounced military service and declined to illuminate and decorate their houses on occasions of public festivities. Though they performed their other duties as citizens most conscientiously and faithfully, there was sufficient ground in their abstentions to make them suspect of being enemies to the Emperor and to the Empire.

In addition to this, at an early date the wildest and most damaging tales got abroad concerning the Christians. Their belief in one only God appeared to the pagans mere Atheism.<sup>4</sup> Their Eucharist and Agape were thought to consist in impure

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* 50.

<sup>2</sup> ORIG. *Cont. Cels.* VII, 26; LACT. *Inst.* X, 9, 9.

<sup>3</sup> MAASSEN, *Über die Gründe des Kampfes zw. dem heidnisch-röm. Staat u. dem Christentum*, 1882; TH. MOMMSEN, *Der Religionsfrevel nach röm. Recht*, *Hist. Z.* 64 (1890), 389-429; KONRAT, *Die Christenverfolgungen*, 1897; J. E. WEIS, *Christenv., Gesch. ihrer Ursachen in Römerreiche*, 1899; A. HARNACK, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den ersten drei Jahrh.* 1905 (*T. u. U. N. F.* XIII, 4); F. AUGAR, *Die Frau im röm. Christenprozess*, 1905; ALLARD, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs* (Engl. Trans. Lond. 1907).

<sup>4</sup> Cp. JUST. *Apol.* I, 6, 13; ATHENAG. *Leg.* 3 ff.; *Polyc. Mart.* 3.

and cannibalistic orgies, equalling in depravity those of Ædipus and Thyestes;<sup>1</sup> to their want of respect to the gods all public calamities were ascribed.<sup>2</sup> To those of the pagans whose profession depended on the old religion—priests, artists, poets, &c.—Christianity was particularly obnoxious, threatening as it did to cut off the source of their income. It was doubtless men such as these who accused Christians of being an unproductive class, *infructuosi in negotiis*.<sup>3</sup>

The evil repute of the Christians soon occasioned outbreaks among the populace. Not unfrequently it was the governors who were responsible for the measures taken against them. With the advent of the third century the emperors themselves began to inaugurate the persecutions. The true grounds of the earlier persecutions are involved in much obscurity, and several explanations have been offered. Some maintain that the Christians were punished in virtue of the common law against illegal assemblies and against sacrilege, especially by the application of the *Lex Iulia maiestatis*, which awarded the death-penalty and confiscation of goods to all who should endanger the Roman State and its security, and to which the Christians rendered themselves liable by their abstention from the civic sacrifices then considered a part of every good citizen's duty. Others, like Mommsen, believe that the trial of the Christians was not a criminal one, but that the 'coercionary' power of a magistrate entitled him to convict summarily all who fell away from the national religion. A still more recent theory falls back on the *Institutum Tiberianum*, or *Institutum trium accusationum*, the so-called *accusatio sumptuaria* (against excessive household expense and suspicious manner of life), *sacrilegii* and *laesae maiestatis*, and considers that, as early as the time of Nero, this law was put into force against the Christians (PROFUMO, cp. § 16, I). There can be little doubt that some such law was appealed to, for Tertullian in his *Apologeticum* (10) writes: *Sacrilegii et maiestatis rei convenimur*. It is also possible that the practice of Christianity was, at an early date, expressly forbidden, or that the laws referred

<sup>1</sup> Cp. JUST. *Apol.* I, 26; *Dial.* 10; ATHENAG. *Leg.* 31-36; THEOPH. *Ad Autol.* III, 4 ff.; MIN. FEL. *Oct.* 30 f.; TERT. *Apol.* 7, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. TERT. *Apol.* 40; CYPR. *Ad Demetr.* 2, 3; ARNOB. *Adv. nat.* I, 13, 26; AUG. *De civ. Dei.* II, 3.

<sup>3</sup> TERT. *Apol.* 42, 43.

to above were interpreted as forbidding it, for the same Tertullian (*Apol.* 4) inveighs against a law which enacted *Non licet esse Christianos*, whilst even Justin (*Apol.* I, 4) complains that Christians are condemned merely on the score of their title. Hence Christianity must have been forbidden as such almost from the beginning, for even under Nero its adherents were persecuted simply on account of their connection with it.

But though the Christians were constantly and rigorously punished, yet their Faith could not be uprooted. A few, and at times many, indeed, fell away before the fear of martyrdom and death, but as a body they showed themselves stronger in enduring suffering and death than their adversaries in inflicting these punishments, so much so, that ultimately it became impossible not to perceive in this power transcending all nature a testimony to the Divine origin of the new religion.

It is usual to reckon ten persecutions within the Roman Empire. This number, which is first found in Orosius (*Hist. adv. pag.* VII, 27), is, however, not quite correct historically, and seems to have been adopted chiefly for a symbolic reason, viz. to form a counterpart to the ten Plagues of Egypt.

## § 16

### The Ten Great Persecutions in the Roman Empire<sup>1</sup>

1. According to Suetonius,<sup>2</sup> the Emperor Claudius, about the year 50, expelled from Rome *Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes*; there can be no doubt but that the Christians, equally with the Jews, fell under this sentence, seeing that the former were looked upon as a mere sect of the latter, and that the agitation which led up to this decree of banishment had been occasioned by the advent of Christianity. Nero (54-68) was, however, the first to start a persecution directed solely

<sup>1</sup> LACT. *De mort. pers.*; ALLARD, *Hist. des perséc.* 5 vol. 1885-90; 3rd ed. 1903 ff.; *Le christianisme et l'Empire romain*, 1897; 6th ed. 1905; K. J. NEUMANN, *Der röm. Staat u. die allg. K. bis auf Diokletian*, I, 1889; LE BLANT, *Les persécuteurs et les martyrs*, 1897; A. LINSSEN-MAYER, *Die Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den röm. Staat bis Julian* (363), 1905. We have appended the sign † to the names of all those martyrs whose *Acts* are to be found in RUINART'S collection.

<sup>2</sup> *Claud.* 25 (Cp. *Acts* xviii. 2. Trans.).

against the Christians. A fire—concerning which it is impossible to say, now, whether it was the emperor's doing or simply the result of an accident—having broken out (July 19, 64) and consumed the greater portion of the city of Rome, Nero proceeded to throw the blame on the Christians, and, as their guilt could not be proved, they were summarily put to death in crowds amidst frightful tortures as guilty of misanthropy: *propter odium generis humani*.<sup>1</sup> No doubt the example of the capital was soon followed in the provinces. Among the victims of this persecution were the Apostles Peter and Paul, and if it be true that they died as late as 67, then the massacres must have been prolonged until Nero's death.

II. Under Vespasian and Titus the Christians were left in relative peace, but in the latter years of **Domitian's** reign (81-96) they had again to suffer. The emperor's own cousin, the senator Flavius Clemens, was executed for *ἀθεότης*, and his wife Domitilla was banished to the island of Pandataria.<sup>2</sup> It would appear that the consul Acilius Glabrio, another victim of Domitian's cruelty, must also be reckoned as a martyr. To safeguard his sovereignty, the distrustful monarch even caused our Lord's surviving relatives to be brought all the way to Rome.<sup>3</sup> Compared with the first persecution, this one was, however, of little importance; Domitian, according to Tertullian,<sup>4</sup> was only a *portio Neronis de crudelitate*. This persecution, nevertheless, must have resulted in a certain number of martyrdoms, for Dio Cassius and others speak of many victims.

III. Nerva (96-98) restored peace to the Christians; he even forbade proceedings to be taken for *lèse majesté*, and enacted that no one should be hindered from living according to the Jewish (*i.e.* Christian) manner of life.<sup>5</sup> A new persecution was started under **Trajan** (98-117), in which there perished our Lord's relative, the 120-year-old bishop Simeon of Jerusalem, and also Ignatius of Antioch. We have some

<sup>1</sup> TACITUS, *Annal.* XV, 44; CLEM. I *Cor.* 5, 6; ARNOLD, *Die neron. Christenv.* 1888; A. PROFUMO, *Le fonti ed i tempi dello incendio Neroniano*, 1905; *Archivio della R. Società Romana*, 1905, pp. 355-93.

<sup>2</sup> DIO CASS. *Hist. Rom.* 67, 14; SÜET. *Domit.* 15; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 308-29.

<sup>3</sup> HEGES. ap. Eus. III, 19, 20.

<sup>4</sup> *Apol.* 5.

<sup>5</sup> DIO CASS. *Hist. Rom.* 68, 1.

details of the happenings in Asia Minor. The proconsul of Bithynia, Pliny the Younger, after having executed many Christians, and brought yet many more, through torture, to apostasy, astonished at their numbers, appealed (c. 112)<sup>1</sup> to the emperor for instructions how to deal with them. The reply was that they were not to be sought out, but that when denounced, they were to be punished, unless indeed they consented to relinquish their superstitions (*Conquirendi non sunt; si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt, &c.*). As it was also laid down that no attention was to be paid to anonymous denunciations, the result of the rescript was to make matters rather more tolerable for the Christians. But their position remained bad enough, for it was also made clear that their Faith was a *religio illicita*.

The two following emperors were more kindly disposed. Their edicts, two of which have survived, show that they took under their protection the Christians of Greece and Asia Minor, who were constantly threatened by mob-law. Adrian, in his rescript to Minucius Fundanus,<sup>2</sup> forbade under threat of punishment any false charge. Antoninus Pius,<sup>3</sup> in his much discussed and probably apocryphal edict to the Council of Asia,<sup>4</sup> disallowed any accusation of Atheism against the Christians. But, even then, there was much suffering. Under Adrian the revolt of Barkochbas (132-35) led to the Christians being much mishandled by the Jews.<sup>5</sup> It was in the reign of Antoninus that there occurred at Rome the martyrdom of the three Christians, which induced Justin to write his second *Apology*, and also, at least according to the more modern reckoning,<sup>6</sup> the death at Smyrna of Polycarp and eleven other Christians †. Hence, though the edicts may have hindered the excessive fanaticism of the Greeks, they certainly did not legalise Christianity.

IV. The fourth persecution took place under **Marcus Aurelius** (161-80).<sup>7</sup> His reign had been ushered in by many

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* X, 97, 98.

<sup>2</sup> *Just. Apol.* I, 68; *Eus.* IV, 9; *FUNK, A. u. U.* I, 330-45; *CALLEWAERT, Le rescrit d'Hadrien*, 1903.

<sup>3</sup> *Mg.* by *LACOUR-GAYET*, 1888; *E. BRIANT*, 1896.

<sup>4</sup> *Eus.* IV, 13; *T. u. U.* XIII, 4; *N. J. f. d. Th.* II, 131-46.

<sup>5</sup> *Just. Apol.* I, 31.

<sup>6</sup> *KL.* X, 145-54.

<sup>7</sup> *Eus.* IV, 16-V, 5; *RENAN, Marc. Aur. et la fin du monde antique*, 4th ed. 1884 (*Engl. Trans.*).

misfortunes. Famine and plague were raging over the Empire, powerful enemies were threatening the borders, and in many localities the people rose against the Christians as the cause of all these miseries. In Rome there died (c. 165) Justin †, with his six companions; in Lyons there fell about fifty victims, among whom the aged Bishop Pothinus (178) †. Blood also flowed in the East, but no general edict of persecution was issued. The emperor, indeed, wrote to the proconsul of Gaul that all who professed Christianity were to be executed, but this was merely in answer to a request for advice in a particular case. In other localities the governors would seem to have acted on their own. Nor is there anything credible in the tale that Marcus Aurelius, after his expedition against the Quadi (174), forbade any further persecution, for he himself ascribed his unexpected victory to Jupiter Pluvius, and not to the prayers of the Christians, as the legend of the *Legio fulminea* does.<sup>1</sup> With the advent of Commodus (180-92) peace was again restored to the followers of Christ, thanks to the influence over the emperor of Marcia, his concubine. There were, nevertheless, some martyrs: at Carthage the Scillitan martyrs † were put to death (July 17, 180),<sup>2</sup> and in Rome Apollonius †,<sup>3</sup> whilst in Asia Minor a persecution raged for a time under the proconsul Arrius Antoninus.<sup>4</sup>

V. **Septimius Severus** (193-211), to begin with, continued his predecessor's policy,<sup>5</sup> but his conduct soon changed, and he forbade (201) not only conversion to Judaism—or rather the reception of circumcision—but also the profession of Christianity.<sup>6</sup> This enactment was followed by the fifth great persecution, in connection with which we have some information concerning two localities. At Alexandria, Leonides † with several disciples of his son Origen, and at Carthage, Perpetua and Felicitas †, together with three others, died for their Faith.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *SB. Berlin*, 1894, pp. 835-82; *Hermes*, 1895; *Civiltà catt.* 1895; *N. J. f. d. klass. Altertum*, 1899, pp. 253 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. NEUMANN, pp. 72-76, 284-86; *Texts and Studies*, I, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Eus.* V, 21; *JEROM. Cat.* 42; MAX, Prince of Saxony, *Der hl. M. Apollonius von Rom*, 1903; *Nachr. Göttingen*, 1904, pp. 262-84.

<sup>4</sup> TERT. *Ad Scap.* 5.

<sup>5</sup> RÉVILLE-KRÜGER, *Die Religion zu Rom unter den Severern*, 1888.

<sup>6</sup> SPART. *Sept. Sev.* 17.

<sup>7</sup> FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *La Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, 1896. (J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, item.)

Peace was again established for a time by the death of Septimius, though it was at about this time that the jurist Domitianus Ulpianus drew up his collection of the imperial rescripts against Christianity.<sup>1</sup> Antoninus Severus Caracalla (211-17) probably spared them on account of the favourable impression they had made upon him in his youth. Elagabalus (218-22) cherished the ambition of fusing all religions, Christianity included, in the Syrian Sun-worship, to which he was himself addicted. Alexander Severus (222-35), a religious eclectic, doubtless influenced by his mother, Julia Mammæa, who was kindly disposed to the Christians, regarded Christianity as a legitimate mode of worshipping God. Among his *Lares* there stood a picture of Christ, side by side with those of Apollonius of Tyana, Abraham, and Orpheus, whilst on the walls of his palace and on certain monuments he caused the words of *Luke* vi. 31 (in the form in which they are found in the *Didache*, I, 2) to be inscribed. The emperor even went so far as to express a wish to erect a temple to Christ; in spite of the opposition of the Roman stallsmen who claimed the right to occupy it, he declared the Christians free to use a certain open space in the city for their worship. The emperor's own kindness did not, however, prevent deeds of violence by his officials. According to tradition, it was in his reign that the much debated martyrdom of St. Cæcilia occurred,<sup>2</sup> at least it must have taken place then if the bishop Urban, to whom allusion is made, was really the Pope of that name (222-30).

VI. Under **Maximinus Thrax** (235-38) the position of the Christians again became difficult. This emperor persecuted indiscriminately the partisans of his predecessor and the Christians who had been protected by him. In consequence of an edict which he directed against the clergy in particular, P. Pontian and the anti-pope Hippolytus were both deported to Sardinia, where the climate soon occasioned their death.<sup>3</sup> It does not seem, however, that much, if indeed any, blood was shed, save in the provinces of Cappadocia and Pontus, where disastrous earthquakes excited the populace to

<sup>1</sup> LACT. *Inst.* V, II.

<sup>2</sup> Στραμάτιον ἀρχαιολογικόν; *Mitteilungen zum zweiten intern. Kong. f. Christl. Archäol.*, 1900: *Th. Qu.* 1902-05.

<sup>3</sup> *Catal. Liberianus.*

rise against the Christians;<sup>1</sup> this latter persecution did not last long, and it is probable that Maximin had nothing to do with it. Under Gordian (238-44) and Philip the Arab (244-49) the times continued to be peaceful; the latter was even reported to have become a Christian,<sup>2</sup> a rumour which doubtless had no better base than the emperor's friendliness to Christians, for it is certain that, whatever may have been his private convictions, he showed himself outwardly a thorough pagan.

VII. Apart from the unimportant persecution under Maximin, the Church enjoyed at this time a period of quiet extending over forty years, a period sufficiently long to notably increase her numbers. Unfortunately her inward growth was not proportioned to her outward development; many of her members grew tepid, and, to try them again, God sent—the remark is Cyprian's<sup>3</sup>—a new persecution, which was commenced by Decius (249-51).<sup>4</sup> Determined to restore its ancient splendour to the now visibly decaying Empire, he judged it well to start by reclaiming the Christians to heathendom, and this he proceeded to do in so methodical a manner and with such energy that his persecution exceeded all previous ones in cruelty. Christians were bidden to put aside their religion, and when brought face to face with the most horrible tortures, they did in fact fall away in crowds.<sup>5</sup> Some consented to sacrifice (*sacrificati*), others to burn incense before the idols (*thurificati*), others sought certificates attesting that they had complied with the emperor's demands (*libellatici, acta facientes*). Yet the race of Christian heroes still lived; many, like Fabian, or the priest Pionius † at Smyrna, chose to retain their faith at the cost of their lives. At the beginning of 251 Decius, perceiving the utter uselessness of his cruelty, began to desist, and died soon after, when engaged in a war against the Goths. With his death peace was restored, and, as his successor Gallus (251-53) at first took no measures against Christianity, there seemed some prospect of the Christians being left unmolested. But as soon as a plague began to lay waste the Empire, the

<sup>1</sup> Ep. FIRMIAN. *inter Cypr. ep.* 75, 10; ORIG. *In Matth. hom.* 39.

<sup>2</sup> EUS. VI, 34; VII, 10, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *De lapsis*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> GREGG, *The Decian Persecution*, 1898.

<sup>5</sup> CYPR. *De lapsis*, 7-9; EUS. VI, 41.

emperor decreed that intercessory sacrifices should be everywhere offered to Apollo, and, on the Christians refusing, their troubles began anew. But they were now better prepared for the trial than they had been under Decius, and many of those who had previously fallen now made amends for their former cowardice. Among the then martyrs must be reckoned Pope Cornelius, who died in exile.

VIII. On **Valerian**<sup>1</sup> (253-60) ascending the throne, peaceful days again dawned; the new emperor was said to have Christians even in his own household. But not much time had elapsed before he too was led by the intrigues of his favourite Macrianus to harsh dealings.<sup>2</sup> By the edict of 257, bishops, priests, and deacons were threatened with banishment should they refuse to sacrifice, whilst the faithful were forbidden under penalty of death to visit the cemeteries or assemble for worship. A later edict (258)<sup>3</sup> ordained that the higher clergy should be executed forthwith, and that the more eminent members of the laity should be dealt with likewise, unless indeed the loss of both fortune and status had brought them to their senses. Ladies of rank were to lose their possessions and be banished; members of the imperial household were to be deprived of their goods, put in irons, and made to serve as penal slaves on the emperor's farms. The persecution caused much bloodshed, especially in the East, where it was pushed forward by the usurper Macrianus; in the West, however, it came to an end with the capture of the emperor by the Persians. Gallienus, Valerian's son,<sup>4</sup> not only allowed the Christians to live in peace, he also restored to them their cemeteries and the places of worship, which, in spite of their religion being forbidden, they had been able to establish, either in virtue of the law of Septimius Severus concerning *Collegia funeraticia*,<sup>5</sup> or in consequence of the tolerance shown to them by several of the emperors,<sup>6</sup> but which had been confiscated during the previous persecution. A like restitution of goods and dignities was probably made to the private persons who had been deprived

<sup>1</sup> P. J. HEALY, *The Valerian Persecution*, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> EUS. VII, 10-12.

<sup>3</sup> CYPR. *Ep.* 80, 1.

<sup>4</sup> EUS. VII, 13.

<sup>5</sup> DE ROSSI, *Roma sotteranea*, I, 101-10; II, pp. VI-IX.

<sup>6</sup> DUCHESNE, *Congrès scient. III des catholiques*, V, 488.

of them. The best-known martyrs of Valerian's period were, in Rome, Pope Sixtus II and his deacon Lawrence †; in Africa, the *Massa Candida*, a large company of martyrs put to death at Utica; at Carthage, Cyprian †; and in Spain the bishop Fructuosus of Tarragona and his deacons Augurius and Eulogius †.

IX. It would seem that Gallienus not only found a *modus vivendi* agreeable to both State and Church, but that, under him, Christianity was recognised as a *religio licita*. But the time was not as yet ripe for such a revolution; according to quite a number of *Acts*, blood again flowed in Italy and in Rome itself during the reign of Claudius II. However this may be, in Aurelian (270-75)<sup>1</sup> a new foe to the Christians came on the scene. Though ever an earnest devotee of the gods, in the early years of his reign this emperor observed the edicts of Gallienus; thus it was he who gave judgment in the case of the Christians of Antioch against the deposed bishop Paul of Samosata, and in favour of the rightful bishop Domnus. Nevertheless, in 275 he issued an edict of persecution, though, to tell the truth, it was of no effect, as he died soon after and his successors failed to act on it.

X. Diocletian<sup>2</sup> (284-305) and the co-Augustus Maximian (286-305), likewise their two Cæsars, Galerius and Constantius (from A.D. 292), for some time left the Christians to their own devices, a fact which led to a great spread of the Gospel. In the more important towns large churches were being erected, and everything seemed to point to the new religion soon obtaining the better of paganism. At a later date (313) Maximian was able to say, though no doubt he was guilty of exaggeration, that nearly everybody had gone over to Christianity.<sup>3</sup> But the victory was not to be gained so easily. Galerius, backed by other like-minded pagans, persuaded Diocletian to change his religious policy, with the result that there followed the tenth persecution, the most bloody of all, which was to decide finally the issue between Christianity and paganism. It began with the purification of the army, Christian officers being

<sup>1</sup> EUS. VII, 30; LACT. *De mort. pers.* 6.

<sup>2</sup> VIOLET, *Die paläst. Martyrer des Eusebius v. C.* 1896 (*T. u. U.* XIV, 4); BELSER, *Zur dioklet. Christenv.* 1891; O. SEECK, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, I, 2nd ed. 1897.

<sup>3</sup> EUS. IX, 9.

bidden to apostatise or lose their rank ;<sup>1</sup> some were, even then, put to death. The persecution commenced in earnest in 303 ; within a brief space of time four edicts were published which threw into mourning the whole of Christendom. The first ordained<sup>2</sup> that the churches should be razed and the sacred books burnt, that all Christians should be accounted outlaws and lose their offices and dignities, and that those who were attached to the emperor's household should lose their freedom. The carrying out of this edict led to some bloodshed, and in Nicomedia there were even many martyrs. A fire which broke out in the emperor's palace there was set down to the Christians, and on this charge all who refused to sacrifice were executed. Popular upheavals in Syria and Cappadocia were also made a pretext for further persecutions. A second edict<sup>3</sup> commanded all clerics to be imprisoned, a third<sup>4</sup> compelled them all to offer sacrifice under threat of torture ; lastly, after a brief respite granted for Diocletian's *vicennalia*, a fourth edict<sup>5</sup> (304) was published, making sacrifice obligatory on Christians of every class. Blood was now poured out everywhere save only in the prefecture of Gaul ; Constantius, who ruled over this portion of the empire, confined himself to executing the first edict, and, on his death (306), his son Constantine continued his policy of clemency. In Italy and Africa the Christians obtained a breathing space under Maxentius (306-12), whilst in Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Noricum peace was secured by the arrival of Licinius (307), but in the East the persecution was pushed forward with unabated fury until 311. Diocletian was succeeded by Galerius, who was the real cause of all the evil, but who was himself surpassed in brutality by the new Cæsar, Maximin Daza. Yet all was in vain, as even Galerius was at last forced to acknowledge, when, in 311, he issued his edict<sup>6</sup> granting toleration to the Christians. **Constantine** was soon to go much further ; already favourable to Christianity before his campaign with Maxentius, no sooner had he vanquished his enemy at the Milvian Bridge (312), than he made haste to issue at Milan, in conjunction with his son-in-law Licinius, his famous edict of

<sup>1</sup> EUS. VIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* VIII, 2 ; LACT. *De mort. pers.* 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* VIII, 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* *De mart. Palaest.* 3.

<sup>6</sup> LACT. *De mort. pers.* 34 ; EUS. VIII, 17.

toleration (313).<sup>1</sup> That granted by Galerius had been conditional, but here we find the freedom of religious worship made absolute; each one is henceforward free to worship according to his will, and ecclesiastical goods and buildings confiscated during the religious troubles are to revert to the Churches, which are at the same time recognised as lawful associations. The new order of things had still one opponent in Maximin, who, in spite of the peace of 311, had recommenced hostilities; his power came, however, to an end with the decisive battle of Adrianople (314), when Licinius, the victor, became ruler of the East and introduced into his dominions the observance of the Edict of Milan.

The conversion of Constantine to Christianity was a matter of such vast importance in the history of the Roman Empire and to the world at large, that we cannot be surprised if it soon came to be looked upon as the result of a miracle. In his *Church History* (IX, 9) Eusebius merely tells us that during the battle against Maxentius, the emperor had implored the help of the God of heaven and of Christ the Redeemer, and that his prayer having been heard, he commanded that the statue which was erected in his honour in Rome should bear in its right hand the sign of the Redemption, and have at its base an inscription telling how by means of this salutary sign he had freed the city from tyranny. The second contemporary writer, Lactantius (*De mortibus persecutorum*, 44), simply observes: *Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus, ut caeleste signum Dei notaret in scutis atque ita praelium committeret*, &c. In his *Vita Constantini* (I, 28-31) Eusebius, on the authority of a statement made to him by Constantine, gives a much more circumstantial story, to the effect that on a certain afternoon the emperor, together with his whole army, had beheld a fiery cross standing over the sun and inscribed with the words  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \iota\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$ ; that during the following night Christ had appeared to Constantine with this same sign, and had commanded him to make a standard after this pattern, a kind of banner adorned with Christ's monogram, and which was afterwards called the *Labarum*. In this form, however, the narrative is open to suspicion, seeing that the apparition of the Cross, which we are told was witnessed by the whole host, is not even mentioned in the earlier version; but it does not follow that the tale is wholly fictitious, nor should we be justified in denying that Constantine may have discerned in the sky some sign resembling a cross. We have probably to deal with some real phenomenon, though it may have been enlarged upon and explained in the light of subsequent

<sup>1</sup> EUS. X, 5; LACT. 48.

events. Cp. HEINICHEN'S *Meletema*, xxiv, to EUS. V. C. I, 28, 29; L. RANKE, *WG.* IV, 2, 255-63; DESROCHES, *Le Labarum*, 1894; FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 1-23; DE COMBES, *Finding of the Cross*, Engl. Trans. London, 1907, pp. 125 ff.

It is to Diocletian's persecution that we must refer the martyrdom of the **Thebaian Legion**, which is first spoken of by St. Eucherius of Lyons in 450. According to his statement, this entirely Christian legion, which was quartered at Agaunum (St. Maurice, Canton Valais, Switzerland), after it had refused to a man to take any part in the persecution of the Faithful, was twice decimated and finally wholly destroyed by Maximian. The names of some of the martyred legionaries have been preserved, those namely of Maurice, Exsuperius, and Candidus. Later accounts of the same story state that detachments of this legion were put to death in other cities, notably along the Rhine. There is doubtless some truth underlying the story, though the accounts which embody it may rightly be suspected of having embellished the real facts. Allard (V, 335-64) locates it at the time of the revolt of the Bagaudæ (286), and instead of a legion substitutes a cohort of some few hundred men. The latest writers who have dealt with the question are STOLLE, 1891; J. SCHMID, 1893; R. BERG, 1895. Cp. *Th. Qu.* 1891, p. 702; 1893, p. 176; 1895, p. 171.

Another martyrdom which deserves to be mentioned here is that of **St. Ursula** and the eleven thousand Virgins. Being on their way back to Britain from a pilgrimage to Rome, they are said to have been put to death at Cologne by the Huns. That the story is very ancient is seen from the old Clematius inscription (which cannot be later than the fifth century) in the choir of the Church of St. Ursula at Cologne, which testifies that certain virgin-martyrs were venerated in the city. Beyond this inscription we have no historical witnesses to the fact, for the legendary accounts are not worth any consideration. The oldest documents which give a figure speak of eleven virgins, and, possibly, the huge figure of the later legends may be explained by the error of a scribe, who, finding mention made of XI. M. VIRGINES, mistook the letter M, which really stood for *Martyres*, for the Roman numeral denoting a thousand. Cp. FRIEDRICH, *KG. Deutschlands*, I, 141, 166; G. MORIN, *L'inscription de Clematius et la légende des onze mille vierges*, in the *Mélanges Paul-Fabre*, 1902, pp. 51-64.

## § 17

The Struggle against Christianity with the Weapons  
of the Mind<sup>1</sup>

Not only did paganism seek the aid of the secular arm to support it against the encroachments of its new rival, it also strove to gain its end with weapons of a different character. Quite a number of writings made their appearance, in which Christianity was attacked either openly or indirectly. Amongst these must be reckoned, besides two similar works of which scarcely anything is known,<sup>2</sup> the *Ἀληθῆς λόγος* of the philosopher **Celsus** (written 170–85), the fifteen books against the Christians by the neo-Platonist **Porphyrius** (270–75), and the *Λόγοι φιλαλήθεις* of Hierocles, a governor of Bithynia in 303. These writings, partly on account of an imperial edict (A.D. 448) which condemned to the flames the books of Porphyrius and possibly all other works of a like stamp, partly because they failed to interest later readers, soon fell into oblivion, so that at present they are known to us only through the works of the Christian Apologists. The work of Porphyrius has not come down to us even in this form, as the polemical tracts which dealt with it have likewise perished, with the possible partial exception of one (cp. § 75). The most important of all these attacks seems to have been that of Celsus, which it is possible to reconstitute almost in its entirety from the exhaustive refutation penned by Origen.<sup>3</sup> His philosophical objections against Christianity, especially against the doctrines of the Incarnation of the Son of God and the Redemption, were accounted so able that later opponents of Christianity did little more than refurbish the arguments used by Celsus. On the other hand, the historical side of his work is of a much weaker character, whilst his statements concerning Christ's life are wholly fabulous.

<sup>1</sup> H. KELLNER, *Hellenismus u. Christentum*, 1864; AUBÉ, *Hist. des perséc. de l'église*, vol. II: *La polémique païenne à la fin du II<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 1878; KLEFNER, *Porphyrius*, 1896 (Lectures at Paderborn, 1896–97).

<sup>2</sup> One being that of Fronto (cp. MIN. FEL. Oct. IX, 31).

<sup>3</sup> KEIM, *Celsus' Wahres Wort*, 1873; AUBÉ, *op. cit.* pp. 275–389; J. F. MUTH, *Der Kampf des Phil. Celsus gegen das Christentum*, 1899; FUNK, *A. u. U* II, 152–61 (for the date of Celsus's work).

The work mentioned above did not constitute Porphyrius's only effort against Christianity. He argues against it in several passages of his *Philosophy derived from the Oracles*.<sup>1</sup> This latter work has also an indirectly polemical character, for its whole object is to furnish the pagans with a teaching which shall depend on God's authority, in other words with a counterfeit of Holy Writ, which might satisfy the pagans' longing for an Absolute, and so retain them for the old religion. It was probably a like object which the neo-Pythagorean Flavius **Philostratus** had in view when, in obedience to the demand of Julia Domna, Caracalla's mother, he undertook to write the life of Apollonius of Tyana,<sup>2</sup> a biography which is palpably modelled on that of Christ. It was again a like reason which, in the third century, led to the unearthing of the Orphic and Hermetic writings.

Lastly, we may reckon among the ancient literary foes of Christianity the friend of Celsus, the Rhetor Lucian of Samosata, at least inasmuch as his work *De morte Peregrini* casts ridicule on the Christians' fraternal love and contempt of death. The work itself is, however, really directed against the Cynics. Cp. BERNAYS, *Lucian u. die Cyniker*, 1879; DEELEMEN, *Lucianus' Geschrift De morte Peregrini*, 1902.

<sup>1</sup> WOLFF, *Porphyrus de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae*, 1856.

<sup>2</sup> F. WHITTAKER, *Apollonius of Tyana*, 1906.

## CHAPTER II

### THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

#### § 18

#### The Clergy<sup>2</sup>

AT the very beginning, the direction of the Church was naturally left in the hands of the Apostles, who were aided by the two categories of 'prophets' and 'doctors.'<sup>3</sup> The latter seem to have undertaken the further instruction of the new Christians, whereas on the Apostles there devolved the duty of making converts. The title of Apostle was not reserved to the Twelve, it was also bestowed on all their companions and helpers, such as Barnabas, and in fact on all the earlier heralds of the Gospel,<sup>4</sup> who, by the way, were also known as 'Evangelists.'<sup>5</sup> From the earliest times we also find mention made of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.<sup>6</sup> The latter offices were destined to remain, whereas the former either disappeared with the end of the Apostolic Age (such being the case with the Evangelists) or, like those of the 'prophets' and 'doctors,' were merged in the permanent offices of bishop and presbyter.

<sup>1</sup> BINGHAM, *Origines sive antiquitates eccles.*; A. RITSCHL, *Entstehung der altkath. K.* 2nd ed. 1857; DÖLLINGER, *Christentum u. K.* 2nd ed. 1868 (Engl. Trans. *First Age of Christianity and the Church*, 2 vol. 3rd ed. 1877).

<sup>2</sup> *Rquh.* 1888, II, 329-84; 1891, II, 397-429 (*Th. Qu.* 1889, p. 698; 1892, p. 700); SOBKOWSKI, *Episkopat u. Presbyterat in d. ersten christl. Jahrh.* 1893; RÉVILLE, *Les origines de l'épiscopat*, 1894; *Revue biblique*, 1895, pp. 473-500; MICHIELS, *L'origine de l'épiscopat*, 1900; DUNIN-BORKOWSKI, *Die neueren Forschungen über die Anfänge des Episkopats*, 1900; *Revue Bénéd.* 1901, pp. 26-43; H. BRUDERS, *Die Verfassung d. K.* 1902.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Acts xiii. 1; Eph. iv. 11; *Doct. Ap.* 11-15.

<sup>4</sup> *Doct. Ap.* XI, 3-6.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. iv. 11; Acts xxi. 8; EUS. III, 37; V, 10.

<sup>6</sup> Acts xx. 17-28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8, 12; v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5, 7; *Doct. Ap.* XV, 1.

Of bishops, *Acts* xx. 28 tells us that they were placed over the Church of God to rule it; hence, even in those times, Christians fell into two classes, that of the rulers and that of the simple Faithful, or, to use the expressions employed even in the remotest Christian antiquity, that of the clergy and that of the laity.

The rulers of the Church are, in Scripture, always mentioned in the plural, sometimes under the names of *πρεσβύτεροι*, sometimes under that of *ἐπίσκοποι*.<sup>1</sup> We must, accordingly, conceive them to have formed a kind of college or priesthood (1 *Tim.* iv. 14), after the pattern adopted by the Jews, whose synagogues were governed by a Council of Elders (עֲלֵיָהוּדָה). The college had a president, and, as the direction of the Church was left more and more in his hands, his authority extended, until finally the title of *ἐπίσκοπος*, which at first had an entirely general meaning, came to be applied to him alone. This change, of which we find the first indications in the letters of Ignatius M., at the beginning of the second century, testifies to the growth of the monarchical idea in the constitution of the Church. From this it does not, however, follow that the episcopate in its present meaning was a late introduction; were this the case, and had the Church been originally wholly presbyterian in its constitution, it would be difficult to understand how its episcopal form came to prevail so early in every part of Christendom, especially as the Mother and Mistress of the Churches did not then, as yet, possess sufficient influence to introduce so great a change throughout the world. Nor are traces wanting of bishops, even in the earliest times; Timothy and Titus in the Pastoral epistles of St. Paul, and the 'Angels' of the seven Churches of Asia, in the *Apocalypse* (I, 20 ff.)—though some consider the latter to be simply personifications of the Churches—seem to hold a rank identical with that of bishops. James the 'Lord's brother' is distinctly called by Hegesippus bishop of Jerusalem, and what Holy Writ says of him entirely bears out this statement. The opinion of St. Jerome,<sup>2</sup> that originally there were only priests, and that

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in *Acts* xx. Paul summons the ancients (*presbyteri*), and in the course of his address bids them 'take heed to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost had placed them bishops (*episcopi*).' Trans.

<sup>2</sup> *Comm. in Tit.* I; *ep. 69 ad Ocean.* I; *ep. 146 ad Evang.* I.

bishops made their appearance later, when, as a measure of precaution against schisms and other like dangers, one priest was made supreme over his colleagues, is based on an erroneous inference from the older fashion of speech. At any rate, ever since the **bishop** attained to power, it is he who is the true president of each Church, its leader and pastor, directing its worship and administering its sacraments, forming at once the connecting link between the different members of the community he rules, and their spokesman in their dealings with other Churches.

The **priests**<sup>1</sup> originally formed the council of the bishop, whom they assisted in the Liturgy and in the office of preaching; in his absence they would officiate in his place.<sup>2</sup> Except in the larger Churches, their office does not appear to have been very onerous, and their title was often one of honour merely. It is noticeable that the *Didascalia* leaves it to the Faithful to decide whether any portion of the offertories shall be set apart for the priests, whereas it attributes to the bishop and his deacon a strict right to the same. It was only when parishes came into being that the priesthood became a position of any importance.

The **Diaconate**,<sup>3</sup> or third class of clerics, either came into existence by the election at Jerusalem of the seven who were to serve at table (§ 8), or it was a development of this earlier service. The deacon's office was, generally speaking, to assist the bishop in his work, and, in practice, their duties seem to have been very extensive. The deacon had to act as the bishop's deputy in caring for the poor, he had to assist the bishop in the Liturgy, principally by administering the Holy Eucharist, and, when necessary, also by baptising. So long as deacons remained the bishop's only ministers, many other duties also fell to their lot. They thus occupied a far more important

<sup>1</sup> 'Presbyteri.' Clement of Rome is the first to use the term *ιερείς*: 'Sacerdotes' of Christian priests. Trans.

<sup>2</sup> In certain Churches the college of priests had the power *vacante sede* of consecrating their candidate to the episcopal office. DUCHESNE I, p. 94. Trans.

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by J. N. SEIDL, 1884; ZÖCKLER (*Diakonen u. Evangelisten*), 1893; P. A. LEDER (*Die Diakonen der Bischöfe u. Presbyter u. ihre urchristlichen Vorläufer*), 1905.

position than the priests, though they stood lower in the hierarchy.<sup>1</sup>

Other Orders of clerics were introduced after the time of the Apostles. As the Churches increased in size with a corresponding increase of work for the clergy, whereas, if we may accept the statement of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea (c. 15), it was thought unseemly to increase the college of deacons beyond the sevenfold number fixed by the Apostles, a decision was taken to create new Orders for the relief of the overworked deacons: sub-deacons (*ὑποδιάκονοι*), who should be at the service of the deacons; lectors (*ἀναγνώσται*), for the public reading of the Scriptures; acolyths, whose duty seems to have been to assist the sub-deacons and perform various subordinate services; exorcists (*ἐπορκισταί*), who assumed the charge of those possessed of evil spirits (*ἐνεργούμενοι, χειμαζόμενοι*); and porters (*πυλωροί*), who were entrusted with the supervision of the church doors. All these Orders are mentioned by Pope Cornelius (251-53).<sup>2</sup> They had been instituted, some in the third, and some even in the second century. In the larger Churches the instruction of catechumens devolved on the catechists, or, as they were sometimes called, the *doctores audientium*, whilst for the performance of certain services to the female sex, which could not easily be undertaken by men, especially those connected with the administration of Baptism, another Order, that of the deaconesses, was instituted. This Order was already in existence in the time of St. Paul (*Rom. xvi. 1*). Yet another Order, which came into existence at about the same time, was that of the widows. St. Paul lays down the rules for their life (*1 Tim. v. 3-13*); their principal duty appears to have been that of prayer. The division between the two Orders is not always quite clear, and, particularly at the beginning, the office of deaconess was entrusted only to widows.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ignatius M., in his *ep. to the Trallians*, compares the bishop to God the Father, the deacons to Jesus Christ, and the presbyters to the Apostles. Trans.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. ad Fab. ap.* EUS. VI, 43; H. REUTER, *Das Subdiakonat*, 1890; F. WIELAND, *Die genetische Entwicklung der sog. Ordines minores*, 1897 (*R. Qu. Suppl.* fasc. 7).

<sup>3</sup> Cp. PANKOWSKY, *De diaconissis*, 1866; SEESEMAN, *Das Amt der Diaconissen*, 1891; ZSCHARNACK, *Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrh. der chr. K.* 1902.

## § 19

The Preparation, Selection, and Means of Subsistence of the Clergy<sup>1</sup>

I. The Apostles prepared their disciples as they themselves had been prepared by their Master, that is, they taught them by keeping them always in their company. The followers of the Apostles acted likewise, and this system of training was helped on, as new Orders gradually came into being, by the rule forbidding anyone to be promoted to a higher rank who had not given good promise in a lower Order. The catechetical schools, which are known to have been in existence before the end of the second century—in spite of their primary object being different—must also have contributed to train the clergy, whilst in the very earliest period there were the extraordinary *charismata* bestowed to help the preachers of the Gospel and the rulers of the Church (1 Cor. xii. 28 ff.).

II. Owing to the exceptional authority of the Apostles, the selection of the clergy in the beginning was left almost entirely in their hands, though even then the Church's wishes were first ascertained. Later on, the choice of bishops was left to the Churches and to the other bishops of the province; according to Cyprian, the individual Churches exercised the right of election (*suffragium*), whilst the bishops of the province claimed the right of giving their ratification (*consensus, iudicium*) to the election. The Councils of Arles (c. 20) and Nicæa (c. 4) decreed that at least three bishops should be present at the consecration, the Nicene Council also laying it down that the metropolitan should be consulted in the choice of a new bishop. Members of the lower clergy were selected by the bishop, information being previously sought as to the Church's feelings. It stands to reason that, under these circumstances, offices were not seldom obtained by underhand means.

III. According to Holy Writ (*Matt. x. 10*; 1 Cor. ix. 13) the ministers of the altar have the right to live by the altar. The Faithful fulfilled this duty to their pastors by presenting

<sup>1</sup> FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 23-39 (on their election); 121-55 (on their celibacy); II, 60-77; III, § 8 (on commerce and trade in Christian antiquity).

offerings (*oblaciones*) at the services. The *Didache* (c. 13) directs the Faithful to offer to God their first-fruits, whilst the *Didascalia* (*Const. Apost.* II, 25), by applying to the Christians the injunction of the Book of Numbers (c. xviii), seems to enjoin the paying of tithes. Soon, thanks to the Roman law regarding associations (see above, § 16, viii), the Church began to grow wealthy; as yet, however, the communities were not able to provide completely for their pastors; many of the clergy supported themselves on their patrimony, or followed the example of St. Paul (*Acts* xx. 34) in working for their living, either in the fields, or at a trade or otherwise. Some bishops, indeed, gave so much time to their worldly business that Cyprian (*De lapsis*, 4) was led to complain, and the Council of Elvira (circa 300, can. 19) to decree a prohibition.

IV. Every Christian was not esteemed fit to enter the ministry. As the latter's duty is to rule the Church of God, the Apostle Paul had demanded of the candidate to the clergy certain mental and moral qualifications (1 *Tim.* iii. 2-13; *Tit.* i. 5-9); amongst other things, the bishop and deacon was to be the husband of one wife, *i.e.* to have been married once only. Not only twice-married men, or *digami*, but also neophytes, were excluded from the ministry, lest 'being puffed up with pride they should fall into the judgment of the devil.' Besides these, other categories of persons were held incapable of receiving Orders, to wit, those who had performed ecclesiastical penance, those who on account of sickness had been baptised by infusion or aspersion (*baptismus clinicorum*),<sup>1</sup> and those who had made themselves eunuchs.<sup>2</sup> Of candidates to the episcopate, it was usually required that they should have attained the age of fifty, but for the priesthood the age of thirty was considered sufficient.<sup>3</sup>

V. Celibacy was not considered essential to the cleric of any rank. A married man entering the ecclesiastical state could continue his previous relations with his wife; but this freedom was only allowed to such as had contracted marriage before taking Orders. Once ordained, bishops, priests, and deacons were no longer free to marry, except when they elected

<sup>1</sup> *Eus.* VI, 43; *Conc. Neocaesar.* c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Conc. Nic.* c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Didasc. et Cons. Apost.* II, 1; *Conc. Neocaesar.* c. 11.

to retire from office. One exception only was made, in 314, by the Council of Ancyra (c. 10), in favour of the deacon who at his ordination had expressly reserved his right to contract marriage. As, moreover, according to the clear statements of Christ (*Matt.* xix. 12) and of Paul the Apostle (*1 Cor.* vii. 7, 32-34), celibacy is the higher state, and the best in which to serve God, many Christians, of their own accord, consented to remain continent, and, naturally enough, it was from among these that the ministers were chosen by preference. Hence, even in quite early times, the practice of celibacy was common among bishops and priests, being accounted more consistent with their sacred duties, though it was only in the last year of the fourth century that the Council of Elvira in Spain (c. 33) made it the object of a law, by absolutely prohibiting ministers of the altar to hold any carnal intercourse with women.

## § 20

### Dioceses and Provinces <sup>1</sup>

I. The earliest Christian communities were to be found in the towns; such communities went by the name of *παροικίαι*; at the head of each was a bishop. In the course of time it was found convenient to split the communities in the larger towns into several churches, or, as they were called at Rome, *Tituli*. Churches soon began to make their appearance in the country districts; we hear of the presence of priests and catechists in villages,<sup>2</sup> of a *diaconus regens plebem*,<sup>3</sup> of *ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ἀγρῶν*.<sup>4</sup> These developments did not, however, affect the position of the bishop, who remained the ruler, not only of the different churches in the episcopal city, but also of all the churches founded in the territories belonging to the city.

II. Just as by the union within a single city of several churches there resulted a *παροικία*, so by the union of many

<sup>1</sup> THOMASSIN, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* par. I, lib. I-II; K. LÜBECK *Reichseinteilung u. kirchl. Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgang des 4 Jahrh.* 1901.

<sup>2</sup> Eus. VII, 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Conc. Illib.* c. 77.

<sup>4</sup> Eus. VII, 30.

of the 'parishes' (which we should now call 'dioceses'), ecclesiastical provinces, or *ἐπαρχίαι*, came into being. As a rule these provinces coincided with the civil provinces of the Empire; at the head of each province stood a metropolitan, who was usually the bishop of the civil capital. An exception to this latter rule was to be found in the provinces of Numidia and Mauritania, in which the metropolitan was always the senior bishop. As early as the third century the bishops of each province began to meet in annual synods.<sup>1</sup> This organisation of the hierarchy was already perfect in the East by the end of the third century; into the West it was introduced somewhat later.

III. The metropolitans were not, however, supreme. The Council of Nicæa (c. 6)<sup>2</sup> speaks of yet higher dignitaries as already of long standing, namely the œcumenical patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, whose respective jurisdiction extended over the West, Egypt and the neighbouring provinces, and the East. The Council also alludes to other bishops of the same order, probably intending those of Ephesus, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Heraclea, who controlled the dioceses of Asia (*Asia proconsularis*), Pontus, and Thrace respectively. The importance of these last-named bishoprics becomes more apparent in the next period.<sup>3</sup>

## § 21

### The Oneness of the Church and the Roman Primacy<sup>4</sup>

The unifying tendency which we have just seen at work in the organisation of the metropolitan system had its complement in the union of the whole Church. The latter union was not, however, merely a result of this tendency, for it had been established from the beginning. Christ had preached one God and one Faith. He also founded one only Church, and by constituting St. Peter chief of the Apostles He made him to be the outward and visible centre of His Church. Nor can it be argued that this disposition was only for the time

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. FIRMIL. inter ep. CYPR. 75, 4.*

<sup>2</sup> *Cp. HEFELE, CG. I, 388-403.*

<sup>3</sup> *Conc. Constant. 381, c. 2.*

<sup>4</sup> *MÖHLER, Die Einheit in d. K. 1825; FUNK, A. u. U. I, 1-23.*

of the Apostles, for it was equally necessary in later times ; hence, Peter's prerogatives and duties must perforce have been transmitted to his successors.

And so indeed we find the Bishop of Rome standing at the head of the whole Church. His primacy was implicitly acknowledged by the eagerness of heretics and schismatics to win the approval of the Roman Church ; with St. Cyprian,<sup>1</sup> they evidently considered that to be in communion with Rome was to be in communion with the whole Church. Another proof of the Roman supremacy is to be found in the fact of St. Dionysius of Alexandria being accused of heretical leanings before his namesake Dionysius of Rome. The tone of authority with which the Roman Church (c. A.D. 96) enjoined that of Corinth to keep the peace<sup>2</sup> testifies likewise to its consciousness of being the chief Church.

Explicit witness to the pre-eminence of the Roman Church was borne by Ignatius of Antioch,<sup>3</sup> according to whom this Church is *προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*, i.e. the president of the Society of Love, or, in other words, of all the Faithful. Even if we take these words as referring to the inexhaustible charity of the Romans—though, as a matter of fact, *προκαθῆσθαι* is never used in the sense of 'excelling'—there remain the words *ἦτις καὶ προκαθῆται κτλ.*, which seem equally to indicate a kind of primacy. The same Church of Rome is called 'the Queen' by Abercius of Hieropolis (c. 200) in his epitaph. Irenæus allows it, on the ground of its having been founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul, a *potentior principalitas*, and also declares that for this same reason all other Churches must submit to its ruling ; he says :<sup>4</sup> *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam (sc. Romanam) propter potentio rem principalitatem necesse est omnem ecclesiam convenire, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.* Another writer, Cyprian, calls this Church the *ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis orta est*,<sup>5</sup> and, even more clearly than Irenæus, ascribes her chief rank to her having been established by St. Peter. The opinion which found favour in the East after the founding of Constan-

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 48, 3 ; 55, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *1 Clem.* c. 56-65.

<sup>3</sup> *Rom. insc.*

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. haer.* III, 3, 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ep.* 59, 14 ; cp. *De eccl. cath. unitate*, 4 ; *Epp.* 43, 5 ; 55, 8.

tinople, that the Roman primacy was merely the outcome of the political rank of the city of Rome,<sup>1</sup> was quite unknown in the earlier period.

Hence, even in the first centuries, the primacy of the Church of Rome was looked upon as something settled, though it was then far from possessing that extent which it afterwards acquired. Its importance consisted in maintaining intact the oneness of the Church; so long as this was not threatened by any departure from the true faith or from correct discipline, or by any other danger, the other Churches were free to act independently. Cyprian, after ascribing the Church's unity to her having been founded on Peter, adds that our Lord had given equal authority to each of the Apostles, so that whatever was possessed by Peter was likewise shared by the other Apostles;<sup>2</sup> and in the same passage in which he speaks of the Roman Church as chief of all, and the source of priestly oneness, he maintains that the bishops, so far as the government of their dioceses is concerned, are answerable to God (alone).<sup>3</sup> This explains why in early times the title of Pope was borne by all bishops.

<sup>1</sup> *Conc. Const.* 381, c. 3; *Conc. Chalced.* c. 28; THEODORET, *ep.* 173.

<sup>2</sup> *De eccl. cath. unitate*, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 59, 14; cp. *Épp.* 55, 21; 72, 3; 73, 26.

## CHAPTER III

### WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS

#### § 22

#### Baptism, the Apostles' Creed, Rebaptism <sup>1</sup>

I. BAPTISM, by which a man becomes a Christian, was, in Apostolic times, bestowed forthwith on every one who confessed Christ. We find many traces of this practice in *Acts* (ii. 41; viii. 36-38; x. 47; xvi. 15, 33). In the course of time, in fact as early as the second century, a more prolonged course of instruction and trial came to be insisted on; according to the Council of Elvira, this course was to last two years (c. 42), or even three years, when a lengthier instruction seemed advisable (c. 4). Candidates for Baptism were known as *κατηχούμενοι*, *audientes*, because it was their duty to listen to the instructions given on the truths of salvation. The name is first found in Tertullian, but Justin was already acquainted with the practice.<sup>2</sup> Apart from exceptional cases, Baptism was administered twice only in the year, on the vigils of Easter and Whitsun. At first the candidates were baptised in rivers or ponds, or in the sea; later on the Church buildings began to serve for this purpose. The act was performed by the bishop, or by a priest or deacon in his stead; in cases of necessity it could even be administered by laymen.<sup>3</sup> Baptism was administered by a triple immersion; for the sick (*baptismus clinicorum*), or in cases where an immersion was not practicable, an infusion or

<sup>1</sup> J. MAYER, *Gesch. d. Katechumenats in den ersten 6 Jahrh.* 1868; A. G. WEISS, *Die altkirchl. Pädagogik*, 1869; PROBST, *Sakramente u. Sakramentalien*, 1870, pp. 97-194; *Gesch. d. kath. Katechese*, 1886; D. STONE, *Holy Baptism*, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.* I, 61.

<sup>3</sup> TERI. *De bapt.* 17.

sprinkling was considered sufficient (see, however, § 19, iv). Holy Writ and the *Didache* (7) speak only of water, but as early as the year 200 we hear of divers ceremonies which accompany the bestowal of Baptism, such as marking the catechumen with the sign of the cross, the offering of salt, the renouncing of Satan, various exorcisms, the recitation of the Creed, and the profession of fidelity to Christ. Baptism was immediately followed by Confirmation, after which the new Christian partook of the Eucharist. On this occasion the neophyte received, besides the sacred species, a little milk and honey. The baptismal festivities lasted a week, during which the newly baptised wore white garments. From the fact of these garments being discarded on the Sunday after Easter arose the name by which this Sunday is now designated in the West, *Dominica in albis* (*sc. depositis*);<sup>1</sup> in the Eastern Church it was known as New Sunday. God-parents are first mentioned by Tertullian.<sup>2</sup> Martyrdom undergone by a catechumen was accounted a substitute for Baptism; this was the Baptism of blood. In 1 *Cor.* (xv. 29) mention is made of a baptism for the dead; this practice remained in honour among many of the sects, especially among the Marcionites, though it was reprobated by ecclesiastical writers from Tertullian downwards.

II. The Creed<sup>3</sup> which was recited at Baptism enumerated the chief articles of the Christian Faith. This symbol in early times admitted some slight variations; a settled and fixed creed is first heard of in Rome towards the end of the second century. This formulary is the Apostles' Creed in its original form; no doubt this famous symbol was already old at that time, but it is difficult to determine exactly when it was composed. Some believe it to be a result of the controversy with Marcion (150-80), but the more common opinion is that it was put together at the beginning of the second century, or even earlier.

III. With the outbreak of heresies and schisms a question was bound to arise concerning the validity of baptisms

<sup>1</sup> The English equivalent for Pentecost, Whitsun (White Sunday), arose in the same manner. Trans.

<sup>2</sup> *De bapt.* 18.

<sup>3</sup> HAHN, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3rd ed. 1897; F. KATTENBUSCH, *Das apost. Symbol*, 2 vol. 1894-1900; B. DÖRHOLT, *Das Taufsymbolum der alten K.* I, 1898; *Z. f. d. neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1905, pp. 72-79.

administered by heretics,<sup>1</sup> or generally by those outside the fold. Tertullian strenuously denied all worth to such Baptisms, and it is his work, *De baptismo* (which also appeared in Greek), which must probably be made accountable for the fact that shortly after its appearance no less than three Councils, that of Carthage (c. 220) and those of Synnada and Iconium in Asia Minor (c. 230), decided the question in the same sense. This view, which had a far-reaching practical effect, did not attract general notice until it received the sanction of the synod of Carthage, presided over by St. Cyprian (255-56), when it gave rise to a controversy destined to become famous. No sooner was the decision of the Council of Carthage reported to Pope Stephen, than he forbade the Africans to introduce any such novelty, threatening them with excommunication should they venture to rebaptise. A similar notification was dispatched to the prelates of Asia Minor as soon as it was known that they, notably Firmilian of Cæsarea and Helenus of Tarsus, were consenting parties to the innovations of the Africans. In the Council held by the Africans in the autumn of 256 the decision formerly arrived at was maintained, and, as a consequence, intercourse with them was broken off by Rome. The efforts of Dionysius of Alexandria to make peace or to secure toleration for the Anabaptists, and a new persecution of the Christians started soon after by Valerian, helped to quiet the storm; Stephen's successor, Sixtus II, resumed relations with the Africans, though the latter seem to have persisted in their practice for some time after. As late as 314 the Council of Arles (c. 8) witnesses concerning them: *quod propria lege sua utuntur, ut rebaptizent*.

Cyprian gives the following as Pope Stephen's opinion: *Si qui ergo a quacunque haeresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam, cum ipsi haeretici proprie alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum* (Ep. 74, 1). Firmilian (Ep. inter Cypr. 75, 7) makes him to say in addition: *haereticos quoque ipsos in baptismo convenire*. If Stephen really believed that the heretics of his time were in agreement with the Church concerning Baptism, there is no ground for questioning the further opinion attributed to him by Cyprian.

<sup>1</sup> J. ERNST, *Papst Stephan I u. der Ketzertaufstreit*, 1905; *Z. f. k. Th.* 1906, pp. 38-56 (showing the position with regard to this matter of Dionysius of Alexandria).

## § 23

The Eucharist, the Agape, the *Disciplina Arcani*<sup>1</sup>

I. Conformably with its institution at the Last Supper, the Eucharist was originally celebrated in the evening at the conclusion of the *Agape*. At a very early date the celebration was transferred to the morning; possibly, having regard to the abuses already prevalent in the time of St. Paul (1 *Cor.* xi. 20 ff.), this change may have occurred towards the end of the Apostolic period; possibly it may have been a result of Trajan's decree against the *Hetaeriae*, or illicit nocturnal gatherings. We learn from *Acts* (ii. 42) that the early Christian meeting comprised the 'doctrine of the Apostles,' *i.e.* the expounding of Holy Writ, the breaking of bread, and prayers. According to the fuller account left by Justin,<sup>2</sup> the ceremony began with a lesson from Scripture, followed by a sermon by the bishop and prayers recited in common. The Faithful having exchanged the kiss of peace, bread and wine (the latter mixed with water) were offered to the bishop, who pronounced over them several prayers and gave thanks (*εὐχαριστία*, cp. *Matt.* xxvi. 27), whereupon the elements were administered by the deacons, as the Body and Blood of Christ, to the Faithful present at the gathering, or carried to those who were absent. One detail, *viz.* the singing of hymns, seems to have been omitted from the above account. At least it is certain that the singing of psalms had its place side by side with prayer, the lesson of Scripture and the homily, in the synagogue service of the Jews of the Dispersion, and the Christians can scarcely have failed to follow suit.

The celebration seems generally to have taken place on Sunday.<sup>3</sup> Tertullian<sup>4</sup> alludes to one being held on the days on

<sup>1</sup> CABROL and LECLERCQ, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, I, 1902; PROBST, *Liturgie der 3 ersten chr. Jahrh.* 1870; *Sakramente*, 1872, pp. 194-244; BICKELL, *Messe u. Pascha*, 1872; WARREN, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, 1897; *RE. d. chr. A.* II, 309-26; P. BATIFFOL, *Études d'histoire*, 3rd ed. 1904; RAUSCHEN, *Eucharistie u. Bussakrament in d. ersten 6 Jahrh.* 1908.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.* I, 65-67.

<sup>3</sup> *Doct. Ap.* 14; *PLIN. Ep.* X, 97; *JUST. Apol.* I, 67 (*Acts* xx. 7).

<sup>4</sup> *De orat.* 19.

which stations (see below, § 25, I) were made. Cyprian<sup>1</sup> even speaks of a daily offering. The daily 'breaking of bread' spoken of in *Acts* (ii. 46) seems to have been a practice peculiar to the Church of Jerusalem; it may possibly have resulted from the fusion of the *Agape* with the Eucharist.

The celebrant at such meetings was the bishop, assisted by the priests and other ministers. Though a priest could, under given circumstances, take the bishop's place, yet he was not allowed to do so without the latter's authorisation. Where there were several churches, the Eucharist was consecrated only in the bishop's own, whence it was carried to the other churches by acolyths. In Rome this continued to be the practice even long after the period of which we are speaking, and it was looked upon as a symbol of ecclesiastical unity, and as a means of preserving it.<sup>2</sup>

II. It was customary to receive Communion under both elements, and, as it clearly appears from Justin's description, the rule was to receive it at every service in which the Eucharist was consecrated; hence the frequency of its reception was governed solely by the frequency of the Eucharistic celebrations. The consecrated Bread was, moreover, given to the Faithful for them to take home and partake of daily, in which custom we first meet with Communion under one species. The practice of fasting-Communion is mentioned even by Tertullian, and doubtless it goes back to the time when the Eucharist began to be celebrated in the morning. With regard to the manner of reception, the Bread was simply placed in the hands of the receiver.

III. Only the Faithful, that is, the baptised, could receive Communion; catechumens were debarred; not only were the latter forbidden to receive the Eucharist, they were not even allowed to assist at the principal portion of the celebration, being compelled to leave at the Offertory. They had to be content with assisting at the didactic part of the service; as soon as this was over, they, in company with the demoniacs and the public penitents, had to retire. The Eucharist was accounted a thing beyond their comprehension, and a similar

<sup>1</sup> *De orat. dom.* 18; *Ep.* 57, c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Liber pont. Vita Miltiadis*, and *Vita Siricii*, INNOC. I, *Ep.* 1 *ad Decent.* c. 5.

reservation was made with regard to Baptism. In other words, to use the modern expression, there existed a *disciplina arcana*, or 'discipline of the secret.'<sup>1</sup> This discipline may be traced back to the second century, Justin being a witness in its favour rather than against it. The Fathers generally justify it by quoting *Matt.* vii. 6, but most probably the practice was encouraged for pedagogical reasons, the object being to lead the proselytes step by step into the fulness of the religion of Christ. The *disciplina arcana* was flourishing in the fourth century, but, with the decay of paganism in the Roman Empire, and the consequent deficiency of catechumens, it began to fall into disuse in the fifth century.

IV. As already remarked, the Eucharist was originally preceded by the *Agape*,<sup>2</sup> and even after the celebration of the Eucharist had been separated from the *Agape*, the latter continued to be held as a charity meal for the poor. The food was provided by the Faithful, and the meal was accompanied by prayers and hymns, and also, no doubt, by a sermon; its object was the support of the poor and the maintenance of brotherly love among the Christians. But the meal soon degenerated, and on account of the excesses to which it gave rise,<sup>3</sup> its being held in the Church was repeatedly forbidden, last of all by the Council in Trullo. Banished from the Church, the practice was discontinued, though, but a short time since, it still survived in Abyssinia and among the Christians of St. Thomas in India, and probably it yet lingers on in these remot.

V. In the earliest times the Faithful met for Divine worship in private houses; but, from the third century, buildings were set apart for church services. At Rome the anniversaries of the martyrs were solemnised at their tombs in the catacombs—the long underground galleries in which most of the Christians of early times were buried. Cp. KRAUS, *Roma sott.* (NORTHCOTE and BROWNLOW, *Rom. sott.*)

<sup>1</sup> H. GRAVEL, *Die Arkandisziplin*, I, 1902; FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, 2.

<sup>2</sup> KEATING, *The Agape and the Eucharist*, 1901; FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Can. Hippol.* ed. ACHELIS, 105-11; cp. 2 *Peter II.* 13.

## § 24

The Penitential Discipline<sup>1</sup>

Claiming to be a society of saints, the ancient Church could not endure the presence of evil-doers in her midst. The three capital sins of adultery or fornication, of idolatry, and of murder were rewarded with expulsion. Yet at no time was it believed that such excommunicates were lost for all eternity: the general conviction was that such people, by sincere penance, could obtain pardon of God. Hermas, who is a witness to this belief (*Mand.* IV. 3), speaks expressly of penance and forgiveness; and though he evidently considers it in the light of an extraordinary dispensation granted by God for a time, and thinks that Christians who shall again fall into sin after this new revelation will have no claim on God's mercy, yet later writers, such as Dionysius of Corinth, Tertullian, in his work *De paenitentia*, and Clement of Alexandria, all of them speak, without any such reservation, of penance as the second means of salvation. Whenever a confessor or martyr chose to intercede for one of the fallen, or to countersign a *Libellus pacis*, as the written plea was then called, reconciliation nearly always followed as a matter of course, that is, the penitent was readmitted to Communion as soon as the martyr had given effect to his intercession by his death. It is difficult to secure any accurate information concerning the then practice until we reach the third century. Cyprian (*Ep.* 55, c. 21) witnesses to a twofold custom having prevailed in Africa, some of the bishops (though not the majority) refusing absolutely to readmit adulterers into the Church. It is possible that in some cases absolution was granted to the sinner on his death-bed. Rome was the first to pave the way to a milder practice; Callistus (217-22) decided that, due penance having been performed, those guilty of unchaste acts could be reconciled to the Church, whilst Cornelius (251-53) extended this dispensation to those also who had fallen into idolatry; those only were

<sup>1</sup> MORINUS, *Comment. hist. de disciplina in admin. sacr. paenitentiae*, 1682; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 155-209; *KL.* II, 1561 ff.; P. BATIFFOL, *Études d'histoire*, 1904; *Journal of Theol. Studies*, IV. (1903), 321-37; F. PIGNATARO, *De disciplina paenit. priorum eccl. saeculorum*, 1904; G. ESSER, *Die Busschriften Tertullians u. d. Indulgenzedikt d. Papstes Kallistus*, 1905; RAUSCHEN, *Euch. u. Bussakr.* 1908.

excluded who delayed their repentance until the hour of death. The need of some change was already apparent, for if perpetual exclusion from the society of the Faithful was in some cases productive of good, in that it roused the sinner to repentance, in other cases it led to results which were anything but desirable. In spite of this, the innovations called forth protests, and each of them, in combination with other circumstances, gave rise to a schism (cp. §§ 32, 35). Outside of Rome the reform likewise found opponents: Origen, in his work *De oratione* (c. 28, written about 233-34), declares bluntly that to readmit those who had fallen into idolatry and incontinence is to outstep the powers of the priesthood and to transgress the disciplinary laws of the Church; in Spain the Council of Elvira pronounced the sentence of perpetual excommunication against all who should render themselves guilty of idolatry (c. 1, 2), of malefices or sorcery (6), of prostitution (12), or of marrying a Christian daughter to a heathen priest (17); but the Spanish Church of the period was quite exceptional in the severity of its laws.

The discipline of the Roman Church was adopted generally, but it remained what it was: that is, one extra chance, and one only, was given to the sinner; just as there was only one Baptism, so there was only one Penance. Accordingly, those who were guilty of a second backsliding could expect no more mercy from the Church.

To be readmitted into the Church the repentant sinner had to confess his sin and make amends for it by penance in sackcloth and ashes, by fasting and prayer for a determined period, often until the very end of his life. The confession, when the sin was a matter of public knowledge, was usually, so at least it would seem, made publicly in the presence of the assembled Church. When, however, the sin was private, then the confession was made privately to a priest; the rule was, however, to repeat such confessions before the Church, except, of course, when the sin was of a nature to scandalise the Faithful.<sup>1</sup> The importance attributed to this confession is clear from the word *ἔξομολόγησις* being used to designate the whole work of penance, and this not only in the Latin, but also in the Greek Church. Permission to receive Communion was

<sup>1</sup> ORIG. *Hom. II, in psalm 37, c. 6.*

granted only after complete performance of the penance, the sole exception made being in favour of those dangerously ill ; even the latter, if restored to health, were expected to complete their penance as soon as they recovered their strength. The act of reconciling the penitent was performed by imposition of the bishop's hands, the bishop's place, in his absence, being taken by a priest, or even by a deacon.

The single protracted penance of which we have been speaking was reserved for capital sins ; lesser sins could be remitted more frequently, and for their remission other means than penance could be utilised, namely, the so-called works of mercy.

The general direction of the penitents was in the hands of the bishop, and it was he who, usually, declared the sinner reconciled, but in the larger Churches he was, naturally, assisted in his work by the priests. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, Pope Marcellus (308) was the first thus to disburden himself. At a later date we hear of priests in the East called *penitentiaries* ; their duty was to welcome the penitents, to fix an equivalent penance for the sin committed, and to see that this penance was duly performed.

An Eastern practice was the dividing of the penitents into classes, those namely of the Hearers, the Prostrates, and the Assistants ; of these the first two are alluded to in the *Epistula canonica* of Gregory Thaumaturgus, whilst the last is mentioned by the Council of Ancyra (314, c. 25). A fourth and lowest class of all, that of the Weepers, is of somewhat later origin. These classes were quite unknown in the West, nor were they in vogue everywhere in the East ; in fact they seem to have been peculiar to Asia Minor, and even there they differed according to the regions.

I. The Weepers (*προσκλαίοντες*) were altogether excluded from the sacred edifice. Their place was in the courtyard, near the entrance, where they had to implore with many tears the intercession of the Faithful as they passed on their way to church. They are first mentioned by St. Basil. The *χειμαζόμενοι* mentioned by the Council of Ancyra, in 314 (c. 17), who were formerly identified with the Weepers, can in reality only have been *energumeni*, possessed of evil spirits. Nowhere do we find the word (*χειμάζοντες*) used in Antiquity to denote an ecclesiastical situation.

II. The Hearers (*ἀκροώμενοι*) were assimilated to the catechumens, and were consequently allowed to attend the exhortatory part of the services ; hence their name.

III. The Prostrates (*ὑποπίπτοντες*) were allowed to remain in the church after the departure of the Hearers, on the condition, however, of lying prostrate, or at least kneeling during the rest of the service.

IV. The Assistants (*συστάντες, συνεστῶτες, συνιστάμενοι*) could, like the Faithful, remain standing; but they were not permitted to receive Communion.

In the West all penitents seem to have had the privileges of the two latter classes; at any rate, there is no proof of penitents ever having been required to leave the church before the Offertory. Sozomen (*H. E.* VII, 16) seems to say that in the Roman Church they remained for the whole service, without, however, partaking of the Eucharist. Cp. *Th. Qu.* 1900, pp. 481-534; 1903, pp. 254-70; *RHE.* 1906, pp. 16-26.

## § 25

### Festivals and Fast-days; the Paschal Quarrel<sup>1</sup>

Under the old Covenant there was a weekly day of worship, and, in addition, certain feast-days occurring at fixed seasons during the year. Among the more rigorous Jews it was customary also to fast twice in the week (*Luke* xviii. 12), on the Monday and the Thursday. These customs told on the discipline of the Christian Church.

I. The Christians devoted one day in the week to the special worship of the Almighty, but for this purpose they chose, not the Sabbath or seventh day, which was kept by the Jews, but the first day of the week, as being the day on which our Lord rose from the dead. For this reason the **Sunday** came to be called, in the language of the Church, the Lord's day, *κυριακή, dies dominica*, and, as a sign of rejoicing, the prayers on that day were said standing. We may trace back the observation of the Sunday to the very earliest times (*Αποκ.* i. 10). The Judæo-Christians, in addition, kept also the Sabbath.

At an early date Wednesdays and Fridays became fast-days; as such they are mentioned, together with the corresponding Jewish fasts, by the *Didache* (8, 1), whilst in the West they were called *dies stationis, i.e.* Vigils or Watch-days. The

<sup>1</sup> PROBST, *Kirchl. Disziplin*, 1873; A. LINSSENMAYER, *Entw. d. kirchl. Fastendisziplin bis zum Konzil von Nicäa*, 1877; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 241-58; H. KELLNER, *Heortologie*, 1901 (English Trans. 1908); *D. Z. f. KR.* XVI (1906), 100-13.

fast only lasted half the day, until the nones or ninth hour (3 p.m.). On such days it was customary to hold a service; in Alexandria only the didactic portion of the Liturgy was read, in Western Africa the whole service was performed (see above, § 23). The Council of Elvira (c. 26) mentions also a fast on the Saturday, and it is probable that even at this period a similar fast was observed in Rome.

II. Two of the annual festivals of the Jews continued to be kept by the Christians, because of the events by which these days had been signalled at the beginning of the Christian era. The first of these feasts was **Easter**, the Pasch or Pass-over, the commemoration of the sparing of the first-born of the Jews when among the Egyptians, and of Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian bondage; this the Christians kept in memory of the death and Resurrection of Christ. The other was the Feast of Weeks or harvest festival, also known as **Pentecost**, Πεντεκοστή, kept in recollection of the Descent of the Holy Ghost. As these feasts were no longer consecrated to their original objects, their meaning was altered, but their Jewish parentage was apparent both in their names and in the fashion in which they were calculated, which depended, not on the solar, but on the lunar year. These feasts, which were derived directly from the Old Testament, reach back to the very beginning of the Church, and for some time they remained her only annual festivals. In the East, however, another feast soon made its appearance, that of the **Epiphany**; this, in the first instance, commemorated the revelation of Christ's Divinity at His Baptism in the Jordan and at the wedding-feast at Cana (hence its other name: the Theophany); at a later period it came to commemorate the birth of Christ. Lastly, each Church kept with solemn celebrations the anniversary days of its martyrs' deaths, such a day being called his *dies natalis*, having been his birthday to a higher life.

III. **Easter** was not kept everywhere on the same day. The larger portion of the Church kept it on the Sunday, which fell on, or next followed, the fourteenth Nisan (*i.e.* the first full moon after the vernal equinox), choosing the Sunday because Christ rose on that day. On the other hand, the Christians of the province of Asia, who, by the way, appealed for support to the practice of the Apostle John, invariably, and without

any regard for the day of the week, kept the feast on the fourteenth Nisan—in other words, on the day on which, according to the Synoptists, Christ's death occurred; nor do they appear to have found anything unseemly in keeping Easter on this day, probably because they considered the feast as a memorial day of the whole work of salvation rather than of the Resurrection merely. Hence, in Asia Minor, the feast of Easter almost always fell on a different date from that kept in the rest of Christendom, and the divergency was all the more noticeable from the solemnity of the feast in question. Efforts were repeatedly made to secure uniformity. We hear of negotiations between Pope Anicetus (155–65) and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, but neither of these saintly bishops was able to induce the other to relinquish the practice of his predecessors.<sup>1</sup> Nor was Pope Victor (189–98) one whit more successful, though he caused the matter to be debated at a number of Councils. Led by Polycrates of Ephesus, the Asiatics remained obstinately attached to their old Quartodecimanism.<sup>2</sup> In the course of the third century they must, however, have dropped their practice, for when we next hear of them, at the Council of Nicæa, they are among the supporters of the common custom.<sup>3</sup> But uniformity had not yet been attained. In early times the Jewish calculations as to the Paschal full moon had been accepted without question, but soon, especially in the greater Churches, the Christians began to reckon the date independently, probably because they had remarked that the Jewish reckonings were carelessly made and that Easter was often antedated, or possibly because they objected to being made dependent on the Jews. In other places the Jewish reckoning was adhered to, the Sunday after the Jews' Passover being kept as Easter, which, by the way, is the method prescribed by the *Didascalia*. As we learn from the Council of Nicæa, this practice—which later on obtained for its followers the nickname of Protopaschites, because it so often led to Easter being kept too early—was especially prevalent in Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia. There were yet other divergencies owing to differences in reckoning the equinox itself; hence the matter was to crop up repeatedly for discussion (see below, § 69).

<sup>1</sup> Eus. V, 24, 16–18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* V, 24, 1–15.

<sup>3</sup> Eus. *Vit. Constant.* III, 17–20.

Easter was preceded by a fast. The latter it was customary to support by the words of Christ (*Matt.* ix. 15), and, as Tertullian puts it, it lasted as long as the days *in quibus ablatus est sponsus* (*De ieiun.* 2). But its duration was different according to the locality; according to Irenæus (Eusebius, V. 24), some fasted one day, others two, and yet others many days, whilst some simply observed a fast of forty hours. It would seem to follow from this that the early fasts were very short; their shortness was, however, compensated for by their severity: such fasts might not be broken for the whole day, some even fasted for several days without a break. Thus the *Didascalia* prescribes in set words an unbroken fast for the Friday and Saturday of Holy Week; the same work also ordains a previous fast of four days on bread, salt, and water; hence the practice for which it vouches is really a six-days' fast. This was also the practice known to Dionysius of Alexandria.

The word **Pasch** is from the Hebrew פסח, Pesah, or rather from the Aramaic פסחא = Passover (*i.e.* of the Lord, when the first-born of the Egyptians were slain). Those of the Fathers who derived it from the Greek πάσχειν were misled by the verbal similarity. The English word 'Easter' is from the Anglo-Saxon *Eostre*; the German 'Ostern' from *Ostâra*, the goddess of dawn, whose feast occurred at Easter. Cp. HEFELE, *Beiträge*, II, 285 f.

ZAHN, in his *Forschungen* (IV, 1891, 283-303; VI, 1900, 106, note 1), seeks to show that the point at issue between Polycarp and Anicetus concerned, not the celebration of Easter, but the fast which preceded it; that whereas Polycarp was acquainted with such a fast, Anicetus was not, and that such a fast was not introduced into the Roman Church until after the time of Pope Soter; see, however, *Kath.* 1902, I, 314-27.

## § 26

### The Christian Morals<sup>1</sup>

As the writer of the Letter to Diognetus (5, 1-4) remarks, 'Christians differ from the rest of men neither in their

<sup>1</sup> NEANDER, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, I (Engl. Trans. *Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages*, Bohn's Libr.); FUNK, *Gesch. des kirchl. Zinsverbots*, 1876; *A. u. U.* II, 45-60; E. v. DOBSCHÜTZ, *Die urchristl. Gemeinden; sitten-geschichtl. Bilder*, 1902; A. BIGELMAIR, *Die Beteiligung der Christen am öffentl. Leben in vorkonstantinischer Zeit*, 1902; H. ACHERIS, *Virgines subintroductae*, 1902; *Bibl. Z.* III (1905), 44-69; HARNACK, *Militia Christi*, 1905.

food, nor in their manner of dress and lodging; in such-like matters they follow the customs of their respective countries.' 'We Christians,' says Tertullian to the heathen in his *Apologeticum* (42), 'do not live in your world without sharing your forum, your baths, your workshops and markets, and all your business; like you, we are seamen or soldiers, farmers or merchants, and like you we offer for sale the produce of our art or toil.' Sayings such as these were true, for the natural necessities of life were not changed by the advent of Christianity. But where it became a question of religious or moral matters, then the difference between Christians and pagans was at once apparent. As the *Letter* already quoted says: 'Christians live in the flesh, but not according to the flesh; they dwell indeed on earth, but their conversation is in Heaven.' This 'otherworldliness' of theirs was all the more noticeable, surrounded as they were by pagan sensuality. The shows, gladiatorial sports, combats with wild beasts, and similar heathen amusements were shunned by the Christians, on account of the immorality or cruelty which they involved.<sup>1</sup> Some of them even refused to be present at executions.<sup>2</sup> Anxious only to lay up treasure in heaven, they cared but little for the goods of this world, freely spending their belongings for the benefit of their neighbours. 'We who once devoted all our energies to the pursuit of wealth,' writes Justin,<sup>3</sup> 'now distribute our possessions to others, giving alms to all the needy.' Money given as a loan was never to enrich the lender; the taking of interest was held in abhorrence; by the Council of Elvira (c. 20) the practice was forbidden under sentence of excommunication, though the Council of Nicæa (c. 17) and the other ancient synods held this punishment to apply to clerics only. The Christians were also wont to cut down their expenses to the lowest possible limit; all finery and ornaments, all pomp and display were banished, among the practices at which they looked askance being the wearing of ear-rings, the painting of the eyes and cheeks, dyeing, the wearing of false hair, and shaving.<sup>4</sup> All these

<sup>1</sup> TERT. *De spectaculis*; THEOPH. *Ad Autol.* III, 15; LACT. *Inst.* VI, 20.

<sup>2</sup> ATHENAG. *Leg.* 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Apol.* I, 14.

<sup>4</sup> CLEM. ALEX. *Paed.* II, 8, 12; III, 2, 11; TERT. *De cultu fem.*; COMMOD. *Inst.* II, 19.

things were held to be mere wantonness, when, indeed, they were not incentives to sin; to decorate oneself was as bad as to reproach the Creator with not having made man as beautiful as he should be, to pierce the ears was to sin against the order of things as established by God. The reaction against paganism even led the Christians to taboo certain deeds more trivial than those just spoken of. Thus they esteemed flowers, in common with all other natural products, as gifts of the Almighty, yet many of the Christians deemed it sinful to use them for the adornment of the head or for wreaths with which to decorate the tombs, arguing that such practices were unnatural and contrary to reason, or that they involved something of paganism.<sup>1</sup> But, however strong the feeling of the Christians may have been concerning such matters, they also felt that differences of social status had to be taken into account; zealous as he was against anything approaching luxury, Clement of Alexandria takes care to let us see that his crusade is, not so much against the wearing of jewellery and fine clothes, as against the inordinate love of such things.<sup>2</sup>

Another point is worthy of separate mention. Second marriages were not absolutely reprobated; the Apostle Paul had even counselled young widows to seek new husbands (1 *Tim.* v. 14); they were, however, regarded unfavourably by the early Church. We already know that a second marriage disabled a man from receiving Orders; at a later date it was even punished by ecclesiastical penance, and in view of this the clergy were forbidden to take any part in such weddings.<sup>3</sup> Athenagoras,<sup>4</sup> very bluntly, calls such marriages a decorous means of committing adultery: *ἐνπρεπῆς μοιχεία*. Many Christians, mindful of the counsel of Scripture, voluntarily forbore to marry (see above, § 19), whilst others contracted a spiritual marriage. The maid or widow who entered into such a contract came to be known as *συνείσακτος*, *subintroducta*. A little later, the initiative of such marriages was often taken by the female, rich ladies bringing into their houses, for the protection of their persons and for the administration of their property, a man, usually a monk. This practice

<sup>1</sup> CLEM. ALEX. *Paed.* II, 8; TERT. *De corona militis*; MINUC. FEL. 12, 38.

<sup>2</sup> CLEM. *Paed.* II, 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Conc. Neocaesar.* c. 7; *Laodic.* c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Leg.* 33.

may in certain instances have proved dangerous, or it may simply have aroused suspicion; at any rate, from the middle of the third century we hear complaints, and the Councils of the next period, beginning with that of Ancyra, 314 (c. 19), laid it under a ban. It did not, however, completely disappear till much later (cp. § 60).

We have already seen that the pagans were not unaware of the Christians' good morals (§ 14). Perhaps the most striking testimonial in their favour was that given by the physician Galen (†200), who praises their scorn for death, their purity and their continence, and for their self-control and their honour likens some of them to the ideal philosopher.

## CHAPTER IV

### HERESIES AND SCHISMS<sup>1</sup>

#### § 27

#### The Meaning of Heresy and Schism—Simon Magus and Menander

I. THOSE to whom the Gospel was preached did not, all of them, receive it as the very word of God, to which nothing may be added, and from which nothing must be taken. Some imagined that they might season it with other elements, and it was this mistaken notion which gave rise to the **heresies**. The elements in question were either of Jewish or of pagan origin. Many of the converts from Judaism found it difficult to believe that the olden dispensation had been abolished by the new; to them it seemed that the old Law had not lost its binding force, and, through excessive esteem of the Law, they came to form too low an idea of the new dispensation, and of the nature of its Founder. On the other hand, the pagans found it difficult to enter into the Christian doctrine concerning Creation and the nature of evil, and, as Creation out of nothing appeared to them unthinkable, they proceeded to oppose to the Christian monism a dualistic system of philosophy. Consistently with its twofold origin, heresy (*αἵρεσις*) assumed two forms, according as it mingled Christianity with Judaism or with paganism, though in the

<sup>1</sup> IREN. *Adv. haereses*; HIPPI. *Refut. omnium haer.*; EPIPH. *Panarium*; THEOD. *Fabul. haer. compendium*; PHILASTR. *De haeresibus*; AUG. *De haer., Praedestinatus, De haer.*; PS. TERT. *Adv. omn. haer.* (= TERT. *De praescr. c.* 45-53); CH. W. F. WALCH, *Historie d. Ketzereien usw.* II vol. 1762-85; HILGENFELD, *Ketzergesch. des Urchristentums*, 1884; HARNACK, *Dogmengesch.* 3 vol. 3rd ed. 1894-97 (Engl. Trans. *History of Dogma*, 1894-99); *Z. f. w. Th.* 1890, pp. 1-63.

event the distinction was not always quite clear, some heretics being equally influenced by both Jewish doctrine and pagan speculation.

II. Whilst heresy involves a deviation from the Church's doctrine, **Schism** (*σχίσμα, σχίζειν*) consists in a departure from the Church's discipline, or more correctly in a separation from the body of the Church, brought about by circumstances of discipline. In the earliest period of the Church, it was chiefly the question of penance which gave rise to such divisions.

III. According to the Fathers, the patriarch of heretics was that **Simon Magus** of Giddon in Samaria who is spoken of in *Acts* (viii. 9 ff.), their motive for thus considering him being the fact that he was the first known opponent of Christianity. It is not, however, easy to find any Christian element whatever in his teaching; he seems to have given himself out as the manifestation of a Godhead previously unknown, and his doctrine of Creation was one of emanation pure and simple. His countryman, **Menander**, who succeeded him, taught a like doctrine of Creation, and, if he did not actually represent himself as God, yet he allowed it to be known that he was the redeemer sent from the higher world for the salvation of mankind.

Simon Magus (whom Baur, *KG.* 2nd ed. I, 190, wrongly considers to have been a mere personification of the so-called Gnosis), or rather his school, seems to have taught that from the highest God there proceeds, in the first instance, Ennoia, from whom, in their turn, other spirits emanate. The latter it was who formed the world, and who, in order to conceal their parentage, imprisoned Ennoia, the Mother of all, in matter. She, the lost sheep of the Gospel (*Matt.* xviii. 12), after wandering through body after body, entered finally into that of Helena of Tyre, Simon's companion. To effect her deliverance and to redeem men, Simon, God's own mighty power, took the form of man and descended to earth; coming to the Jews—among whom he suffered in appearance only—as the Son, to the Samaritans as the Father, and to the Nations as the Holy Ghost. All that is required for salvation is belief in Simon and Helena; he who has this faith need trouble about naught else, and may behave as he pleases; for it is God's mercy which saves, and not works of righteousness. The fact is—in spite of all that the demiurges have taught, in their desire of bringing men into bondage—there are no such things as good works. In practice, this teaching had lamentable results. Following the master's example, the adherents of this sect, which survived

as late as the fourth century, cultivated the arts of magic and sorcery (IREN. I, 23; SCHENKEL, *Bibelllexikon*, V, 301-21; PRÄFKE, *Leben u. Lehre Simons d. M. nach den pseudoklem. Homilien*, 1895).

### § 28

#### The Judaizing Christians--The Ebionites, Cerinthus, the Elkasaïtes

I. The heresy of the Judaizers was a result of the convert Jews clinging to the Law in which they had been educated. From the very beginning the Jewish converts seem to have been split into two factions, some holding that the Law was binding on all Christians, whatever religion they had professed before their conversion, others holding that it continued to bind only converts from Judaism. It was not long before the rigorist party severed its connection with Christianity. After having received a first blow at the Council of Jerusalem, it appears to have officially seceded from the Church, in 63, after the death of the Apostle James, by electing a rival bishop, Thebutis, in opposition to Simeon of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> With the progress of time it was felt that the practices even of the milder party, which did not seek to impose on all the observance of the Mosaic Law, were scarcely compatible with the profession of Christianity. Even in Justin's time they were shunned by many of the Christians, though Justin himself allows that they still have some hope of salvation.<sup>2</sup> After Justin no Church writer speaks even of the latter class as forming part of the Catholic Church. Moreover, the grounds of the distinction between the two factions were slowly altering; formerly it was the stress laid on the observance of the Law, now it is the difference in their beliefs concerning Christ, which serves to distinguish them one from the other.<sup>3</sup> The rigorist Judæo-Christians accounted Christ to be a mere man; whilst the other party believed at least in the Virgin birth. The former party emerges into history under a definite name only at the end of the second century. Irenæus bestows on

<sup>1</sup> EUS. IV, 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.* 47.

<sup>3</sup> ORIG. *Cont. Cels.* V, 61; EUS. III, 27.

these heretics the appellation of **Ebionites**, and informs us that they would not acknowledge the authority of St. Paul. According to their own account, their name was adopted to denote their poverty; it must therefore be derived from the Hebrew עֲבִיּוֹנִים, though many of the Fathers speak of a certain Ebion as their founder. The more orthodox Judaizers are, by St. Epiphanius, called **Nazarenes**. This name was known also to Jerome, though he makes no clear distinction between Ebionite and Nazarene, and uses both names almost indiscriminately. The sect had a Syro-Chaldaic, or Aramaic Gospel, which, on account of the language in which it was written and of the nationality of those who used it, was called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Ev. secundum Hebraeos*). Their headquarters—owing to the Christians having evacuated Jerusalem at the outbreak of the Jewish war with Titus and Vespasian, and departed to Pella—were in Peræa, whence they spread into some parts of Syria.<sup>1</sup>

II. **Cerinthus**, a late contemporary of the Apostle John—who, according to Irenæus, wrote his Gospel in confutation of this heretic—associated with Christianity not only Jewish, but also Gnostic teachings. The Creator of the world was not God, but an angel. Jesus was originally an ordinary man, but at his baptism Christ descended on him, and through him manifested to men the unknown Father; at the beginning of the Passion Christ again forsook Jesus. At the end of time, after the resurrection, a kingdom, teeming with earthly joys, will be established on this earth (IREN. I, 26, 1; III, 3, 4; III, 11, 1). *Th. Qu.* 1904, pp. 20–38.

III. The **Elkasaites**, who by Epiphanius (*H.* 53) are called Sampsæans, traced their parentage to a certain Elkasai. They owed allegiance to the Law of Moses, though they discarded sacrifice; they also practised magic and astrology. They had a baptism of their own and many ritual purifications; Christ regarded as a superior Æon, whom they believed to have several times become incarnate, first of all in Adam (*Philos.* X, 13–17). According to CHWOLSON (*Die Ssabier*, I, 114 ff.), they have survived to the present day under the name of Sabæans (*i.e.* 'washers') or Mendaitæ (*i.e.* 'Penitents') in the southern regions of Mesopotamia.

IV. According to the **Clementine Homilies** (ed. DRESSEL, 1853; LAGARDE, 1865), the original Revelation made at the Creation was eclipsed by sin, but, again and again, made visible by the true Prophet who became manifest in Adam, Moses, and Christ. Hence the true law of Moses—not that distorted version

<sup>1</sup> *KL.* IV, 82 ff.

of it which is found in the Old Testament—were it known, would be identical with Christianity. Creation is explained as a kind of emanation; vegetarianism, early marriage, and poverty are recommended as the best restraints for concupiscence. All this teaching is put forward in the garb of a kind of romance, which details the adventures of Clement of Rome in his search for truth. A like material has been used in another work, the so-called *Clementine Recognitions*, which have been preserved in the Latin translation of Rufinus; in the latter, however, the Jewish element has been to some extent ousted by the Christian. The two writings seem to be based on some document going back to 200, though other materials have been utilised. The problem of their origin is one of the riddles of history, at which countless scholars have laboured (cp. H. U. MEYBOOM, *De Clemens-Roman*, 2 vol. 1902-04; H. WAITZ, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 1904 [CHAPMAN, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1901-02, pp. 436-41]; *Z. f. w. Th.* 1906, pp. 66-133.

## § 29

### Gnosticism, its Origin and General Characteristics<sup>1</sup>

It was the persistent problem of the origin of evil which provoked the rise of Gnosticism.<sup>2</sup> The existence of evil in the world being manifest, the question: *πόθεν τὸ κακόν*;—‘Whence is evil?’ was bound to suggest itself, and was also bound to lead to the further question as to whether God could be conceived of as the originator of an evil world. A negative answer being given to this question, yet another arose as to the manner in which the world came into being. Lastly there obtruded itself the practical question: ‘How can we overcome the evil which is against God’s Will, and which has no right to be?’ To many the answers given by Christianity seemed insufficient, and accordingly they sought, by drawing in new elements—derived, some of them from the Greek philosophy, others from the pagan religions of the East, especially from Parseeism—a more consistent solution to their questionings. To the Church’s Faith, or *πίστις*, they opposed their knowledge, or

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by MÖHLER (Collected Works, I, 403-35); E. NEANDER, 1818; F. Ch. BAUR, 1835; LIPSIUS, 1860; AMÉLINEAU (*Essai sur le Gn. égyptien*), 1887; KUNZE (*De historiae gnosticisimi fontibus*), 1894; *T. u. U.* XV, 4 (for the origin of Gnosticism); E. FAYE, *Introduction à l’étude du gnosticisme au II<sup>e</sup> et au III<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* VI, 12, 96, p. 788; TERT. *De praescr.* 7; EUS. V, 27; EPIPH. *H.* 24, 6.

γνώσις, which—because, unlike the Church's own γνώσις, it failed to take its stand on Faith, but transcended Faith and replaced it to all purposes by a different doctrine—was termed by the Fathers ψευδώνυμος γνώσις (or 'knowledge falsely so-called,' 1 *Tim.* vi. 20), and afterwards received the name of Gnosticism.

The new doctrine was essentially dualistic. All Gnostic systems have this much in common, that they posit an opposition between God and uncreated matter, whether they conceive of this matter after Plato's fashion, as devoid of substance and form (= μὴ ὄν), or whether, following their Parsee teachers, they look upon it as animated by a principle of evil. It was also the common teaching of the Gnostics that from the hidden God there proceeded by emanation (προβολή) a series of Æons or spirits, whose goodness diminished in proportion to their distance from their source. In the course of this process of degradation, elements of the kingdom of Light (πλήρωμα) had come to be mingled with Matter (ὑλη), and it is from these mingled elements that the world has since been made. The actual building of the world was the work of the lowest Æon, the so-called Demiurge, who was also the Legislator of the Old Testament. The aim of Creation was the freeing of the elements of Light imprisoned in matter. Hence Creation was a beginning of the Redemption, though merely a beginning; to complete the work a higher Æon had to come, preaching the true and highest God and the existence of a world above, and teaching men how to overcome matter and effect their deliverance. The Redeemer assumed the appearance of a man (hence the name of *Docetism*), some believing that his body was merely a phantasm, others that he descended on Jesus, the Messiah sent by the Demiurge, at his baptism, and remained in him until the Passion. In the Redemption thus effected only the *Pneumatists*, that is the Gnostics, can share. *Hylists* or material-minded men, *i.e.* the great mass of mankind, are, like matter itself, doomed to perdition. Some of the Gnostics reckoned another category, that of the simple Faithful or *Psychists*, to whom they attributed a middle place in the next world. Of the Redeemer's work, the end and object is the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, the restoring of all things to the place which befits their nature.

Hence salvation, according to the Gnostics, is a cosmic process, and the Redemption—the only element which Gnosticism borrowed from Christianity, and which accounts for the system being accounted a Christian rather than a pagan heresy—is merely a part of the evolution of the world. Consistently enough, the Gnostic ethics was of a physical character, and, agreeably to the doctrine that all matter is evil, it began by being exceedingly, in fact unnaturally, rigorous, though afterwards it not unfrequently ran to the opposite extreme, and this all the more easily because the identification of the Legislator of the Old Testament with the Demiurge conduced to a spirit of hopeless lawlessness. The claim to a higher knowledge also led to outward actions being discounted ; Gnostics considered it allowable to join in pagan rites, nor could they be brought to see the need of confessing the Faith before the persecutor, holding as they did that the true Confession, or martyrdom, consisted in the Gnosis.

A species of Gnosticism may be traced back to Simon Magus and Cerinthus, but it was in the second century, under the leadership of a series of clever men, that it attained its majority and assumed an aspect so threatening as to compel the Fathers of the period to come into conflict with it. The character of the system being syncretic, its invention cannot be ascribed to any one heresiarch ; the only information we obtain from history relates to certain of the Gnostic factions and the founders of some of the Gnostic schools of thought.

### § 30

#### Individual Gnostics

I. According to Irenæus (I, 24), the real heads of the Gnostics were **Saturnilus** and **Basilides**. The former, who lived at Antioch, divided mankind into two classes. The wicked, with the assistance of the demons, would have prevailed against the good, had not Christ, in the appearance of human flesh, come to the rescue of his own. This sect accounted marriage as an institution of the devil, and many of its members practised abstinence from flesh-meat.

II. The teaching of **Basilides**, who dwelt at Alexandria in the time of Adrian, has come down to us in two notably diverse descriptions. Both accounts concur, however, as to the groundwork of Basilides's system. Hippolytus really agrees with Irenæus

in describing it as a species of dualism rather than of pantheism, though some authors have not been willing to admit this (cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 358-72), and it is the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus which in all probability has preserved the original form of the system, whilst the account left by Irenæus merely gives the teaching of the heresiarch's disciples.<sup>1</sup> According to the account embodied in the *Philosophumena* (VII, 14-27), God, when as yet He was not, without either knowledge or will, created from nothing a world which also was not. The explanation of these enigmatic words seems to be that in the beginning the kingdom of God and the kingdom of matter, in the course of their respective developments, came into collision, with the consequence that elements of the one were mingled with elements of the other, to form the primitive chaos or world-seed. This seed contained all within itself as the acorn contains the oak, but as the elements were in a state of chaos, it was as yet a 'world which was not,' but of which the world was to be. The first thing to come into existence was the supernatural or over-world; some of the substance of Light, the first and second Sonships, rose straightway to the Father, though the second, owing to its grosser nature, remained suspended on the Holy Ghost, which is set as a barrier on the confines of the higher world. With regard to the sub-lunar world, it is three-fold: there is the Ogdoads, reaching to the moon, and composed of a celestial and ethereal substance; there is the Hebdomas, of which the nature is lower and merely psychic; and, lastly, there is the earthly world. After the production of the last, the third Sonship, which had so far been imprisoned in the world-seed until the accomplishment of its purification, was at last delivered and enabled to make its way to the kingdom of the Father. This happened—after the long-drawn silence of the reign of Ogdoads, and after the reign of Hebdomas, who had revealed himself instead of the Father to Moses—in the third and last period, by means of the Gospel which made manifest the over-world and preached the duty of delivering the captive elements. In Jesus the deliverance was effected by His death, and thus also must the whole Sonship be delivered from its connection with foreign matter. Once above the barrier-spirit (the Holy Ghost), the Sonship attains to immortality, and God, by involving the whole world in ignorance, will effectually prevent anything more from rising superior to its nature. According to Irenæus's account (I, 24, 3-7), from the unbegotten Father there proceeded, by way of emanation, a number of Æons; these angels created 365 heavens, each of which is inferior to its predecessor. It was the inhabitants of the lowest heaven who built the visible world, their chief being the God of the Jews. To make an end of their sovereignty, the Æon Nous, or Jesus,

<sup>1</sup> DUCHESNE, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, I, p. 170, adopts the opposite view. Trans.

came (though in appearance only) to earth ; it was not, however, he, but Simon of Cyrene, who suffered. Redemption consists in being aware of the advent of the Saviour ; hence, though the Basilideans confessed Jesus, they deemed it fit and right to deny the Crucified. They held that meat sacrificed to idols might lawfully be eaten, and generally they attached little importance to externals, though the chiefs of the school, Basilides and his son Isidore, professed a rigorous system of morals. The sect would appear to have survived down to A.D. 400.

III. Others are known simply by the name of Gnostics, or are designated by some peculiarity in their teaching : such were the **Barbelo-Gnostics** and the Ophites. The former associated with the Father, at the head of the kingdom of Light, an ever-young female spirit, whom they called Barbelo (בַּרְבֵּל אֱלֹהִים, 'in the four is God'), and held that the product of each new emanation was a fourfold being or Tetras, of which the members were styled Syzygies, a feminine Tetras being invariably succeeded by one of the masculine gender. According to the **Ophites**, the Demiurge (called by this sect Jaldabaoth, *i.e.* 'Son of the desert') was intent on withholding from men the knowledge of the highest God. His great opponent was the Serpent (ὄφις), to whom they ascribed a place of importance, though whether this was because it had been the first to reveal the Gnosis, or for some other reason, does not clearly transpire (IREN. I, 29, 30). The Ophitic Gnosis gave rise to several schools. Thus we hear of the Naasseni, who looked on the Serpent (נָחִישׁ) as the primeval being ; of the Cainites, who considered all the persons who are reprobated in the Old Testament, from Cain downwards, as real Pneumatists and martyrs for the truth ; of the Sethites, who held that just as Cain and Abel were the founders of the Hylist and Psychist tribes, so Seth was the father of the Pneumatists, and that he had again manifested himself in Christ (IREN. I, 28, 31) ; of the Peratae, who pretended that they alone could cross (περᾶν) the instable sea (of death) ; lastly, we are told of a certain Justin, who contrived so to combine Christian and Old Testament ideas with the pagan myths, that even Hercules became a prophet (*Philos.* V, 12-18, 21-28). Mg. on the Ophites, by GIRAUD, 1884 ; HÖNIG, 1889 ; *Theol. Tijds.* 1904, pp. 136-62 ; C. SCHMIDT, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, I, 1905.

IV. It was to the Ophites that **Valentinus** belonged, who, according to Irenæus (III, 4, 2), betook himself in the time of Hyginus (c. 135) from Alexandria to Rome, where he remained until the episcopate of Anicetus (c. 160), and who, according to Epiphanius (*H.* 31, 7), died in Cyprus. If we may trust Irenæus (I, 11, 1), he cast the Ophite doctrine into a new shape, and thus became the founder of a new system, in which the Æon theory is enlarged considerably, though the older dualism, in consequence of Platonic influences, becomes less conspicuous. The Pleroma

comprises thirty Æons—one Ogdoas, Decas, and Dodecas—together, fifteen pairs of Æons, all the Æons emanating in Syzygies. At their head stands Πατήρ or Βυθός and Σιγή or Silence, whilst the last and least of the Æons is Σοφία. Sophia falls through her inordinate desire for knowledge and union with the Father, and is, in consequence, expelled from the Pleroma, when, in recollection of the higher world, she first brings forth Christ, and then—after that Christ has sprung back to the kingdom of Light, leaving her destitute of all pneumatic substance—she gives birth to the right Demiurge Pantocrator and to the left Archon Cosmocrator. Out of this ‘right’ and ‘left,’ *i.e.* out of the psychic and the hylic, our lower world is composed. The system, of which the details cannot be determined with any degree of accuracy, was taught and remodelled by Secundus, Colarbasus, Ptolemæus (IREN. I, 1-7), Mark (IREN. I, 13-21), Heracleon, and by Axionicus, who represented at Antioch the Eastern form of the system; the gnosis assuming different forms, according as it was taught in Italy or in the Levant; the Italic school forsaking the master’s doctrine, and accepting the existence of a twofold Sophia, the higher of whom had been reincorporated into the Pleroma after having been purified, whereas the lower, the Κάτω Σοφία or Achamoth (תחתונה, *Proverbs ix. 1*), the offspring of the former, was the source of all later cosmic developments. Of the adherents of this school, two are known to us through Irenæus, namely, Ptolemæus (I, 1-7) and Mark (I, 13-21), and the teaching of the former on the fall of the thirtieth Æon and the formation of the world may serve to complete our idea of the whole system. The result of Sophia’s inordinate desires was the premature birth of an offspring, whose arrival spoils the concert of the Pleroma. Order was re-established by its banishment from the higher realm and the appearance of two new Æons, Christ and the Holy Ghost, who explained to the other Æons the Syzygy and the unsearchableness of the Father’s being. Thereupon, to prove their oneness and contentment, all the Æons together gave birth to a common offspring, the Æon Soter, or Jesus, on whom devolved the task of reclaiming the Κάτω Σοφία, the fallen offspring of the higher Sophia. First of all, she received from Christ and the Holy Ghost a perfect figure; but no sooner had they left her again to her own devices than she contracted all manner of diseases, wherefore she had to be healed by Christ, and her diseases becoming materialised, furnished the elements of which the world was afterwards made. Achamoth accomplished this work by first fashioning out of the psychic substance the Demiurge who is supreme over all psychic natures; the government of everything hylic falls to Satan, whilst Achamoth retains the control of the Pneumatists. To effect the Redemption, Soter unites himself to the Messiah sent by the Demiurge, whom he inhabits from the time of the Baptism until the Passion. Soter’s office was to teach the

Pneumatists concerning their higher origin, and to convert the Psychists to good ; only the Hylists were incapable of Redemption. When the Pneumatists have arrived at the perfection of the gnosis, Achamoth will lead them back to the Pleroma, where she will be wedded to Soter, whilst the Pneumatists will select their partners from among the angels. The place which they had occupied, the middle place, will be assigned to the Demiurge, to the Psychists, and to the just generally ; as for the Hylists, they will perish in the conflagration in which the world will be involved. (Cp. *KL. art. Valentin.*)

V. **Carpocrates** of Alexandria, another Platonist, also taught that the world had been shaped by inferior Æons, but, in addition, he proclaimed the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. This is the punishment with which souls are rewarded for having fallen away from God, to whose orbit they originally belonged, and which will last until they have completed the cycle of all possible human stations, and so regained their liberty. Jesus, the son of Joseph, through the purity of his soul, through his ever-present recollection of the world above, and with the help of the Father, was enabled to put the Demiurge to flight, and ascend to the Pleroma. Every man who despises the Demiurge can do likewise. The Redemption is a result of faith and charity, everything else is without worth ; good and evil are merely human inventions. The sect made itself notorious by its loose morals ; its members kept images of Christ and worshipped them, as likewise they did with those of Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers (*IREN. I, 25*). Epiphanes, the master's son, who died at the early age of seventeen, and who was worshipped as a god in his mother's birthplace, Cephalonia, had urged the practice of keeping wives in common (*CLEM. Strom. III, 2*). Cp. *KL. art. Karpokrates.*

VI. The lawlessness of another faction, that of the **Antitactae**, was as notorious as that of the Carpocratians, their ground-principle being resistance to the Law, ἀντινόσσεσθαι (*CLEM. Strom. III, 4*) ; with them we may reckon the **Nicolaitae**, who claimed descent from the deacon Nicolas, mentioned in *Acts* (vi. 5), and whose watchword was the killing of concupiscence by abuse of the body (cp. *Apoc. II, 6, 15* ; *IREN. I, 26, 3* ; *CLEM. Strom. II, 20* ; *III, 4* ; *St. u. Kr. 1893, pp. 47-82* ; *N. k. Z. 1895, pp. 923-61*) ; and the **Prodicians**, taking their name from a certain Prodicus, who, deeming themselves a royal tribe, refused to be bound by a law intended for slaves (*CLEM. Strom. III, 4*).

VII. The very name of the **Encratites** is synonymous with severity and continence. They rejected marriage, the use of flesh-meat and wine ; even in celebrating the Last Supper they made use of water instead of wine, for which reason they were dubbed Hydroparastatae or Aquarii. Among other tenets they believed in Adam's damnation. If it be true that Tatian, the

Christian apologist, did not merely join this sect, after his secession from the Church, but was actually its founder, then it is to him that must be ascribed the invention of the Æon doctrine, not unlike that of the Valentinians, which formed a part of the Encratite belief. Soon after Tatian's time a certain Severus entered the sect, founding the school of the Severians (IREN. I, 28, 1; EUS. IV, 29).

VIII. The Syrian **Bardanes** of Edessa († 222) also professed a doctrine concerning the Æons similar to that of Valentinus; he likewise held the common Gnostic views as to the imperfection of the Creator of the world, and as to the merely phantasmal character of Christ's body. He and his son Harmonius, by embodying their teaching in hymns, succeeded in winning many disciples. As late as the middle of the fourth century we find St. Ephræm in conflict with this error, and composing Catholic hymns to counteract the evil influence of the Gnostics (cp. HILGENFELD, *Bardanes*, 1864).

IX. This seems the right place to mention **Marcion**, though he was not a Gnostic in the strict sense of the word, neither acknowledging the existence of Æons, nor making use of the allegorical imagery so much in favour with the Gnostic school. He was born at Sinope in Pontus, and came (c. 140) to Rome. His views having been reprobated by the Church, he founded, in connection with the Gnostic Cerdo, a new sect. Basing himself on a one-sided interpretation of the Pauline doctrine of Grace through Christ, he inferred that there is an absolute opposition between the two Testaments, that they are not different revelations of one and the same God, but rather manifestations of two different beings, of a righteous God and of a good God; of the angry God of the Jews, who is identical with the Creator, and of the loving God of the Gospels. The apparent discrepancies between the Old and the New Testaments were dealt with in a treatise, now lost, entitled *Ἀντιθέσεις*. The good God, formerly all-unknown, first revealed himself in Jesus. The latter descended from heaven in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and having assumed an immaterial body, he entered on the scene in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, and was ultimately crucified, though in appearance only, by the subjects of the Demiurge, whose kingdom he came to destroy. To his peculiar doctrines Marcion added an austere system of morals; marriage, flesh-meat, and wine were forbidden luxuries. Such doctrines involved not only the rejection of the Old Testament, but also the rejection of a large portion of the New Testament. As a matter of fact, the heresiarch accepted only the first nine epistles of St. Paul and the Gospel according to St. Luke, the two first chapters of which were also set aside, because they deal with the birth and youth of Christ. The school soon spread far and wide, and in both size and importance surpassed all other Gnostic sects. In the fifth century it was still in existence in many countries. Among the better known disciples of the founder

were Lucanus and Apelles; the latter, however, by acknowledging one only God, was unfaithful to one of the main elements of the master's teaching. (For an account of Marcion's Bible, see Th. ZAHN, *Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons*, I, (1888), 585-718.)

X. The painter **Hermogenes** (c. 200), to whom both Theophilus (Eus. IV, 24) and Tertullian (*Adv. Hermog.*) devoted special refutations, was likewise no real Gnostic; but by postulating an eternal matter out of which the world might be produced, he approached the Gnostic systems, though in other respects his doctrine was entirely different (Mg. by E. HEINTZEL, 1902).

## § 31

### Manichæism<sup>1</sup>

In Manichæism, as the Persian Gnosis was called, Christianity retires even further to the background than in the Gnostic systems enumerated above. The substance of this doctrine was derived from the ancient religion of Babylonia and Chaldæa, though it comprised also some Parsee elements, whilst its morality and asceticism was mainly Buddhist. To Christianity it owed only the use of certain names and some superficial analogies. Its founder was Mani (216-76), called by the Greeks Manes, and by the Latins Manichæus. The accounts of his life do not agree. According to the *Fihrist al-ulum* (or 'catalogue of knowledge') of the Arab Mohammedan-Nadim—who wrote at the end of the tenth century, and whose account purports to be based on Mani's own story—he was born at Babylon of Persian parents, and brought up in the religion of the Mughtasila, *i.e.* of the Mendaitæ or Sabæans (Elkasaites). On receiving his mission to promulgate a new religion, he was compelled by the disfavour of the Persian king Shapur I (241-72) to preach it first of all in the surrounding countries; at a later date he managed to introduce it into Persia also, though in so doing he found his death (276). His supporters were energetically prosecuted by the authorities, not only at home, but also in the Roman Empire. In spite of these hindrances the sect spread over both East and West, and made its influence felt even late in the Middle Ages.

<sup>1</sup> F. CH. BAUR, *Das manich. Religionssystem*, 1831; G. FLÜGEL, *Mani, s. Lehre u. s. Schriften*, 1862 (a German trans. of the *Fihrist*); K. KESSLER, *Mani*, I, 1889.

According to Mani's teaching, in the beginning there existed two sharply opposed principles, the one being good and the other evil: Darkness and Light. Both consisted of a number of elements, termed members, and both, by emanation, gave rise to a kingdom of Æons. But when Satan, the ancient Devil, who was a product of the elements of Darkness, succeeded in making his way to the upper regions, and overcame the first man, whom God had created for His own defence, fragments of Light became mingled with fragments of Darkness, and an angel, out of the confused mass, constructed the present world. The end of Creation is to deliver the imprisoned fragments of Light, the *Iesus patibilis*, to use the expression of the Western Manichæans, from the fragments of Darkness in which they are involved. The first man still plays a part in this redemption, for the Sun and Moon, in which he dwells, have for their task the collecting of the scattered light, and the transmitting of it to the regions above. The Archon of darkness in his turn created men, first Adam and then Eve, hoping that through the constant breaking up of the elements occasioned by the generation of offspring, the separation of the particles of Light might be prevented and his booty preserved. In the meantime Adam was warned (by the Æon Jesus) to abstain from any sexual intercourse with Eve; he nevertheless allowed himself to be led astray, whereupon, in due season, Jesus came to earth clothed in an ethereal body, and taught mankind the distinction of the kingdoms. His teaching having been, however, misunderstood and falsified, Mani himself, the promised Paraclete, came preaching the three seals by which the separation of the elements of Light may be effected: the *signaculum oris*, forbidding evil speech and unclean food, more especially blasphemy and the use of meat and wine, the *sign. manus* (*manuum*), forbidding the performance of ordinary work as an interference in the world of Light, and the *sign. sinus*, prohibiting marriage. As soon as the elements are completely separated, the world will perish in a 1468-year-long conflagration, after which the two kingdoms will never again come into contact.

But only the select (*electi*), *i.e.* members of the high class, also known as *Catharistae* (AUG. H. 46), could profit by the use of these seals. The far more numerous category of the hearers (*auditores*) or catechumens was not obliged to observe them. The fasts were also less severe for this latter class; only on Sunday were they bound to fast. Manichæan worship consisted chiefly in prayer, though Baptism and the Supper were retained as esoteric rites by the upper class. Only one of their feasts is known, that of the Bema (*βῆμα* = pulpit), a commemoration of the execution of Mani. Their hierarchy seems to have consisted, apart from the head, *i.e.* the successor of Mani, of twelve *magistri*, seventy-two *episcopi*, besides *presbyteri*. They also had deacons, though, as they merely served as adjutants to the bishops, their position seems to have been of little importance (AUG. H. 46). In accordance with

the doctrine that Light consists of five elements, the membership of the sect was sometimes divided into five classes, corresponding to the three hierarchic divisions just mentioned, together with the elect and the hearers. The whole of the O. T. and a portion of the N. T. was set aside, but, on the other hand, the Gnostic Apocrypha, and still more the writings of Mani, were held in high esteem. According to Socrates (I, 22), among the latter were: the Book of Mysteries, the Book of the Principal Articles, the (Living) Gospel, and the Treasure (of Life).

## § 32

### The Monarchians<sup>1</sup>

There is a certain indefiniteness about the earliest Christian utterances regarding the Redeemer. He was believed to be God, or the Son of God, but no attempt was made to understand His nature, or to determine the relations in which He stood to the Father. It was only in the second century that the matter became a subject of serious reflection. The then problem was to seek how belief in the Divinity of the Son could be reconciled with belief in the unity of God. The most ancient Fathers followed in the steps of Philo the Jew,<sup>2</sup> and distinguished between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικὸς*, and, whilst they looked on the Logos or Word as eternal in its essence, they considered that it depended for its hypostatisation on the Creation of the world. In other words, they considered the Logos to have been originally the wisdom of the Father, which, for the purpose of Creation, was emitted or begotten by the Father, and thus became a distinct person.<sup>3</sup>

This view made the Son subordinate to the Father, and led to His generation being looked upon less as an eternal and vital act than as a free and temporal act of God's will. Yet, as this conception safeguarded both God's oneness and the Divinity of the Son, it gave no offence to the Christian

<sup>1</sup> KUHN, *Kath. Dogmatik*, II, 1857; SCHWANE, *Dogmengesch. der vorchristlichen Zeit*, 2nd ed. 1892; HAGEMANN, *Die röm. K. u. ihr Einfluss auf Disziplin u. Dogma in d. ersten 3 Jahrh.* 1864.

<sup>2</sup> DÖLLINGER, *Heidentum u. Judentum*, p. 843 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This is the view of ATHENAGORAS, *Leg.* 10, and even more manifestly of THEOPHILUS, *Ad Autol.* II, 10-22. It was also held by HIPPOLYTUS, *Philos.* X, 33; by TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Prax.* 6, 7; and likewise by ORIGEN, *De princ.* I, 3, 5; *Cont. Cels.* III, 34; VIII, 15; *In Ioan.* t. II, c. 2.

consciousness, however unsatisfactory the theory may now seem to us.

But at about this same time a new theory arose which seemed to threaten danger to the Faith. Some few Christians, laying excessive stress on the oneness of God, declared that the Redeemer must have been a mere man, though miraculously born of a virgin and the Holy Ghost ; others solved the difficulty by identifying the Son with the Father Himself. By the former the Divinity of the Son, by the latter the distinction between the Father and Son, was called into question. These heretics came to be known, on account of their rallying-cry, *Monarchiam tenemus*, as Monarchians, and, according to the answer they gave to the problem, were divided into two groups, respectively named Dynamistic or Ebionist Monarchians, and Modalists or Patripassians.

I. It was usual formerly to reckon, as the earliest exponents of the Ebionist theory, those Christians of Asia Minor (c. 170) to whom Epiphanius (*H.* 51) applies the nickname of Alogi ; whether they really were is a moot point. All that we know is that the Alogi were opposed to the Montanists and rejected the Johannine writings ; quite possibly it was merely their rejection of these writings which led Epiphanius to infer that they should be classed with the Ebionites and Theodotians, and that they really denied the Word.<sup>1</sup> However this may be, not long after, **Theodotus**, a tanner of Byzantium,<sup>2</sup> imported this doctrine to Rome, whereupon he was promptly excommunicated by Pope Victor (189-98). His disciples, Asclepiodotus and Theodotus Junior, a money-changer by profession, made an attempt to institute a new Church, over which they placed Natalis as bishop. The attempt was, however, a failure, Natalis eventually returning to the Faith. At a yet later date the same doctrine was professed, probably in Rome, by a certain Artemas. Towards the end of the third century it was again advocated by Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, who opined that Jesus was a mere man, though he likewise admitted that He was inspired by the (impersonal) Logos which dwelt in Him. The Council of Antioch in 268 excommunicated Paul, and chose Domnus as his successor. Paul, however, in his

<sup>1</sup> *Kath.* 1889, II, 187-202 ; *RE. f. pr. Th.*, art. *Aloger and Monarchianer.*

<sup>2</sup> *Philos.* VII, 35 ; X, 23 ; *EUS.* V, 28 ; *EPIPH. H.* 54.

quality of agent to Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, retained his position until the reduction of Antioch by Aurelian (272). The seed which he had sown bore fruit, and it is doubtless his evil influence which accounts for the subordinatist doctrines on the Logos of the presbyter and martyr, Lucian of Antioch († 312).

The Council of Antioch refused to admit that the Son or Logos was *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ*. Whether this was, as Athanasius (*De syn.* 45) and Basil the Great (*Ep.* 52, c. 1) have it, to answer Paul's argument—if Christ is not essentially man, then he is *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ*, and there are three natures, and as the natures of the Father and the Son are set over against that of God, it follows that the Father is no longer the source of all Godhead—or as Hilary (*De syn.* 81, 86) says, because Paul looked on both God and the impersonal Logos as *ὁμοούσιος* (*eiusdem* or *unius substantiae*), or because, as Epiphanius puts it more clearly, he would not allow to the Logos any independent subsistence. The remaining fragments of the Council, which deal with the discussion between Paul and his presbyter Malchion, will be found in ROUTH, *Reliquiae sacr.* t. III; cp. Eus. V, 27-30.

II. The first known representative of modalistic Monarchianism was **Noetus** of Smyrna.<sup>1</sup> Under Pope Victor the heresy was carried by Praxeas to Rome. On being refused acknowledgment by Rome, Praxeas proceeded to Carthage, where he came into conflict with Tertullian.<sup>2</sup> A little later another disciple of Noetus, Epigonus, contrived to form a Patripassian party in Rome itself; this party was headed by Cleomenes and Sabellius. The novelty caused great commotion in the Roman Church, and was opposed chiefly by the presbyter Hippolytus, Pope Zephyrinus confining himself to an endeavour to smooth matters. The policy of Zephyrinus was, to begin with, pursued also by his counsellor and successor Callistus (217-22), though, as there seemed little hope of otherwise establishing peace, the latter finally excommunicated both Hippolytus and Sabellius. It is, however, quite possible that Hippolytus brought about his excommunication by his too stringent views regarding certain matters of discipline (§ 24). At any rate, he forthwith assumed the position of bishop at the head of his own adherents. The schism was not of long duration, and, no doubt, Hippolytus returned of his own accord to the Church († c. 237 § 39).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> HIPP. *Cont. Haer. Noeti.* *Philos.* IX, 7-10; X, 27. EPIPH. *H.* 57.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Praxeam*, 1; cp. *Th. Qu.* 1866, pp. 349-495.

<sup>3</sup> *Philos.* IX, 12; DÖLLINGER, *Hipp. u. Kall.* 1852 (Engl. Trans.

Patripassianism also gained a footing in Arabia and Libya. In the former region Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, who had shared the error, afterwards being persuaded of his mistake by Origen, retracted at the Council of Bostra (244).<sup>1</sup> In the latter country Dionysius of Alexandria entered the lists against the innovators, and, the better to combat the Patripassian identification of the Divine Persons, laid such excessive emphasis on the distinction between Father and Son that the essential oneness of the Divine nature seemed in danger; his arguments, being reported to Dionysius of Rome (259-68), brought on him a reprimand.<sup>2</sup>

In Egypt the controversy entered a new phase, the question of the Holy Ghost coming in for discussion, whereas previously the dispute had centred on the relations of the Father and the Son. This does not, however, mean that the Holy Ghost had, so far, been ignored. Sabellius<sup>3</sup> had given the matter his consideration, teaching that God had revealed Himself thrice: as Father in the Creation and in the giving of the Mosaic Law, as Son in the Redemption, and as Holy Ghost in the sanctification of the Church. The fact that he gave to these revelations the name of *πρόσωπα*, or 'persons,' explains how he was able to deceive many as to the real character of his doctrine, which afterwards came to be known as Sabellianism.

### § 33

#### Millenarianism or Chiliasm <sup>4</sup>

The common expectation of the Jews, that the Messiah would establish on earth a kingdom of his own, was adopted by many of those who believed in the Redeemer who was born in a stable and who died on the cross. The only difference was that, according to the latter, this was to take place at the second coming of Christ, which in the *Apocalypse* (xx, xxi) seemed to be represented as near at hand: yet a little while and Satan would be bound for a thousand years (*χίλια ἔτη*), and the just would

*Hippolytus and Callistus, or the Church of Rome in the first half of the third century*, 1876).

<sup>1</sup> EUS. VI, 20-23; HIERON. *Catal.* 60; *Th. Qu.* 1848.

<sup>2</sup> ATHAN. *De sententia Dionysii.* <sup>3</sup> *Philos.* IX, 11, 12; EPIPH. *H.* 62.

<sup>4</sup> J. N. SCHNEIDER, *Die chiliastische Doktrin*, 1859; ATZBERGER, *Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie*, 1896; L. GRY, *Le millénarisme*, 1904.

rise and reign with Christ; afterwards, when the devil shall have been delivered for a while and again vanquished, the world will come to an end with the general Resurrection, the Judgment, and the fashioning anew of both heaven and earth. No doubt the misfortunes of the Christians contributed to the formation of such earthly hopes, just as, formerly, Roman oppression had led the Jews to similar dreams. However this may be, Millenarianism was rampant not only in the Judaizing schools of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, but also in the Church itself. Here the idea was first broached by the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas, and Papias of Hierapolis (§ 37). Later on it was taken up by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Commodian, Victorinus, and by Lactantius; it was also adopted by the Montanists—to whose fanaticism it was well suited—and, naturally, also by Tertullian. Originally it had its headquarters in Asia Minor, but in the middle of the third century its influence was felt, more especially in Egypt. Nepos, bishop of Arsinoe, even defended it in his *Confutatio Allegoristarum* against the attacks of the Alexandrians. After the death of this bishop the Chiliasts of Egypt actually seceded from the Church, though Dionysius of Alexandria, in a discussion which lasted three days, succeeded in demonstrating to Korakion, the then leader of the party, the error of their way of thinking. Not long after this the sect disappeared, vanquished by the force of circumstances rather than by argument.

### § 34

#### Montanism<sup>1</sup>

In the second half of the second century a certain Montanus arose at Ardaban, on the boundaries of Mysia and Phrygia, with the mission to declare that he was the mouth-piece of the promised Paraclete (*John* xiv. 16, 26), and to inaugurate the reign of the Holy Ghost. The prophecies of Montanus were delivered in ecstasy, and related to the near advent of Christ, and of the end of all. The millenium was to begin in the two Phrygian towns of Pepuza and Tymium,

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by BONWETSCH, 1881; BELCK, 1883; *KL.* VIII, 1828-42; ZAHN, *Forschungen*, V, 3-57; *Z. f. KG.* XVI (1896), 664-71; HARNACK, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Literatur*, II, I (1897), 363-81.

Pepuza being the seat of the heavenly Jerusalem. As a preparation for all this, a stricter life was enjoined, and an attempt was made to bring the Church to perfection by a more rigorous system of morality. Second marriages were absolutely discountenanced, and fasting was made more severe; the Station-fasts were made obligatory and were occasionally prolonged till the evening, whilst two whole weeks, saving the Saturday and Sunday, were Xerophagies, on which nothing moistened might be eaten. Another point peculiar to the sect was that they forbade flight in time of persecution. Grievous sinners were excluded for ever from the Church, and maidens were obliged to conform to the custom of married women, in always being veiled when attending service. The prophecies found credence, and soon two women, Prisca (Priscilla) and Maximilla, attached themselves to Montanus as prophetesses. The neighbouring bishops fruitlessly endeavoured to put a stop to the movement, a schism being the only result. The Phrygians, as the Montanists were usually called, after their country—though among themselves they preferred the title of Pneumatists, by which they might be more readily distinguished from the common Catholic herd of Psychists—were first excommunicated in Asia Minor, and then, in consequence of certain revelations of Praxeas, also at Rome, where to begin with they had received some encouragement. All the efforts of the authorities were to no purpose, nor was it long before Tertullian of Carthage professed his belief in the new prophecy, and became its foremost advocate, writing special works in defence of the ecstasies, of the form in which the revelations had been made, and of the Montanist precepts. At the time of the Council in Trullo, 692 (can. 95), and even as late as Leo the Isaurian (722), the sect was still a public danger. One portion of the Montanists, the party of a certain Æschines, took a part in the Monarchian controversy, and defended Patripassianism.

### § 35

#### **The Schisms of Novatian, Felicissimus, and Meletius**

I. The question of penance, which, as we have already seen, had caused a dissension in the Roman Church under Callistus

(§§ 24, 32), was next made the pretext of a schism which lasted several centuries. At the end of the Decian persecution, after the See of Rome had been vacant for fourteen months, the presbyter Cornelius (251-53) was elected by the majority of the Church, whilst another presbyter, **Novatian**, was put forward by the minority. The conflict had for its origin personal motives, Novatian having counted on his election owing to the important position he already occupied in the Church, and the promise he had received of support. It was not long, however, before the dispute assumed a different character: Cornelius was disposed to grant absolution to the Christians who had fallen; Novatian refused to do so, and pushed his severity so far as to withhold forgiveness even from the dying when it could be shown that they were backsliders. Later on, the same rigorous measures were extended to all grievous sinners. It was the boast of the Novatians that their Church was composed only of the pure and holy, for which reason they came to be known as *Kαθαροί*. With this object in view they even subjected to rebaptism such of the adherents of the older Church as came over to them. The sect spread, especially in the East, where it kept up its existence well into the seventh century. It made its converts not only among the members of the Church, but also among the Montanists. One faction, that of the Sabbatians, founded towards the end of the fourth century by Sabbatius, a convert Jew, also followed the Protopaschite system of reckoning Easter (§ 25).

II. Whilst dissension was rampant at Rome, a similar quarrel was dividing the Church of Carthage. St. Cyprian, taking his stand on the Church's practice regarding penance, refused to absolve forthwith those who had fallen in the time of persecution, even when they had taken the precaution of providing themselves with *libelli pacis*. His principal adversary seems to have been the presbyter Novatus, whilst the bishop elected by the opposition was Fortunatus, though the party was ultimately named after **Felicissimus**, a deacon, who had headed the movement at the beginning. The schism did not, however, endure. *Z. f. KG. XVI (1896), 1-41.*

III. Towards the end of the period there broke out in Egypt yet another schism, of which the author was **Meletius** (Melitius), bishop of Lycopolis in the Thebais, but of which the motive is difficult to determine, owing to the discrepancies in

the sources. Epiphanius connects it with the question of penance, and opines that Meletius opposed the mildness shown by the metropolitan Peter of Alexandria. In three documents dating from the beginning of the quarrel, among which is a letter from some Egyptian bishops to Meletius, the only grievance spoken of has reference to certain unauthorised ordinations held by Meletius in dioceses other than his own. On the other hand, Athanasius and Socrates accuse Meletius of having denied the Faith; no doubt their assumption was based on a false report. The former testimonies may be reconciled by supposing that, by his irregular ordinations, Meletius sought to extend his power and disseminate his views. This schism did not die out before the fifth century.<sup>1</sup>

IV. During the Diocletian persecution the Roman Church was again troubled by the matter of penance. Pope Marcellus (308-09) had to take measures against those of the fallen who insisted on being admitted to communion without having performed penance. His successor Eusebius had, on the other hand, to withstand a certain Heraclius, who denied that the fallen could be reinstated even when repentant. The disturbances, of which we owe all our information to inscriptions of Pope Damasus, led to some violence, and induced the emperor Maxentius to banish both the Popes, together with Heraclius; with this the trouble appears, however, to have ended. Cp. *Liber pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 164-67.

<sup>1</sup> EPIPH. *H.* 68; ATH. *Cont. Arian.* 59; SOCR. I, 6; HEFELE, *CG.* I, 343-56; *Z. f. KG.* XVII, 62-67; *Nachr. Göttingen*, 1905, pp. 164-87.

## CHAPTER . V

### ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE <sup>1</sup>

#### § 36

#### The Growth of Ecclesiastical Literature

IN the beginning the Christians were too much taken up with the spread of the Gospel to have any great leisure to indulge in writing. As a general rule, moreover, literature is not to be expected from a society as yet in its infancy. Nevertheless, several written works stand to the credit of earliest Christianity. Their authors, on account of their close connection with the Apostles, received the name of Apostolic Fathers. The character and style of these writings being akin to those of Scripture, they might readily be considered as an appendix to the Bible. We may thus explain how several of them were read at Divine service, and even found their way into MSS. of the Bible. In the *Codex Sinaiticus* are included the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*; in the *Codex Alexandrinus* we find the two epistles of St. Clement, and in a Syriac MS. the pseudo-Clementine epistle *Ad Virgines*.

The first of a new class of work, the *Apologies*, saw the light

<sup>1</sup> *Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur*, ed. GEBHARDT and HARNACK, 1882 ff.; DUPIN, *Nouvelle bibl. des auteurs eccl.* 2nd ed. 19 vol. 1693-1715; REMI CEILLIER, *Hist. gén. des auteurs . . . eccl.* 23 vol. 1729-53, 1858-68; MÖHLER, *Patrologie* (of the first three centuries), 1840; I. FESSLER, *Institutiones Patrologiae*, 2 vol. 1850-51; ed. JUNGMANN, 1890-96; O. BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, 2nd ed. 1901 (Engl. Trans. *Patrology*, 1909); *Gesch. d. altk. Literatur*, I-II, 1902-03; G. KRÜGER, *Gesch. d. allchr. Lit. in d. 3 ersten Jahrh.* 1895 (Engl. Trans. *Hist. of Early Christian Literature in the first 3 centuries*, New York, 1897); A. HARNACK, *Gesch. d. allchr. Lit. bis Eusebius*, I-II, 1893-1904; CRUTTWELL, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, 2 vol. 1899; BATIFFOL, *Anciennes littératures chrét.* I, *La litt. grecque*, 4th ed. 1905; A. EHRHARD, *Die altchristl. Lit. u. ihre Erforschung von 1884-1900*; G. RAUSCHEN, *Grundriss der Patrologie*, 1903 (French Trans. 1907); H. KIHN, *Patrologie*, 1904.

about the year 125. The aim of such books was, in the beginning; to justify Christianity when reviled by pagans and Jews, and, at a later date, to defend the Church when attacked by heretics and schismatics.

Finally, about the year 200, theological works, properly so-called, began to appear, *i.e.* books which were not called forth by attacks from without, but of which the aim was to expose and expound the facts of Christian Faith, or to declare the sense of the Scriptures.

But the birth of theology as a distinct science did not interfere with the development of the earlier science of apologetics. The latter continued to flourish, and so long as Christianity had to fight for its existence, Apologists were needed to assist it in its struggle. Indeed, the Latin Apologists only made their appearance with the beginning of the third century; previous to this any language other than Greek had been only very sparingly used.

### § 37

#### The Apostolic Fathers<sup>1</sup>

The works of the Apostolic Fathers belong, some of them to the end of the first, and the rest to the beginning of the second century. It was formerly believed that some of them were of yet earlier date; such an opinion would now find but few to defend it.

I. The oldest work is certainly the recently found **Didache** *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*. Its discoverer and first editor assigned the work to a date between 120 and 160, holding that the document is dependent on the *Epistle of Barnabas* and on the *Shepherd* of Hermas. But there can be no doubt that in point of fact it is the opposite which is true. The primitive form of the dissertation on the Two Ways, by which alone the question of date can be settled, is found in the *Didache*, rather than in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The general

<sup>1</sup> *Patr. apost. opp.*, ed. J. B. COTELERIUS, 2 fol. 1672 (ed. CLERICUS, 1698, 1724); edd. GERHARDT, HARNACK, ZAHN, 3 fasc. 1875-77 (fasc. I, ed. 2a, 1876-78); ed. FUNK, 2 vol. 1878-81, 2nd ed. 1901.; ed. LIGHTFOOT (*The Apostolic Fathers*, 5 vol. 1885-90, containing Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp); D. VÖLTER, *Die Apost. Väter neu untersucht*, I, 1904.

character of the work is also manifestly ancient, and it cannot have been written much after the period 80-90.

The first portion comprises, besides the discourse to the catechumens, or description of the Two Ways of Life and Death, instructions on the administration of Baptism, on fasting, orisons, and the Eucharist, and on the prayers to be said before and after. The second lays down rules for the conduct and treatment of Apostles, *i.e.* of wandering preachers, of prophets, and of Christian wayfarers; also on the due observance of Sunday, on the election of bishops and deacons, and on the administration of fraternal correction. The work concludes by recommending watchfulness and perseverance in view of the nearness of the end of all things. The *Editio princeps* was published by PH. BRYENNIUS at Constantinople in 1883. For an account of its many subsequent editions, and of the works to which it has given rise, see FUNK, *Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum*, 1887; *A. u. U.* II, 108-41; *Th. Qu.* 1900, pp. 161-79.

II. The **Epistle of Barnabas**, which in parts reproduces the matter of the *Didache*, is, by both the MSS. and the Fathers, ascribed to St. Barnabas. This can, however, scarcely be true, seeing that the author's judgment on the O. T. differs entirely from that of the Apostles. It belongs, moreover, to a more recent date than Barnabas's death, which cannot have occurred much later than 60. It is, however, a highly difficult matter to determine accurately the date to which the epistle belongs, and critics are still divided. If, as is very probable, we must see a reference to contemporary events in the prophecy of the ten kings, who were followed by a lesser one who humbled three of them together (4, 4, 5), then the work must belong, at the earliest, to the reign of Nerva. Some recent scholars have seen in the allusion to the construction of a temple (16, 4), which occurs after mention has been made of the destruction of the Temple of the Jews, a reference to the building of the temple of Jupiter by Adrian, and in consequence they assign the epistle to the year 130-31.

The first and lengthiest portion of the epistle (c. 1-17) has for its object to show that Christians must not observe the Law of the O. T. The O. T. legislation regarding fasts, sacrifices, meats, circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Temple is allegorised and interpreted purely spiritually, the old Covenant being entirely divested of the historical character attributed to it by the Jews. The second part contains the discourse on the Two Ways of Light

and Darkness. Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 77-108; *RHE.* I (1900), no. 1-2.

III. Belonging to the same period as the epistle last mentioned—though, were the more recent theory as to the date of the former proved, it would be some thirty years older—we have the **Epistle of Clement** of Rome, written in the name of the Church of Rome to that of Corinth, with a view to re-establish the harmony that had been threatened by the insubordination of some of its members. Though this epistle may not belong, as was formerly believed, to the years immediately subsequent to Nero, yet it must have been composed very soon after the Domitian persecution. Being the earliest patristic work the contributory circumstances of which are known for certain, it has a great value of its own, especially since the discovery and publication of the Jerusalem MS. (1875), which supplied some portions, previously missing, in particular a fine prayer (57, 7-63).

The MSS. also ascribe to Clement another work written to the Corinthians which, by the ancients, is likewise described as an epistle. Now, however, since the discovery of the second portion (12, 5-20), which formerly was lacking, it is beyond a doubt that the so-called second epistle is in reality a homily, most probably delivered at Corinth—in fact, the oldest sermon we now possess. The mistake committed by the ancients with respect to the character of this writing makes us wonder whether a similar error has not been made as to the authorship. The language and contents of the second epistle would point to a later date. Harnack (*Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.* II, i, 438-50), though without showing sufficient reason, considers the 'epistle' to have been the work sent by Pope Soter, c. 170, to the Corinthians (*Eus.* IV, 23, 11). Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, no. 12. So far as the two epistles **Ad Virgines** are concerned, which are extant only in the Syriac version, they certainly do not belong to Clement, even though they bear his name. The use made of Scripture, the idiom, the contents, and especially the intense repugnance for *mulieres subintroductae*, attest a later origin. It may have been composed in the first half of the third century. For an account of the other works bearing Clement's name, the *Clementines* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, see § 28 and § 75.

IV. To the time of Trajan, *i.e.* to the beginning of the second century, belong the seven epistles written by **Ignatius**, bishop of Antioch, when on his way to Rome to be thrown to the

beasts. Four of them, composed at Smyrna, are addressed to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome; three, written at Troas, were destined for the Churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and for Polycarp the latter's bishop. The letters convey the saint's thanks for the thoughtfulness of the Churches of Asia Minor in sending their greetings to him at Smyrna; they also contain warnings against the heresy of the Judaizing Docetæ, an invitation to all to rally round their bishops, together with repeated expressions of the saint's desire for martyrdom. The main interest of these epistles—which also accounts for their authenticity having been made the subject of so much debate—lies in the fact that they are our earliest witness to the monarchical constitution of the Church, and to the division of the clergy into bishops, priests, and deacons.

At about the year 400, these epistles were interpolated by an Apollinarist, who also increased their number by five, or even by six, if we reckon the letter of Mary of Cassobola to Ignatius which stands at the head of this longer recension. In the Middle Ages four more Ignatian letters, written in Latin, were put into circulation, two to the Apostle John, and one to the Blessed Virgin, together with her reply. In 1845 Cureton published a Syriac version of the Ignatian epistles to Polycarp, Ephesians and Romans. The extra epistles of the longer recension are now universally held to be spurious; on the other hand, of late years, the number of the opponents of the shorter Greek recension has steadily diminished; considering that these epistles are vouched for by Polycarp, Irenæus, Origen, and Eusebius, their authenticity may be reckoned as certain (cp. FUNK, *Die Echtheit d. Ignatiusbriefe*, 1883). Amongst the several *Acts* of St. Ignatius, one only, that of the Colbert MS., known as the *Martyrium Colbertinum*, has any claim whatever to be considered as genuine. But, as it was unknown to Eusebius, besides contradicting the epistles in many details and presenting other difficulties, it can scarcely be what it purports, namely, an account written by certain companions of the saint and witnesses of his martyrdom. More probably it belongs to a later date (FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 338-47; *Th. Qu.* 1903, p. 159).

V. Of very slightly later origin is the epistle sent by **Polycarp**, bishop of Smyrna († 155-56),<sup>1</sup> a disciple of the Apostle John, to the Church of Philippi, which had requested of him

<sup>1</sup> For the year of his death, 156 (until recently the usual date given having been 155), cp. E. SCHWARTZ, *Christl. u. jüd. Ostertafeln*, in *Abh. Göttingen*, N. F. VIII (1904-05), 6, pp. 125-38.

the letters of Ignatius Martyr. As this is the most ancient witness for the Ignatian epistles, the opponents of the former look on it as spurious, or at least as interpolated. Both suppositions are, however, baseless, seeing that the existence of the epistle is attested by Irenæus, one of its author's disciples, and that it was publicly read at the services—a fact which would effectually prevent any corruption of the text (*KL. art. Polykarp*).

VI. Another disciple of John the Apostle's (and not, as Eusebius believed, of a certain presbyter John, whose existence is merely conjectural, being based on an allusion which, most probably, refers to the Apostle himself), **Papias**, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, composed a work explanatory of the words of the Lord, *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*, in five books, the whole of which, apart from some fragments of slight importance, has been lost.

To the above we may add two works, which, though they probably do not proceed from immediate disciples of the Apostles, are usually reckoned among the productions of the Apostolic Fathers, chiefly because their writers were long held to belong to the category, and because, in any case, the documents were written not long after the time of the Apostles. These works are the *Shepherd* and the *Letter to Diognetus*.

VII. The **Shepherd of Hermas** is an exhortation to penance and good works, cast in apocalyptic form. The Easterns generally, and formerly even some moderns, were inclined to see in its author that same Hermas who is spoken of in *Romans* (xvi. 14), and in consequence the work was held to be extremely ancient, in fact by some to have been composed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. The Muratorian Fragment designates, however, as its author the brother of Pope Pius I (140–54), an ascription which is borne out by other Western testimonies, and by the internal criticism of the document. It is true that the author represents himself as a contemporary of Clement the Roman (*Vis.* ii. 4, 3), and on this ground some moderns have seen fit to refer the work to c. 100; but the author's own testimony is of doubtful value, seeing that the visions detailed in the book can scarcely be real revelations, but a mere literary device.

VIII. The **Letter to Diognetus** is an apology for the Faith,

consisting of a brief refutation of paganism and Judaism, together with an explanation of the late arrival of Christianity. This pearl of ancient Christian literature has been preserved among the works of Justin Martyr, though it neither belongs to him nor to the first century, in which it was commonly supposed to have been written. On the other hand, it is certainly not a forgery posterior to Constantine, nor a merely humanitarian essay, but is undoubtedly a product of the second century; beyond this we cannot venture.

### § 38

#### The Apologists and other Writers of the Second Century <sup>1</sup>

Besides the unknown author of the Letter to Diognetus, there are other Apologists whose works are still extant.

I. The Apology of **Marcianus Aristides** of Athens<sup>2</sup> was written to prove that pagan pluralism is incompatible with a true conception of God, besides being hurtful to good morals; that Jewish worship was mere angel worship; and that truth and morality belong to Christianity. Most of its contents were incorporated by John, a monk of Mar Saba near Jerusalem (c. 630), in the legend of Barlaam and Joasaph, though this fact was brought to light only recently, when the work was discovered in a Syriac translation. According to the Syriac text, the Apology was addressed to Antoninus Pius; according to Eusebius, and a recently unearthed Armenian fragment, it was destined for Adrian. It is difficult to say which of the two statements is correct.

II. **Justin** the philosopher<sup>3</sup> was born at Sichern in Samaria, and was martyred at Rome under Marcus Aurelius (163-67). We have two Apologies of his. The first and longer, addressed to Antoninus Pius, was written soon after the middle of the second century. Its aim is to dispose of the current reproaches

<sup>1</sup> *S. Iustini opp. necnon Tatiani adv. Graec. oratio, &c.*, ed. PRUD. MARANUS, 1742; *Corpus Apologetarum christ. saecul. sec.* ed. OTTO, 9 vol. 1842-72; 3rd ed. vol. I-V (*Iustini opp.*), 1875-81.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. by RENDEL HARRIS and J. A. ROBINSON, in *Texts and Studies*, I, 1891; SEEBERG, *Zahns Forschungen*, V, 1893; *Der Apologet Arist.* 1894; *T. u. U.* IX, 1; XII, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by SEMISCH, 2 vol. 1840-42; AUBÉ, 1875; ENGELHARDT, 1878; STÄHLIN, 1880; *KL.* VI, 2060-73.

of atheism, immorality, and cannibalism made against the Christians; it also furnishes some interesting information regarding the Christian worship at the time. The shorter and later treatise supplements the former—though it is more than a mere appendix—and explains why the Christians do not take their lives in order to reach God the sooner, and why God, who protects them, allows them to be slain. Lastly, in the *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*, Justin has left us a defence of Christianity against Judaism.

III. **Tatian** came from Assyria, was one of Justin's disciples, and afterwards chief of the Encratites. He wrote (c. 170) an *Oratio adv. Graecos*, which is rather an attack on paganism than a defence of Christianity. The author also labours to show, by means of the Old Testament, that Christianity is far from being really a new religion.<sup>1</sup>

IV. The *Legatio pro Christianis* of **Athenagoras** (177–80) is also devoted to refuting the three chief calumnies against the Christians. The work is remarkable for the beauty of its descriptions, and for the manner, at once ingenious and dignified, with which it treats its subject. In another book, the *De resurrectione*, an effort is made to overcome the pagan misapprehension of the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection.

V. Of **Theophilus** of Antioch we have the three books *Ad Autolyicum*, written under Commodus. Of these the first book excels by its lucid explanation of the means of attaining to a knowledge of God.

VI. **Hermias** in his *Irrisio philosophorum gentilium*, adopting a suggestion thrown out by Tatian (c. 25), attacks, or rather ridicules, the ancient psychology and metaphysics, by setting side by side the different opinions of philosophers, and allowing them to refute each other. The work, which is usually classed among those of the second century, belongs really to the third. DIELS (*Doxographi graeci*, 1879, pp. 259–63), though on insufficient grounds, even holds it to be of still later origin and to belong to the fifth or sixth century.

VII. This is also the place to mention the **Testamentum XII Patriarcharum**, if indeed it be true that the writer's prophecies respecting Christ were meant to bring about the conversion of the Jews. The work is, however, probably a Jewish one, touched

<sup>1</sup> FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 142–52; A. PUECH, *Recherches sur le Discours aux Grecs de Tatien*, 1903.

up by a Christian hand (cp. HARNACK, II, i, 566; *Z. f. neuest. Wiss. u. Kunde des Urchristentums*, I (1900), 106-75, 187-209).

Of the remaining authors of the second century only one great work of importance has survived in its entirety, and even this one is only extant in a Latin translation; this is the *Adv. Haereses* of **St. Irenæus**. The author was a native of Asia Minor, where he had been a pupil of St. Polycarp. In later life he became a presbyter, and bishop of the Church of Lyons. As Justin's *Syntagmas* have been lost, the work of Irenæus, which was written under Pope Eleutherus (174-89), is the oldest refutation of heresy which we possess. It is also important on account of the clear way in which it lays down the Faith of the Church as opposed to that of the Gnostics.<sup>1</sup>

Another writing of a different character, of which a part, and probably the larger part, has been recovered, has an importance out of all proportion to its length. This is a catalogue of the books of the N. T., drawn up (c. 180) either at Rome or in the neighbourhood. It is not certain whether the list was originally in Greek or in Latin. It is called, after L. Muratori its discoverer, the **Muratorian Fragment**.<sup>2</sup>

Two smaller works give us a glimpse of the sufferings of the early Christians. One is the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, an account of the death of its great bishop written by the Church of Smyrna in 155-56; it is the most ancient of the *Acts of the Martyrs*. The other is the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to those of Asia and Phrygia, dealing with the former's misfortunes under Marcus Aurelius; the larger portion of the letter has been preserved by Eusebius (V, 1, 2).

Among the works which have been entirely lost, or of which only small fragments are to hand, must be mentioned the *Apology* of Quadratus, a pupil of the Apostles, presented by the author to Adrian during the latter's sojourn in Asia (125 or 129); the *Apologies* of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, of Melito, bishop of Sardis, of a certain scarcely known Miltiades, who wrote in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and the *Altercatio Iasonis et Papisci*, written in defence of Christianity by Aristo of Pella during the Jewish interregnum. For a time it was believed that Melito's

<sup>1</sup> Ed. by MASSUET, 1712; STIEREN, 1873; HARVEY, 1857. Mg. by H. ZIEGLER, 1871; J. WERNER (*Der Paulinismus des Ir.*, T. u. U. VI, 2); E. KLEBBA, 1894 (*Die Anthropologie des hl. Ir.*, *Kirchenhist. Studien*, II, 3).

<sup>2</sup> MURATORI, *Antiquitates medii aevi*, III (1740), 851 f. Mg. by HESSE, 1873; G. KUHN, 1892; ZAHN, *Gesch. des neuest. Kanons*, II, 1-143; G. RAUSCHEN, *Florilegium patr.* III (1905), 24-35.

*Apology* had been brought to light in the recently discovered Syriac version of the *Oratio Melitonis philosophi quae habita est coram Antonino Caesare* (cp. *Spicilegium Syriacum*, ed. CURETON, 1835; *Spicilegium Solesmense*, ed. PITRA, t. II; *Th. Qu.* 1862, pp. 392-409; THOMAS, *Melito v. Sardes*, 1893).

Non-apologetical literature fared even worse than the *Apologies*. Among the more noteworthy losses must be reckoned that of the *Memorabilia* of Hegesippus (cp. § 5). Concerning his list of the Popes, see FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 373-90; ZAHN, *Forschungen*, VI (1900), 245 f. Other well-known authors of the time were Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, writer of numerous letters to various Churches (Eus. IV, 23); Rhodon, a pupil of Tatian, opponent of Marcion, and writer of a commentary on the work of the seven days of Creation (Eus. V, 13); Apollonius, an adversary of the Montanists (Eus. V, 18); the presbyter Caius of Rome, who opposed the Montanist Proclus in the time of Pope Zephyrinus (Eus. VI, 20); the anonymous writer of a work against the Monarchians (Eus. V, 28), which is, by Theodoret (*Haer.* II, 5), entitled the *Little Labyrinth*. The opinion of some critics, that its writer was Hippolytus, is by no means certain. Some other productions of the above-mentioned Apologists were for a time believed to be still extant in translations, but the pretended Gospel-commentary of Theophilus of Antioch, for which Zahn recently contended (1883), is now known to be a compilation dating from the period 470-650; the same is true of the *Clavis*, which Pitra (*Spicilegium Solesm.* t. II, III; *Analecta Sacra.* t. II) brought to light and declared to be Melito's *Κλεις* (*Th. Qu.* 1896, pp. 614-29). On the other hand, so far as Tatian's *Diatessaron*—a harmony of the Gospels used in Syria until the sixth century—is concerned, it has quite possibly been substantially preserved in the Arabic translation published by Ciasca in 1888. In this version some parts have, however, been displaced, and the greater portion of the text has been brought into conformity with the traditional reading (cp. ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, I, 1881; VII, 1, 1903; *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanons*, II, 530-56).

### § 39

#### Greek Writers of the Third Century

The headquarters of literary life during the third century were Alexandria, Palestine, and Syria, though Rome also could lay claim to one scholar of fame.

I. At an early date there existed at **Alexandria** a flourishing catechetical school, and in the then state of affairs, when catechists were called upon to instruct not so

much children as adults, who were frequently men of culture, the existence of such a school was bound to promote the growth of theology. The first master of the school of whom we have any knowledge was Pantænus, who must, however, have busied himself exclusively with oral instruction, for no written works of his are known. The next leader of the school was **Clement** (\*) († before 216).<sup>1</sup> He was the first to attempt to found a science of Faith, and his three principal works, which form really a single whole, are devoted to a comprehensive examination of Christianity, both as a doctrine and as a life. These works are: the *Protrepticus* or *Cohortatio ad gentes*, an Apology; the *Paedagogus*, an introduction to the Christian life; the (unfinished) *Stromata*, a more advanced instruction on Faith, or introduction of the believer to the Christian gnosis. By some recent critics this work is held to be, not the last member of the trilogy, but a mere introduction to the third work, or *Didascalos*, as they call it. Besides these there has survived another work of Clement's, *Quis dives salvetur*, in which, taking for his theme the parable of the rich young man (*Mark* x. 17-31), he refutes the notion that the mere possession of riches excludes a man from heaven, and explains what are the duties of the rich man. Among his lost works are the *Hypotyposes*, Commentaries on certain passages from Holy Writ and the Apocrypha.

Even more famous is the name of his pupil and successor, **Origen** (\*),<sup>2</sup> though, in consequence of a quarrel with his bishop, he left Alexandria as early as 231 for Cæsarea in Palestine, and died in 254 at Tyre. He was far and away the most prolific writer of the ante-Nicene period, and for his consuming love of work was called *Χαλκέντερος*, or Adamantius, by his contemporaries. By many he has been held as an incomparable master, though his frequent errors, even in his lifetime, and still more after his death, found many opponents (cp. § 51). Origen's literary activity left no field unexplored, but his principal work was exegetical, consisting of running Commentaries (*τόμοι*) of short notes on obscure and difficult

<sup>1</sup> Ed. POTTER, 1715; KLOTZ, 1831-34; DINDORF, 1869; P. G. VIII, IX. Mg. by Th. ZAHN, 1884 (*Forschungen*, III); E. de FAYE, 1898; HITCHCOCK, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. by De la RUE, 4 fol., 1733-59; LOMMATZSCH, 25 vol. 1831-48; P. G. XI-XVII. Mg. by REDPENNING, 2 vol. 1841-46; BÖHRINGER, KG. I, 2, 1.

passages, and of Homilies or lectures on given portions of Scripture. The larger part of these works has been lost, though a great deal of them, especially of the Homilies, has come down to us in the translations of Jerome and Rufinus. We have also numerous fragments of his works on Biblical criticism, the *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*. Origen also left behind him some important works of an apologetic and dogmatic character, the eight books *Contra Celsum*, a confutation of the philosopher Celsus's attack on Christianity, and the work *De Principiis*, in which he carries out the plan of his master Clement, the construction of a manual of Christian dogmatics; this work now exists only in the Latin translation of Rufinus. Dealing with practical morals and asceticism, we have Origen's *De oratione*, an explanation of the Our Father, with reflections on the nature, quality, time and place of prayer, and the *Cohortatio ad martyrium*.

Origen's speculative errors belong to the domain of exegesis, cosmology, and eschatology, his views on the Trinity being neither better nor worse than those of his contemporaries. Most of his mistakes were a result of his efforts to oppose gnosticism; thus, to cut the ground from under his opponents, who professed to be scandalised at certain passages in Scripture, he, as Philo had done before, pushed allegorism to the extreme, interpreting a vast amount of Scripture mystically and morally instead of literally and historically. Moreover, the better to dispose of the objection that the Creator is unjust because He is the cause of the inequality of His creatures, Origen taught that the present world had been preceded by another, which included only equal spirits (*naturae rationabiles*), embodied, as all created spirits are, in a species of ethereal matter. The present world with its diversity of gifts is the outcome of the different uses which those earlier beings made of their freedom: those who persevered in the right, afterwards went to form the hierarchy of the angels, all of which are provided with ethereal bodies of a spherical shape; those who had strayed a little from God were banished into human bodies; whilst those who had deserted Him altogether became demons, and received bodies of frightful ugliness, which, fortunately for us, are invisible. Creation is considered by Origen as an eternal act, for God's creative activity belongs to His very essence, and any passage from a non-creative to a creative state would involve an alteration of essence which in God's case it is impossible to allow. The object of the external world is the curbing and purifying of the spirits, all of whom, Satan not excepted, will ultimately be cleansed, and revert to God. When this occurs the world will come to an end,

and the bodies will rise with a new and ethereal nature, the end of all things being like unto their beginning (*ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*).

Another of the famous Alexandrian masters was **Dionysius**,<sup>1</sup> a pupil of Origen's, who later on became bishop of the city, but who is better known as a man of action than as a writer. Of his writings only a few fragments remain.

Another who came under the great Alexandrian's influence at Cæsarea was **Gregory Thaumaturgus**, bishop of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus. Of his works there remains a panegyric of his master, an *Epistula canonica*, a *Metaphrasis* on *Ecclesiastes*, a Confession of Faith, and a Syriac translation of a book on God's impassibility and passibility. His authorship of the letter to Philagrius on the unity of nature, which has been preserved in Greek under the title of *Ep. ad Evagrium de divinitate* as a work of Gregory of Nazianzen and of the two other great Cappadocians, is attested by the Syriac translation, and confirmed by internal evidence.

II. The only Roman writer to be mentioned is **Hippolytus** (\*),<sup>2</sup> famous as an exegetist and opponent of heresies. Under Callistus he acted as bishop of the opposition, but seems to have been reconciled with the Church before his death. His followers erected a statue to his memory, which was recovered in 1551, and on which his Paschal tables and a list of his writings is engraved. Of these the larger portion has been lost, though we have still his *Demonstratio de Christo et Antichristo*, his Commentary on Daniel, his *Contra haeresin Noeti*—a fragment of a larger work, being probably the conclusion of his *Memoria haeresium*. In the anti-heretical work falsely ascribed to Tertullian (*De praescr.* c. 45-53) we have, in the main, Hippolytus's Syntagma against all the heresies, which forms the basis of the similar works of Epiphanius and Philastrius. A more important work is the *Refutatio omn. haeresium*, which, though it does not bear his name, probably belongs to him: at least to him alone can it be ascribed with any show of reason. After the contents of the first book—which

<sup>1</sup> Ed. FELTOE, 1904. Mg. by DITTRICH, 1867; *Z. f. hist. Th.* 1871.

<sup>2</sup> *Refutatio omn. haer.* ed. MILLER, 1851; DUNCKER and SCHNEIDEWIN, 1859; CRUCE, 1860. Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 161-97; FICKER, *Studien zur Hippolytfrage*, 1893. *T. u. U. N. F.* I, 2, 4; XI, 1<sup>a</sup>. A. BAUER, *Die Chronik des Hipp.* 1905 (*T. u. U. N. F.* XIV, 1).

had been preserved among the works of Origen, whereas the last seven (IV–X) were recovered only in 1842—it is known as the *Philosophumena*.

III. The remaining writers belong to Palestine and Syria. The first of them, who was indeed born in Libya, but who lived at Nicopolis (Emmaus), **Sextus Iulius Africanus**,<sup>1</sup> wrote a *Χρονογραφία* in five books, reaching from Creation down to 221, the earliest Christian chronicle, and one which long afterwards formed the foundation of similar works, and the *Κεστοί*, a collection of wonderful tales from every department of life. A few fragments are all that remain of these works. He also concerned himself with exegesis, and we still have his letter to Origen dealing with the story of Susanna in the Book of Daniel, and another to Aristides concerning the harmonising of the genealogies of Christ in the gospels according to Matthew and Luke.

Another important work of unknown origin is the **Didascalia** of the Apostles,<sup>2</sup> which may be described as a handbook of Christianity, comprising directions for the due observance of Church discipline. It was probably compiled in the second half of the third century, in Syria; it has been substantially preserved in a Syriac translation, whilst about two-fifths of it has recently been recovered in an old Latin version. It has also been embodied, with alterations, in the Greek *Apostolic Constitutions* (§ 75).

The period is brought to a close by two writers, both of whom were martyred under Maximin Daza, but the trend of whose respective works was curiously different. One was **Methodius**,<sup>3</sup> bishop of Olympus in Lycia. Until recently his only entire work known was the *Symposium*, in praise of virginity: of his books on Free-will and the Resurrection a few fragments only were thought to survive; the former has, however, been recovered complete in a Slavonic translation, together with large portions of the latter and of three other works. The other was the presbyter **Pamphilus** of Cæsarea († 309). In conjunction with Eusebius, he strove to dispose of the objections which Methodius, in his work on the Resurrection, had

<sup>1</sup> H. GELZER, *S. I. Afrikanus u. die byzant. Chronographie*, 2 vol. 1888–98.

<sup>2</sup> *Didascalia et Constitutiones apost.* ed. FUNK, 1905.

<sup>3</sup> BONWETSCH, *Methodius von. Olym.* I, 1891; *Abh. Göttingen*, 1903, A. F. VII, 1.

brought against Origen's doctrine on this matter and on Creation. Of the six books of which this defence consisted, one only has been preserved in a Latin translation by Rufinus.

Lastly, a word must be said of the **Sibylline Oracles** (\*), of which we have twelve books; they consist of poems in hexameters. Their contents are varied, and they hail from divers sources. The ground work is Jewish, and belongs partly (bk. III) to the second century B.C., partly to the first three centuries of our era; some of the books have (I-II; VIII), however, been manipulated by a Christian hand towards the end of the second or beginning of the third century, whilst bk. VI is evidently the work of an heretical Christian, just as bk. VII is the work of some Judaiser. The Oracles were edited by FRIEDLIEB, 1852; GEFFCKEN, 1902. J. GEFFCKEN, *Komposition u. Entstehungszeit der O.S.* 1902 (*T. u. U. N. F.* VIII, 1).

## § 40

### The Latin Literature<sup>1</sup>

Most of the Latin writers of the period were Africans. The first place, in importance as in time, must be assigned to Qu. Sept. Florens **Tertullianus** (\*) of Carthage,<sup>2</sup> a clever man, endowed with much wit and fancy, an energetic character, of fiery temper, as harsh in his ways of thinking as in his manner of life. His excessive severity led him (c. 205) to embrace Montanism, in which he persisted until his death (c. 240). His writings are very numerous: some are apologies for Christianity against Judaism and paganism, others are refutations of heresy, whilst others, again, were written to defend Christian — or rather Montanist — morality and asceticism. Among the apologetical works the first place must be given to his *Ad nationes* and *Apologeticum*. Amongst his dogmatic and polemical works the principal were: *De præscriptionibus adv. Haereticos*, *Adv. Marcionem*, and *Adv. Praxeam*.

Among those of the third class we may mention: *De fuga in*

<sup>1</sup> A. EBERT, *Allg. Gesch. d. Lit. des M.A. im Abendland*, 3 vol. 1874-87; M. SCHANZ, *Gesch. d. röm. Liter.* III, 2nd ed. 1905; P. MONCEAUX, *Hist. littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, I-III, 1901-05.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by A. HAUCK, 1877; NÖLDECHEN, 1890; H. HOPPE (*Syntax u. Stil*), 1903; ADHÉMAR D'ALÈS (*La théologie*), 1905; *T. u. U.* XII, 2.

*persecutione, De pudicitia, De velandis virginibus, De monogamia, De ieiuniis, De cultu feminarum, De corona militis.*

Another writer who may well dispute the first place with Tertullian is **Minucius Felix** (\*),<sup>1</sup> some even holding that there are internal reasons for surmising that Tertullian drew on the *Octavius* in composing his *Apologeticum*, for which reason they reckon the *Octavius* as the earliest specimen of Latin literature. It seems, however, that the contrary is the case, and at any rate external testimonies attest Tertullian's priority. Not only does Jerome, in his *Catalogus*, of which the order is usually chronological, place Tertullian first and Minucius second (c. 53, 58), but he expressly speaks of the former as *primus latinorum*. However this may be, the dialogue called *Octavius* excels all other *Apologies* of its time in skill of composition and in beauty of diction.

The third Latin writer in point of time, and the second master of the African school, was Cæcilius **Cyprianus** (\*), bishop of Carthage (248–58).<sup>2</sup> Before his conversion a rhetor, well read in Tertullian's works, though devoid of the latter's peculiarities and harshness, he was a good pastor of his flock, and an earnest defender of the Faith, for which finally he laid down his life. His best known works are the treatises *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* and *De lapsis*, one being a defence of the Church's oneness against the schism of Felicissimus, and the other a reply to those of the fallen who desired to be restored to the Church's communion forthwith and without due penance. His epistles<sup>3</sup> are also of great importance, and form the best source of the history of his times. His *Life* was written by the deacon Pontius, and has been preserved together with the *Acts* of his martyrdom.

At about this same period a Roman presbyter, later on anti-Pope, **Novatian**,<sup>4</sup> was displaying considerable literary activity. Of his writings we have one, or possibly two epistles, preserved amongst those ascribed to St. Cyprian (30, 36), and the two tracts *De cibis iudaicis* and *De Trinitate*.

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes*, 1905, pp. 373–86 (*Minucius F. und Cæcilius Natalis*).

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by PETERS, 1877; FECHTRUP (incomplete), 1878; BENSON, 1897.

<sup>3</sup> L. NELKE, *Die Chronologie der Korrespondenz C.* 1902; H. v. SODEN, *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung*, 1904 (*T. u. U. N. F. X.*, 3).

<sup>4</sup> Mg. (in Danish) by J. O. ANDERSEN, 1901.

A Christian poet of possibly slightly later date is **Commodian** (\*); he was, however, not only a Chiliast, but also a Patripassian. His rhythmic hexameters are written with small regard for either prosody or metre. Among his remaining works are the *Instructiones adv. gentium deos*—instructing Jews and pagans to accept the Faith, and Christians to lead a holy life, each in their own sphere—and his *Carmen apologeticum*.

**Victorinus**, bishop of Pettau in Styria, and martyr under Diocletian († 303), is the Latin Church's oldest exegetist. Apart from a few fragments, all that remains of his expositions of Scripture is a Commentary on the *Apocalypse*. The last of the Latin writers of the period are two African Apologists.

**Arnobius** (\*), a rhetor of Sicca, wrote (c. 300) his *Adv. nationes*, a work pugnacious rather than defensive. His pupil, Cælius Firmianus **Lactantius** (\*), who was noted for the classic purity of his Latin, has left us, besides two short tracts (*De opificio Dei* and *De ira Dei*), his great work *Divinae Institutiones*, consisting of an apologetically contrived exposition of the Christian Faith, which was later on published by the author in abbreviated form as an epitome. Probably the *De mortibus persecutorum*, of which the importance is great for the history of the persecutions, is also from his pen.

Several writings belonging to this period have been preserved among the works of St. Cyprian, but, in the absence of any tradition, it is impossible to say to whom they really belong. The treatises *De bono pudicitiae*, *De spectaculis*, and *De laude martyrii* have, for internal reasons, been recently attributed to Novatian; in point of fact this ascription is by no means certain, especially with regard to the work mentioned last. Harnack has proposed to ascribe to Pope Victor I the tract *Adv. Aleatores* (*T. u. U.* V, 1), and to Pope Sixtus II the *Ad Novatianum* (*T. u. U.* XIII, 3). Grounds are wanting for the latter attribution, and the former is certainly incorrect. Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 209-36; *Th. Qu.* 1900, pp. 546-601. Weyman and others have suggested that Novatian might well be the author of the recently discovered collection of tracts or homilies edited by BATIFFOL (*Tractatus Origenis de libris ss. scripturarum*, 1900); this opinion is surely wrong, for there are many signs to show that the works in question did not see the light before the fourth century. Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, no. 14; *Bulletin de littérature ecclés. publié par l'Institut cath. de Toulouse*, 1900, no. 9.

## II. CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY

### SECOND PERIOD

FROM THE EDICT OF MILAN TO THE COUNCIL IN TRULLO, 313-692

#### CHAPTER I

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE RISE OF ISLAM

#### § 41

#### The Spread of Christianity and the Decline of Paganism in the Roman Empire<sup>1</sup>

I. By the edict of Milan, Christianity had at last secured legal recognition within the Roman Empire. By the favour and good will of the same emperor to whom it owed its freedom, it was soon to be accorded all the privileges possessed by the old religion of the State. It was not long before **Constantine**<sup>2</sup> granted to the clergy immunity from all public duties (313), empowered the Church to receive legacies, and made of the Sunday a public festival (321) (cp. §§ 63-71). Besides this the Churches and clergy were overwhelmed with material gifts. The advancement of the new religion sounded the knell of paganism, but, as by far the greater portion of the population was still true to its ancient gods, it was found necessary to proceed cautiously. In 320 the private sacrifices of the Aruspices were prohibited, but Constantine still continued to bear the title and perform the duties of Pontifex Maximus,

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XVI, tit. 10 (a collection of laws bearing on the subject); V. SCHULTZE, *Gesch. des Untergangs des griechisch-röm. Heidentums*, 2 vol. 1887-92; G. BOISSIER, *La fin du paganisme*, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1898; SEECK, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 2 vol. 1895-1901; ALLARD, *Le christianisme et l'Empire romain de Néron à Théodose*, 1897; 5th ed. 1903.

<sup>2</sup> EUS. *Vita Constantini*; *De laudibus Constant.*; J. BURCKHARDT, *Die Zeit Kons. d. Gr.* 2nd ed. 1880; FLASCH, *Kons. d. Gr. als erster christl. Kaiser*, 1891; FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 1-23; J. B. FIRTH, *Constantine the Great*, 1905.

whilst coins continued to be struck on which he appeared surrounded by the customary pagan symbols.

Whilst, however, the Western emperor openly espoused the Christians' cause, the ruler of the East had adopted a different policy. It is true that Licinius<sup>1</sup> never formally revoked the edict of 313. Nevertheless he found means to oppress the Christians: they were expelled from the army and dismissed from the court, whilst many lost their rank and fortune; Councils were forbidden, Divine worship was rendered difficult, whilst in some quarters his governors actually caused blood to be shed. But this situation soon came to an end. The jealousy of the two emperors issued in a conflict, which was embittered by the intrusion of the religious question. The outcome of the struggle was that Licinius, in 323, lost his dominions, and, in 324, his life.

Constantine's victory not only re-established the unity of the Empire, it also contributed to the advantage of the Christian cause. The emperor now began to give indubitable signs of his preference. Christians were chosen to fill the highest offices in the State, splendid buildings were erected for Christian worship, whilst the pagan temples were left to fall into ruins, some, especially those which had been used for immoral purposes, being forthwith levelled to the ground. In Byzantium or Constantinople, which had been chosen in 330 as the imperial residence, an entirely Christian city was erected, to adorn which the pagan temples were robbed of their treasures, the idols of gold and silver being melted down. In his manifesto to the East, Constantine expresses his wish that all should co-operate with him in spreading the true religion, but he also directs that no one shall be molested for his conscientious beliefs. In the West it was necessary to be even more careful in sparing the feelings of the adherents of the old order. After the death of Constantine, which occurred in 337 at the castle of Achyron near Nicomedia, soon after his Baptism by Eusebius, bishop of the city, his sons proceeded to carry on his work, though with far less consideration. In 341 Constantius (337-61) issued an edict, in which reference is made to a law of his father's (doubtless to that of 320, against worship in

<sup>1</sup> Eus. *H. E.* X, 8-9; *Vit. Cons.* I, 49-56; II, 1-18; F. GÖRRES, *Krit. Untersuchung über die Licinianische Christenverfolgung*, 1875.

private houses), forbidding generally all sacrifices; this prohibition was soon after followed by another, issued in conjunction with Constans (337-50), enforcing it with the death penalty, and ordering the closing of all temples. After the overthrow of the usurper Magnentius, the same law was again twice re-enacted (353-56). This repetition shows how eager Constantius was to uproot paganism; it also shows that the law had not been put into force everywhere. With the advent of his successor it was repealed.

The legend of Constantine's Baptism by Pope Silvester is utterly unhistorical. Cp. DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln*, 1863, pp. 52-61 (Engl. Trans. *Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1872); DUCHESNE, *Liber pontificalis*, I, pp. cix-cxx. (L. de COMBES, *The Finding of the Cross*, Engl. Trans. 1907, p. 122.)

II. **Julian** (361-63)<sup>1</sup> had long been secretly attached to paganism, and as soon as he ascended the imperial throne, in succession to his cousin Constantius, he lost no time in decreeing its re-establishment. The Church lost all the rights she had acquired, and the Galileans, as Julian contemptuously called the Christians, were dismissed from all official posts and forbidden to lecture on the classics in the high schools, ostensibly because it was not fitting that unbelievers in the gods should explain the works in which their deeds are recorded, but really in order to force the Christians either to attend the pagan schools or abandon all hopes of a liberal education. Apparently in order to falsify the words of Christ (*Matt.* xxiv. 2), an attempt was made to rebuild Jerusalem and its Temple. Even the pen was seized on as a weapon. Julian composed, among other works, three books *Adv. Christianos*, which are, however, only known to us through the refutation devoted to them by Cyril of Alexandria, of which again a part only has been preserved. The excessive zeal of some of the magistrates and the fanaticism of the mob even led to the shedding of some blood. On the other hand the emperor, who was personally attracted to Neo-Platonism, sought to reform the ancient religion. Almshouses and hostels for the reception of strangers

<sup>1</sup> *Iuliani imp. libr. c. Christ. quae supersunt*, ed. C. I. NEUMANN, 1880. Mg. by AUER, 1835; MÜCKE, 1869; RODE, 1877; GARDNER, 1895; *Jewish Quarterly Rev.* 1893, pp. 591-651; VOLLERT, 1899; W. KOCH, 1899; G. NEGRI, 1901; P. ALLARD, 3 vol. 1900-03; C. PARSONS, 1903.

were erected, provision was made for the proper instruction of the people in their religion, the priests were compelled to set a good example, and a kind of pagan ecclesiastical rule of life was introduced, &c. This attempt at reformation, which, in so far as it imitated Christian models, was an indirect testimony to Christianity, had no far-reaching result, paganism being already too decayed to be open to such a renewal. Scarcely was the work begun than the emperor perished, and the attempt was at an end.

III. Though, after Julian's repressive measures, a reaction against the old religion might have been expected, the emperors who immediately succeeded him showed themselves averse to any such policy of reprisals. Jovian restored to the Christians all that they had been deprived of by his predecessor, assigning to paganism the position it had occupied before the reign of Julian. This same policy was, to begin with, pursued by Valentinian I (364-75) and his brother the Arian Valens (364-78), of whom the former ruled the West and the latter the East. Their first prohibitions were directed only against nocturnal sacrifices, and later on, when a decree was issued forbidding all sacrifices, an exception was still made for the thurifications. The emperors who followed were more severe.

**Gratian** (375-83) was the first to lay aside the title and insignia of the Pontifex Maximus. He also suppressed the subventions to heathen worship, and confiscated the revenues of the priests and vestal virgins, together with the landed property of the temples, reduced the immunities of the priests, and removed the altar of the goddess of victory from the hall of the Senate. These alterations, especially the last, occasioned great commotion among the pagans, and a deputation, headed by the senator Symmachus, visited the emperor's camp at Milan to request greater leniency. Shortly after this the emperor lost his life at the hand of the usurper Maximus, and a similar petition, this time couched in writing, seems to have been more successful. Gratian had refused even to receive the pagan deputation; his brother and successor, the thirteen-year-old Valentinian II (383-92), was, on the other hand, advised by his ministers to yield. He too, however, ended by adopting his predecessor's policy, and with still

better reason, the majority in the Senate being now Christian. The adoption of this stronger policy was due to the influence of the great bishop of Milan, St. Ambrose, the power of whose persuasion was greater than that of all the other imperial counsellors.

In the meantime similar events were being enacted in the East. **Theodosius I** (379-95), whom Gratian had appointed successor to his uncle Valens, displayed some hesitation in the beginning of his reign, but, after a few years, he too gave orders for the closing of many temples, and on the pagans in certain localities manifesting their displeasure, they were made to suffer yet more severely. Thus, when in a popular upheaval at Alexandria all the pagan objects of veneration, including the famous *Serapeion*, had been burnt, no measures were taken against the disturbers of the peace. Much the same happened in other places through the zeal of the Christian population, and especially of the monks, the temples, when they were not destroyed, being seized for Christian worship. This it was which induced the rhetor Libanius to address to the emperor his *Oratio pro templis*. His efforts were, however, in vain, for paganism was already in its death-throes.

A little later (391) an enactment of both emperors forbade, under heavy fines, all public heathen worship: not sacrifices alone, but also the visiting of temples and the cultus of idols. A momentary pause followed the assassination of Valentinian by the Frank Arbogast, and the accession of the usurper Eugenius (392-94); at least the practice of the older religion was again permitted in the city of Rome, but the victory of Theodosius at Aquileia finally blasted the hopes of the pagans.

IV. Paganism being now illicit in all its manifestations, it was only necessary to put in force the laws already in existence. This was not, however, considered sufficient, and yet new enactments followed. In the East, Arcadius (395-408) withdrew from the pagan priests whatever privileges and revenues they still retained, and razed the rural temples. Theodosius II (408-50) excluded pagans from public offices (416), and commanded all works inimical to Christianity to be burnt (448). In one of his laws (423) his expressions would

almost lead us to suppose that there were no pagans left, and, at the least, they prove that paganism had dwindled down to almost nothing. That some pagans still existed is, however, clear from the measures which Justinian I (527-65) had to take against them. He ordained that pagans should be incapable of acquiring money, and closed the schools of philosophy at Athens, of which the chairs had, almost without exception, been retained by pagan Neo-Platonists.

In the West the temples lost the remainder of their revenues through an edict of Honorius (395-423), whilst by Stilicho, the emperor's relative and principal minister, the ancient Sibylline books were burnt. Yet, on the other hand, the authorities were careful to preserve the decorations of the public buildings and the statues of the gods with which they were adorned, and to prevent the temples from being destroyed when once they had been deprived of pagan tokens. Here also, in the West, paganism still lingered on, and in out-of-the-way places it actually lasted longer than in the East. Even Gregory the Great was moved to devise means to extirpate it in Sardinia, Corsica, and other regions.

V. Whilst the State was thus engaged in stamping out the old religion, the Church was not idle. Her task was to supplement the work of the legislature, by making real Christians of the many who became converts in outward appearance only. She also continued to preach the Gospel in heathen circles, and among those of her members who devoted themselves to this task two names are conspicuous: that of Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, and that of John Chrysostom. Little record was, however, kept of the Church's work.

After the middle of the fourth century the heathen are commonly designated by the name of *pagani*; we find it in a law of 368 or 370 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI, 18, 2), and the term is commonly alleged as a proof of the straits into which heathenism had fallen, and rightly, for though it had been used before (TERT. *De corona mil.* c. 11) to denote a civilian in contradistinction to a soldier, it seems to have had, at the date when it was adopted as an appellation for the heathen, the meaning of a villager or peasant, and it was chosen because most of the remaining adherents of paganism were country people. For different views, see ZAHN, *N. kirchl. Z.* X (1899), 18-43; HARNACK, *Militia Christi*, 1905, pp. 68 f., 122.

## § 42

Christianity in Asia and Africa <sup>1</sup>

I. Christianity had already contrived to obtain a footing in **Persia** <sup>2</sup> in the previous period. By this time it was already in a flourishing condition, but it was soon to be tried by fierce persecutions. The first broke out, c. 345, under king Shapur II (310-80), and greatly increased in violence when war was proclaimed between this king and Constantius. Sozomen <sup>3</sup> actually states that as many as 16,000 martyrs were known by name. The next Persian kings were less unkindly disposed. Yezdedsherd I (400-21) for a time even favoured the Christians. The destruction of a temple of the fire-worshippers by Abdas, bishop of Susa, in 418 was made the pretext of a renewal of the persecution, which then continued, increasing greatly in violence under Bahram IV (421-38), <sup>4</sup> until 450. Nestorianism also, at about this time, fixed on Persia as its headquarters, and at the beginning of the sixth century whatever possessions remained in the hands of the Catholic Church were forcibly appropriated by the heretics.

II. Into **Armenia** <sup>5</sup> Christianity had made its way at an early date (§ 13, 8), whilst towards the end of the previous period, in consequence of the conversion of king Tiridates by Gregory the Illuminator, all traces of the olden heathenism were destroyed and Christianity was made the religion of the State. The king's example was immediately followed by the nobility, the conversion of the other classes being effected in the course of the fourth century. When, in 428, the country became a Persian province, an attempt was made to introduce Parseeism, but it was frustrated by the constancy of the Armenians. Yet the population as a whole went over to Monophysitism by receiving the Henoticon at the

<sup>1</sup> DUCHESNE, *Autonomies ecclésiastiques, églises séparées*, 2nd ed. 1905. [Engl. Trans. *Churches separated from Rome*, 1907.]

<sup>2</sup> *Z. f. wiss. Th.* 1888, pp. 449-68; 1896, pp. 443-59. J. LABOURT, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse* (224-632), 1904.

<sup>3</sup> *H. E.* II, 9-14.

<sup>4</sup> SOCR. VII, 8, 18; THEODOR. V, 38.

<sup>5</sup> ST. CLAIR-TISDALL, *The Conversion of Armenia to the Christian Faith*, 1896; S. WEBER, *Die kath. Kirche in Armenien, ihre Begründung u. Entwicklung vor der Trennung*, 1903.

Council of Valarshapat in 491, and rejecting the Council of Chalcedon.

III. **Iberia** or Georgia, lying north of Armenia, to the south of the Caucasus, was won over to the Faith through the wonderful cures wrought by a prisoner of war named Nino (c. 325). With this district as its starting-point, Christianity was carried eastwards into Albania, and, at the beginning of the sixth century, also westwards to the Lasi (Colchis), and to the Abasges. These countries all passed over to Monophysitism with Armenia. Cp. RUF. I, 10; SOCR. II, 20; SOZ. II, 7; *Studia bibl. et eccl.* V, 1, 1900 (Life of Nino); *Oriens christ.* II (1902), 130-50.

IV. Theophilus, a bishop sent by Constantius, laboured with good results among the **Homerites** or Sabæans of South Arabia. The population survived the persecution which it had to experience from a Jewish king at the beginning of the sixth century, but in the next century it was wiped out by the Persians and Mohammedans. Cp. PHILOST. II, 6; III, 4; *Z. d. d. morgenl. Ges.* 1881, vol. 35, pp. 1-75.

V. Christianity was carried to **China** in 636 by Nestorian missionaries, as is shown by an inscription of the year 781, which was discovered by the Jesuits at Si-Gan-Fu in 1625. Cp. LAMY and GUELUY, *Le monument chrétien de Si-Ngan-Fou*, 1897 (*Mémoires de l'Académie r. des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique*, t. 53).

VI. In Africa the Gospel reached **Abyssinia**<sup>1</sup> as early as the time of Constantine, by the advent at the court of two young slaves from Tyre, Frumentius and Edesius, who acquired great influence and used it in favour of Christianity. Edesius ultimately returned home, but Frumentius was consecrated, by Athanasius of Alexandria, bishop of Axuma, and the new religion made great progress throughout the country. Owing to its dependence on Alexandria, Abyssinia also went over to Monophysitism.

In the sixth century the **Nubians** who dwelt to the north of Abyssinia were converted to Christianity, or rather to Monophysitism. At about the same time, under Justinian I, the presbyter Julian of Alexandria, and a little later the bishop Longinus, preached the Faith among the Nabadæans; the latter was also the apostle of the Alodæans. Cp. JOHN OF EPHEBUS, *H. E.* IV.

<sup>1</sup> RUF. I, 9; SOCR. I, 19; SOZ. II, 24; THEODOR. I, 23; *Neue kirchl. Z.* X (1899), 736-69.

## § 43

Christianity among the Germans<sup>1</sup>

I. The Germans became acquainted with Christianity by coming into contact with Christian nations as they pushed southwards. The first tribe to be converted was that of the Goths who had taken up their residence in the third century on the northern side of the lower Danube, or, to speak more correctly, that of the West-Goths,<sup>2</sup> or **Visigoths**, the nation being divided into two portions, according to their dwelling-place. A Gothic bishop, Theophilus, was present even at the Council of Nicæa. The work of conversion was greatly hastened by Ulfilas<sup>3</sup> (Wulfila = 'a little wolf'), who devoted himself to the task, and translated Holy Writ into the Gothic tongue. His efforts had, however, also the result of popularising among the Germans his own Arian doctrines. The Arian Valens, who had made an alliance with the chief Fridigern against Athanaric, a foe of the Christians, by sending Arian bishops and priests to the West-Goths, and by providing the tribes with settlements in Thrace where they would be sheltered from the Huns (376), enabled the heresy to gain so strong a footing among the Goths that it clung to them even after they had continued their wanderings through Greece and Italy, and found a new home in Gaul and Spain (419). A change came only at the end of the sixth century. King Leovigild (569-86) had indeed dealt severely, and even cruelly, with his Catholic subjects, but his sons openly espoused the Church's cause. The step taken by Hermenegild, in heading the revolt of the Suevians and Greeks of the Spanish seaports, was indeed useless, for, being attacked and defeated, he was captured and put to death (585) by his father. On the contrary, the conversion of Reccared (586-601) was of great importance. His example was followed by a large part of his people, and in the following century, as we may see from the frequent national

<sup>1</sup> F. DAHN, *Die Könige der Germanen*, I-IX, 1861-1905; PALLMANN, *Gesch. d. Völkerwanderung*, 2 vol. 1863-64.

<sup>2</sup> IORDANES, *De rebus Geticis*; ISID. HISPALENSIS, *De reg. Gothorum*; J. ASCHBACH, *Gesch. d. W.* 1827; GAMS, *KG. von Spanien*, II, I (1864), 180 ff.; *St. u. Kr.* 1893-94; *Z. f. w. Th.* 1899, pp. 270-322 (Reccared).

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by G. WAITZ, 1840; W. BESSELL, 1860; F. KAUFFMANN, 1899 (*Texte u. Unt. zur altgerman. Religionsgesch.* I).

synods held at Toledo, the Church's activity in the kingdom of the West-Goths must have been very great.

II. At the time when the **Suevians** settled in Gallæcia in the north-west of Spain (409), they were still, most of them, heathens. Their conversion was effected towards the middle of the fifth century. The influence of their king Rechiar was sufficient to lead them to embrace Catholicity, just as that of Remismund sufficed to make them espouse the cause of the Arians. At a later date, however, king Chararic (550-59) returned to the fold of the Church. Their subsequent history is that of the West-Goths, whose sovereignty they were forced to acknowledge by Leovigild (585). Cp. ISID., *De rege Goth.*, &c., c. 85-92; *Z. f. wiss. Th.* 1893, II, 542-78.

III. In consequence of their intercourse with the Visigoths, the **Ostrogoths** or East-Goths,<sup>1</sup> in the course of the fourth century, passed over to Arianism, to which they remained attached until the fall of their kingdom. Towards the end of the fifth century their dwelling-place was in Pannonia, from which they invaded Italy as soon as their king Theodoric had vanquished Odovaker (493), who himself had in 476 given the death-blow to the Roman Empire of the West. Though an Arian, Theodoric allowed freedom of worship to all Catholics within his kingdom; that the Church appreciated his fairness is evident from his having been called upon to arbitrate in the case of the double papal election (496) of Symmachus and Lawrence (cp. § 64, II). His kingdom, however, did not long survive his death (526). After twenty years of warfare, the Ostrogoths were compelled in 555 to yield to the Byzantines.

IV. The Eastern Empire was not to enjoy the fruits of its victory. In 568 the **Lombards**<sup>2</sup> advanced from Pannonia, under the leadership of Alboin, on the Apennine peninsula, which they conquered with the exception of the Exarchate of Ravenna, the dukedom of Rome, and some other possessions to the south, which remained in the hands of the Byzantines. At this time the Lombards professed Arianism, which they had doubtless learnt to know through intercourse with others of their race, but, by the marriage of their king Authari with Theodelinde (589), they received a Catholic queen who was

<sup>1</sup> MANSO, *Gesch. des ostgot. Reiches in Italien*, 1824; PFEILSCHIFTER, *Theoderich d. Gr. u. d. kath. K.* 1896 (*Kirchengesch. Studien*, III, 1-2).

<sup>2</sup> PAUL. DIAC. *De gest. Langobard. libb. VI*; *A. f. k. KR.* 1903, pp. 577-619.

able to make her influence felt long after. At Authari's death (590) she, with the consent of the nation, chose as her consort Agilulf, duke of Turin, after whose demise she governed as regent during the minority of her son Adelwald. Arianism was, however, still rampant, and, after her death (c. 623) and the dethronement of Adelwald, the country was again ruled by Arian kings. It was only under Grimoald (†681) that the conversion of the population was completed.

V. The **Rugians** also, like the other Germanic tribes, were infected with Arianism, though it is difficult to say how it obtained a footing among them. On the destruction of the empire of the Huns, subsequent to Attila's death (453), they settled in Noricum or Lower Austria, where just then St. Severinus (†482), the consoler and protector of the oppressed Romans, was living, and whose wonderful life was committed to writing by his disciple Eugippius. There can be little doubt that the same Arian belief was also shared by the Skires and Turkelings, who were united by many ties with the Rugians.

VI. The **Burgundians**,<sup>1</sup> who, at the beginning of the fifth century, had settled, some of them between the Main and Neckar, and others on the left bank of the Rhine, appear in the first instance as Catholics. When we next hear of them, in the country which they had newly conquered between the Jura, Rhone, and Vosges, they had most of them passed over to Arianism. On the death of Gundobad, and the accession of his Catholic son Sigismund (516), the population began again to return to Catholicism, Arianism disappearing as soon as the Burgundians fell under the domination of the Franks.

VII. The **Vandals**<sup>2</sup> were Arians at the time when, in concert with the Suevians and Alans, they made their way in devastating hordes through Gaul, and settled (409) in Spain. They carried their belief with them when, in 429, they passed over to Africa. They even went so far as to harass the Catholics in their new home, and, especially under the kings Geiseric and Huneric, there occurred a series of persecutions in which bishops and nobility suffered severely. This lasted until, in 533, Justinian made an end of the Vandal rule.

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by O. JAHN, 1874; *KL.* II, 1568 ff.

<sup>2</sup> ISID. *Hisp. Hist. Vand. et Suevorum*; VICT. VITENSIS, *Hist. persec. Vand.*; DIEHL, *L'Afrique byzantine* (533-709), 1896; L. SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Vandalen*, 1901.

The Vandal invasion itself involved much suffering among the inhabitants, nor was it long before Geiseric (437) began to attack the Catholic religion as such. On taking possession of Carthage (439) he forthwith banished the bishop with a large body of his clergy; the exiles were shipped on crazy vessels, and left to the mercy of the waves. Other acts of violence followed, and, with a three years' interval (454-57), the persecution endured until 475, when Catholic worship again received toleration. The next few years were peaceful, but after having, to begin with, granted them toleration, Huneric (477-84), in 481, commenced treating the Catholics even more harshly than his father. The meeting which had been called at Carthage to discuss religious affairs having broken up without coming to a decision, all churches were handed over to the Arians, whilst the laws enacted by the Roman emperors against heretics were put into force against the Catholics, who were forbidden to worship publicly. A short pause ensued on the accession of Guntamund, but Thrasamund (496-523) again caused the Catholic churches to be closed. After another interval, caused by the advent to the throne of Hilderic (523-30), the reins of power were assumed by Gelimer, an embittered Arian, who would probably have vented his spite on the Catholics had not his kingdom been destroyed shortly after.

VIII. The **Franks**,<sup>1</sup> who of all the Germanic tribes were to play the most important part in history, became acquainted with the Gospel by settling in a country which was already Christian. They began their migration from the delta of the Rhine in the latter half of the fifth century, and, after having vanquished the Roman governor Syagrius at Soissons (486), they established themselves in northern Gaul as far as the Seine. Pushing the Visigoths farther and farther south, they finally compelled them to cross the Pyrenees, whereupon the Franks found themselves in possession of the whole of Gaul. It was not long before the nation adopted Christianity. Chlodwig (481-511), who already was acquainted with Christianity through his wife Chlotilde, a Burgundian princess, in the battle of Tolbiacum (Zülpich) in 496, when hard pressed by the Alemanni, made a vow that, should the victory remain with him, he would embrace Christianity. The following Christmas he was baptised by Remigius, bishop of Rheims, more than

<sup>1</sup> GREG. TUR. *Hist. Franc.*; BORNHAK, *Gesch. d. Fr. u. d. Merovingern*, 1863; FRIEDRICH, *KG. Deutschlands*. II (1869), 1 ff.; LOEBELL, *Gregor v. T. u. s. Zeit*, 2nd ed. 1869; *Th. Qu.* 1895, 351 f.; G. KURTH, *Clouis*, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1902.

3,000 of his head-men imitating his example. The common people were not long in following suit, for, as it had happened among the other Germanic tribes, the conversion of the ruler invariably brought about the conversion of his people. In this case Chlodwig's example seems to have worked even outside of his own dominions, for king Chararic and his son also appear in the guise of Christians. Nor was it long before Chlodwig seized the territories of the other Frankish kinglets and united the whole country under his sway. The conversion of this nation was a matter of supreme importance. Now that a powerful Germanic nation had adopted the Catholicism professed by the Græco-Roman world, the doom of Arianism was sealed. That in the course of the sixth century three Germanic tribes forsook Arianism is a fact which can only be explained by the influential position of the Franks. Yet their adoption of the Faith did not mean that they were forthwith reclaimed from barbarism. Their ethical conversion was a gradual work which it took ages to accomplish.

## § 44

### The British Isles

Christianity had obtained a footing even in the previous period among the **Britons**<sup>1</sup> who then inhabited England (§ 13, 5); by the fourth century it had been adopted generally, and had penetrated northwards as far as the Firth of Clyde in Scotland. Unfortunately Christianity was not strong enough to retain the positions it had taken. On being evacuated by the Romans the country became the scene of the savage inroads of the Picts and Scots, *i.e.* inhabitants of Scotland and Ireland. The plan of Vortigern, the British king (449), to invite the assistance of the Angles and Saxons under Hengist and Horsa, issued in yet worse calamities. The Saxons, who had come as allies, remained in the island as conquerors, and soon every trace of Christianity was swept away. The only districts in which the Britons were able to maintain their independence and their religion

<sup>1</sup> BED. *H. E.* I, 8-22; WILLIAMS, *Some Aspects of the Christian Church in Wales*, 1895; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 421-59.

were the mountainous tracts of Cambria (Wales) and the south-west extremity of Cornwall.

But whilst Christianity was being set back in Britain, it was beginning its conquest of the neighbouring countries. In Ireland (*Hibernia, Scotia*)<sup>1</sup> it had been preached even earlier, Palladius having been sent by Pope Celestine, in 431, as the first bishop *ad Scotos in Christum credentes*. The real conversion of the country began, however, in the following year, when St. Patrick, who had passed some years of his youth in Ireland as a captive and slave, came forward as a missionary, and with the help of his many disciples worked to such good purpose, during the remaining sixty years of his life, that the island was entirely converted.

In the south of Caledonia or **Scotland** (*Scotia*),<sup>2</sup> that is, in the land of the Picts, the Gospel was preached, c. 412, by the Briton Ninian. In the north of the peninsula the work of evangelisation proceeded with even better success, thanks to the missionary activity displayed during thirty-four years by the Irish abbot Columba, who was the true apostle of the country († 597). The headquarters of this mission was the monastery founded by Columba on the island of Hy, or Iona (I-Kolum-kil). The new Church formed by these monastic missionaries retained long after a quasi-monastic character; all the clergy were monks, and down to the eighth century they continued to owe obedience to the abbot of Iona, though these abbots, like their founder, were simple priests. In this region secular priests do not make their appearance before the eighth century, whilst dioceses came into existence only in the twelfth century.

Towards the end of the sixth century Christianity reappeared in England.<sup>3</sup> In 596, in obedience to a command of Gregory

<sup>1</sup> *Libri S. Patricii*, ed. NEWPORT T. D. WHITE, 1905 (*Proceedings of the R. Irish Acad. C.* vol. 25); GREITH, *Gesch. d. altir. Kirche*, 1867; BELLESHEIM, *Gesch. d. kath. Kirche in Irland*, 3 vol. 1890-91; J. B. BURY, *The Life of St. Patrick*, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> ADAMNAN, *Vita S. Columbae*, ed. FOWLER, 1894; BED. *H. E.* III, 4; BELLESHEIM, *Gesch. d. kath. K. in Schottland*, 2 vol. 1883; (Engl. Trans. *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland from the introduction of Christianity to the present day*, 4 vol. 1887 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> *Beda Vener. Hist. Eccl. gent. Anglorum* (ed. HOLDER, 1882; PLUMMER, 1896); E. WINKELMANN, *Gesch. d. Angelsachsen bis zum Tode K. Älfreds*, 1883; SPENCE, *The Church of England*, I, 1897; BROU (Engl. Trans. *St. Augustine of Canterbury and his Companions*, 1897); HOLTUEUER, *Die Gründung d. angelsächsischen K.* 1897; O. JENSEN, *Der englische Peterspfennig*, 1903.

the Great, the abbot Augustine, with some forty monks, set out to convert the Anglo-Saxons. King Ethelbert of Kent, who was then Bretwalda or head of the Heptarchy, and who was favourably predisposed to the Gospel owing to his wife Bertha being a Frank, granted them leave to preach, and soon after presented himself with a large number of his people for Baptism. As soon as the news of Augustine's success had been carried to Rome, the Pope dispatched additional missionaries, and directed that two ecclesiastical provinces, each with twelve suffragan bishops, should be established in England. The two metropolitans were to be the bishops of London and York, though, in the event, Canterbury, which was the capital of Kent, and had been the scene of the missioners' first efforts, was chosen instead of London. Within fifty years five new kingdoms were marshalled under the Cross, the principal being Essex, with its capital London (seat of a bishop since 604), and Northumberland, which had been Christianised from Iona, but which, in 664, agreed to conform to the Roman practices, especially to the Roman Easter reckoning. The last to enter the fold was Sussex, under king Ceadwalla (685-88). The close connection of the country with Rome soon after found its expression in a yearly tax; at least it is certain that king Offa of Mercia († 796) made a promise of Peter's Pence.

## § 45

### The Islam <sup>1</sup>

Whilst the Gospel was engaged in its conquest of the West, a new religious power had made its appearance in the East. To Mohammed (570-632), its moving spirit, due credit must be allowed for his success in expelling idolatry from his country, and in bringing the Arabs to the belief in one God. It is beyond doubt that his knowledge of Monotheism was acquired through his intercourse with Jews and Christians, whose tenets he had many opportunities of

<sup>1</sup> A. MÜLLER, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland*, 2 vol. 1885-87 (ONCKEN, *Allg. Gesch.* II, 4). Mg. on Mohammed by H. GRIMME, 2 vol. 1892-95; LAMAIRESSE and DUJARRIC, 2 vol. 1898; O. PAUTZ (on his doctrine of Revelation), 1898.

studying at home, and still more during his travels. In the same manner he came to know other elements of Jewish and Christian doctrine; Moses and Christ he acknowledged as prophets, and he likewise admitted the Resurrection and the Last Judgment. Relying, however, on certain revelations of which he thought himself the recipient, he proclaimed that he himself was God's messenger, and, in fact, the greatest of the prophets. It was this conviction which ultimately made of him a foe of Judaism and Christianity, to both of which he had, in earlier days, been disposed to be friendly. His quarrel with the Christians dates from the year (622) of his flight, or Hedjrah, when, on account of the animosity of the Meccans, he migrated to Yathrib or Medina, and its reason was the sanction he gave to the polygamy practised by the Arabs. Mohammed continued, however, to maintain the identity of the revelations, arguing that the Christians had corrupted the sacred books by their Trinitarian doctrines. In the following year he broke away from the Jews also. Jewish practices which had been adopted were again set aside, and, in particular, the direction of prayer (*Kibla*) was altered from Jerusalem to Mecca, where there was the sacred object of the Kaaba. At this time he was impelled by his revelations to declare that it was part of the Faithful's duty to wage the Holy War, *i.e.* to fight unceasingly all unbelievers, and to set the example he undertook, with his followers, the conquest of Arabia. Mecca was taken in 629, and the Kaaba, after the idols had been destroyed, was made the centre of the new religion, which now came to be known as the Islam, on account of the abandonment of self into God's hands which it involved. Soon practically the whole country was in the Prophet's grip, and his plans for subjugating the neighbouring lands were carried out by his successors, the Caliphs. The first two, Abu Bekr (632-34) and Omar (634-44), effected the conquest of Persia, Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. Under Othman (644-56) an attack was made on the territories of Carthage, and, though the outbreak of civil war at home caused the attempt to be foiled, yet towards the end of the century the Carthaginians were safely gathered under the standard of the Prophet, and the conquerors were free to continue their victorious march on the Barbary States and the West of Africa, the many divisions and enmities to which the

Christological disputes had given rise among the Eastern Christians greatly facilitating their task.

As a general rule, toleration was extended to the Christians of the conquered lands, though an exception was made for Arabia, from which both Jews and Christians were expelled. Christianity had, nevertheless, much to suffer: owing to the long-drawn ecclesiastical dissensions the Faith had grown cold, whilst the Mohammedans were naturally anxious to make converts among their new subjects, seeking to gain this end sometimes by petty vexations, sometimes by real acts of oppression. Laws were passed to induce the Christians to apostatise; such as did so were declared free from the capitation tax, whilst slaves and bondsmen of the Christians could recover their liberty by embracing the Islam. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at if many fell away; with the course of time Christianity died out altogether in the north-west of Africa. The Church of Carthage, which survived the longest, disappeared in the year 1160. On the other hand, any attempt to convert the Moslems was frustrated by the law, which condemned to death anyone who should forsake the Prophet.

The principal religious book of the Mohammedans is the **Koran**, or collection of Mohammed's revelations [Engl. Trans. by SALE]. It was compiled under Abu Bekr, at the suggestion of Omar, for the private use of the Caliphs. A second and official redaction, intended for Moslems generally, was published under Othman. The work comprises 114 chapters or Suras. As a commentary on the Koran we have the Sunnat, a compilation of sayings of the Prophet and anecdotes regarding him, which were transmitted orally until a century after Mohammed's time. This collection of traditions is, however, acknowledged as authoritative by only one-half of the Moslem world, namely by the Sunnites; the Shiites, on the other hand, reject it almost in its entirety. The three ground-dogmas of the Islam are the belief in one invisible God, in Mohammed his prophet, and in an everlasting life, of which the joy is, however, grossly sensual. The five commandments, or pillars, of Mohammedanism are: 1. Purifications, or washings. 2. Prayers recited five times a day at the call of the Muezzin from the minaret. 3. A daily fast in the month of Ramadan, from dawn until sunset. 4. The Pilgrimage to Mecca to be undertaken by each Moslem at least once in his life. 5. The giving of alms of the value of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of one's fortune.

## CHAPTER II

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINE—THEOLOGICAL DISSENSIONS, HERESIES, AND SCIISMS<sup>1</sup>

#### § 46

#### Summary of the Matters in Dispute

THOUGH the Church, as a whole, agreed in one Faith, yet when it became a question of determining the precise meaning of the articles of this Faith, opinions were prone to differ, and this difference of opinion continued to be a source of constant quarrel; in fact, the theological controversies of this period were of far greater moment than those of the previous, for not only did they persist throughout the period, but they touched on the most essential points of the Faith, whilst the manner in which they were resolved is also of great interest. When the attitude of the Roman State had been altered from one of hostility to one of patronage, it became customary to summon Councils of the whole Church in which the points at issue might be debated and definitively settled. According to the subject-matter, we may distinguish three great disputes.

I. The first to crop up was the Trinitarian question, which had already presented itself in the previous age. In the beginning the dispute concerned the relations of the Son to the Father, *i.e.* a purely theological question agitated between the orthodox, the Arians, and semi-Arians; later on, the advent of the Pneumatomachi made a discussion of the nature of the Holy Ghost also necessary. Both these questions were authoritatively settled by the first two oecumenical Councils.

<sup>1</sup> SCHWANE, *Dogmengesch. d. patr. Zeit* (325-787), 1866; 2nd ed. 1895. HEFELE, *CG.* I-III. [DUCHESNE, *Churches separated from Rome*, Engl. Trans. 1907.]

II. The Trinitarian dispute gave rise to the Christological. It had first to be shown that Apollinaris and the Arians were in the wrong in maintaining that the Logos had not assumed the whole of human nature, then it became necessary to determine the relations of the two natures in Christ; this was done at the Third and Fourth General Councils, which condemned the mistaken disruptive and confusing tendencies of Nestorianism and of Monophysitism respectively. Lastly, there arose the question as to our Saviour's will, which was decided against the Monothelites by the Sixth General Council.

III. Simultaneously with the Christological quarrel, there broke out the Anthropological or Soteriological controversy concerning the original state of man, the consequences of the Fall, and the relation of freedom and grace, the innovators in this case being the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians. This last controversy exercised minds more especially in Western or Latin Christendom, the Eastern Church concerning itself almost exclusively with the others. Side by side with these disputes many smaller ones were proceeding; of these, some were connected with those just mentioned, whilst others had a separate origin. Though their real importance was small, yet some of them caused no little disturbance in the religious world, as for instance the rise of Donatism, and the question of the Three Chapters, to settle which the Fifth General Council was summoned.

## § 47

### **The Beginning of the Arian Controversy; the First General Council<sup>1</sup>**

The Church, by excommunicating both categories of the anti-Trinitarian Monarchians, had implicitly acknowledged Christ's person to be Divine, and yet distinct from that of the

<sup>1</sup> GELASIUS CYZICENUS, *Acta conc. Nicaeni*; G. LÖSCHKE, *Das Syntagma des Gelasius C.* 1906 (*Rhein. Museum*, vol. 60-61); KUHN, *Kath. Dogmatik*, II, 1857; DORNER, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1845-53 (Engl. Trans. *Hist. of the development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 1859 ff.); GWATKIN, *Studies of Arianism*, 2nd ed. 1900; SNELLMAN, *Der Anfang des arian. Streites*, 1904; *Nachr. Göttingen*, 1905, pp. 257-99; REVILLOUT, *Le Concile de Nicée*, 1899; O. BRAUN, *De s. Nicaena synodo*, 1898; *Z. f. k. Th.* 1906, pp. 172-78 (for the number of the bishops present at the Council).

Father. But the relation in which the Divinity of the Son stood with respect to that of the Father remained undecided, several opinions being in the field, most of which had this in common, that, though they did not deny the Son's Divinity, they inclined to subordinate the Son to the Father, either by connecting His begetting with the Creation of the world—thus endangering either His eternity or at least the eternity of His personal existence—or even by conceiving of His Divinity as inferior to, and derivative from, the Divinity of the Father. Yet at the same time we also meet, especially in the Roman Church, the persuasion that the Father and the Son are really coequal. It was this conviction which was to prevail ultimately, and the occasion was to be furnished by the Arian controversy.

**Arius**, a presbyter of Alexandria, was no mere subordinatist in the sense of the older Fathers. He not only subordinated the Son's nature to the Father's, he actually denied to the former the possession of a Divine nature and of Divine attributes, calling into question particularly His eternity, as we may see from his words: *ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, and *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν*.<sup>1</sup> According to Arius, Christ the Word was a creature, though He was indeed head of all creatures, He alone having been produced directly by the Father, whereas all other things were created through the Word. Though he allows to Christ the title of God, yet he expressly reminds us that His Divinity must not be understood in the strict sense of the term, but only in a moral sense (*μετοχῆ*).<sup>2</sup> This doctrine Arius would seem to have imbibed from the presbyter Lucian of Antioch (§ 32). As soon as he ventured (c. 320) to give public utterance to his views, the quarrel began. A few of the clergy declared themselves on his side, whilst the bishop Alexander, who considered the system to be merely an Ebionite form of Monarchianism, after fruitlessly labouring to reclaim Arius from his error, excommunicated him together with all his adherents at the Synod of 323 (321).<sup>3</sup>

This action caused the controversy to become general. Arius began to cast about for new supporters, and he found

<sup>1</sup> i.e. 'Sprang from nothing.' *Arii ep. ad Eus. Nicom. ap. THEOD. I, 4.*

<sup>2</sup> *Arii Thalia, ap. ATH. Orat. c. Arian. I, 9.*

<sup>3</sup> *SOCR. I, 5, 6; SOZ. I, 15; THEOD. I, 3.*

them, not only in the camp of the Meletians, but also in the Catholic episcopate. Eusebius of Nicomedia openly espoused his cause: in fact, not only the clergy, but also the laity took an interest in the struggle. Hence Constantine, as soon as he had brought the war with Licinius to a successful close, bethought himself of a means of allaying this new strife, and after having sought in vain to arbitrate between Alexander and Arius, and seeing that there were other questions also to debate, especially that of Easter, he took the course of convening an œcumenical Council at Nicæa in Bithynia (325). Some 300 bishops (318) attended, among the most ardent advocates of the Faith being Eustathius of Antioch, Marcellus of Ancyra, and the deacon Athanasius of Alexandria. The assembled bishops holding various views, the debates were occasionally somewhat acrimonious, and the emperor was several times compelled to intervene and exhort the bishops to peace and unity. To begin with, the Fathers were inclined to define in simple Bible language the truth which had been called into question, and to set against the Arian ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων its own ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. But as the Arians were prepared to interpret these words agreeably to their own tenets, that there might be no room for such dissembling, it was finally decided to declare that the Son is ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς and ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί.<sup>1</sup> The Creed which was drawn up by the Council, besides making use of the above words, also explicitly acknowledges, in its first part, the Son as true God (Θεὸς ἀληθινός), begotten and not made, and consubstantial with the Father, whilst, in the second portion, it condemns under anathema Arius's main contentions, viz. that the Son had been made in time and out of nothing, that His hypostasis or *ousia* is different from the Father's, and that He is subject to change (τρεπτὸς ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸς). This Creed was accepted by almost all who were present: only Secundus, bishop of Ptolemais, and Theonas of Marmorica, who had all along been on the side of Arius, refused to sign. They accordingly, like Arius himself, were banished. The same punishment, soon after, overtook Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicæa, and, possibly, also Maris of Chalcedon,

<sup>1</sup> ATHAN. *De decret. Nic. syn.* 19, 20.

who refused to give their sanction to the excommunication of Arius. The Council also decreed that the writings of Arius and of his friends should be burnt.<sup>1</sup>

## § 48

### The Further History and End of Arianism <sup>2</sup>

It was not long before Constantine wearied of the task of enforcing the decrees of the Nicene Council. The exiles, Arius, Eusebius, and Theognis, soon received permission to return to their homes, and the latter two were again restored to their Sees. This encouraged them to commence a campaign against the Faith of Nicæa and its defenders. In 330, Eustathius of Antioch, on the suspicion of Sabellianism, and for disrespect to the empress-mother Helena, was deposed and banished. Against **Athanasius**, who, since 328, was bishop of Alexandria, complaints of the most varied nature were lodged: it was said that he had commissioned his presbyter Macarius to overthrow the altar of a Meletian priest named Ischyras, and had murdered the bishop Arsenius of Hypsele. Athanasius was indeed able—at the Council of Tyre (335), where the matter came up for decision—to dispose effectually of the charge of murder, by bringing forward the murdered man himself as a witness. He was, nevertheless, deposed for his action in the case of Ischyras, and for other alleged offences. On seeking of the emperor at Constantinople a revision of this sentence, a new charge was launched against him, viz. of having attempted to hinder the yearly export of wheat from Alexandria to Constantinople, and on this ground he was exiled to Treves. To this sentence Constantine gave his sanction, either because he believed the truth of the charge, or because he saw no other means of restoring peace to the Church. But the efforts of the Eusebians did not cease with the banishment of their arch-enemy; the Council of Constantinople also pronounced the deposition of Marcellus of Ancyra. On the other hand, their efforts to have Arius readmitted to the fold were less successful. The emperor indeed gave instructions to this effect to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, but Arius had already departed this world before they could be put into execution (336).<sup>3</sup>

It is thought that Arius's death determined Constantine to recall Athanasius, but as the emperor died soon after (337), it was left to his sons to carry this out in the following year. But the Eusebians could not endure the presence of the great defender of

<sup>1</sup> SOCR. I, 9; THEOD. I, 19.

<sup>2</sup> ATHAN. *Hist. Arianorum ad monachos*; J. GUMMERUS, *Die homousianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius* (356-61), 1900.

<sup>3</sup> SOCR. I, 25-38; SOZ. II, 16-30; THEOD. I, 13-29; ATHAN. *Apol. c. Arian.* I-19; *De morte Arii.*

the Faith of Nicæa, and as Constantius was inclined to hearken to them, it came about that Athanasius was again deposed at the Council of Antioch, and the Cappadocian Gregory consecrated in his stead. A Roman Council (340), indeed, pronounced null and void the sentences on both Athanasius and Marcellus, but the Eusebians, nothing daunted, held a synod of their own (*in encaeniis*) on the occasion of the consecration of the so-called golden church at Antioch, in 341, in which they drew up three rules of faith, asserting against Marcellus the eternity of the kingdom of Christ, and anathematising all who shared his view. These same bishops, nevertheless, in a fourth formula which was decided on in a new synod—or possibly a continuation of the previous—held in the same year, condemned also those very propositions of Arius which had been condemned by the Council of Nicæa.<sup>1</sup>

These dissensions were deeply deplored, especially in the West, and at the instigation of Pope Julius and other bishops, the emperor Constans urged his brother Constantius to convoke another representative Council.

This Council assembled in the autumn of 342 (343)<sup>2</sup> at **Sardica** (Sofia) in Mœsia, on the border of the two empires, but it failed to re-establish ecclesiastical unity; in fact, the two parties found it impossible even to discuss the matters in dispute; on the orthodox party forthwith admitting Athanasius and Marcellus into communion, the Eusebians seceded from the Council and betook themselves to Philippopolis. Here they proceeded to anathematise, not only the two principal objects of their hate, but also Pope Julius and all the other bishops of the Council. As the Fathers of the Council of Sardica retorted by fulminating a like anathema against the dissenters, the division merely grew deeper. Constans succeeded, nevertheless, in obtaining that the upholders of the Nicene doctrine should be left in peace, and Athanasius was able to return to his diocese (346).<sup>3</sup>

Peace lasted for some time, but on the death of Constans (350) the quarrel recommenced. At the Council of Sirmium (Agram) in Pannonia (351) the *ὁμοούσιος* was practically abandoned, the word finding no admission into the first creed there drawn up. Simultaneously Athanasius, whose fortune seemed to be bound up with that of the Nicene Faith, again became the butt of new outrages. The Councils of Arles (353) and of Milan (355) both declared him deposed, and the bishops who refused to concur in this judgment were banished, among them being Paulinus of Treves, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Calaris, Dionysius of Milan, Liberius of Rome, Osius of Corduba, and Hilary of Poitiers.

<sup>1</sup> SOCR. II, 1-17; SOZ. III, 1-10; THEOD. I, 30-II, 3; ATHAN. *Apol. c. Arian.* 20-35; *De synod.* 22-26.

<sup>2</sup> On the date, see *Nach. Göttingen*, 1904, p. 341.

<sup>3</sup> SOCR. II, 20-24; SOZ. III, 11-20; THEOD. II, 6-9; ATHAN. *Apol. c. Arian.* 36-50.

Athanasius himself was compelled to flee to the desert in order to save his life (356), and his place was taken by the Cappadocian George.<sup>1</sup>

The anti-Nicene party was now victorious. Their success they owed to the secular power, and to their own tactics in uniting to level at the Homoousians the charge of Sabellianism. Their agreement was, however, now nearing its end. Several factions had now been formed, the great subject of contention being whether the Son was like (*ὁμοιος*) or unlike (*ἀνόμοιος*) the Father, and, according to the answer given to the question, the party was divided into the strict Arians or Anomoians, and the Homoians, or followers of the old Eusebians. The former had for their leaders the deacon Aëtius of Antioch, and the two bishops Eunomius of Cyzicus and Acacius of Cæsarea. The Homoians were also split into two factions, some holding that the likeness was confined to the will and operations, whilst the others who believed the Son to be like to the Father in His essence (*ὁμοιούσιος*) were called Homoiousians, or semi-Arians. In reality the parties were not new, for, from the beginning, there had existed among the opponents of Nicæa an extremist and a moderate party, and a conflict was inevitable as soon as the partisans of either opinion began to strive for supremacy. This quarrel within the camp was the beginning of the end. Led by Valens of Mursa (Essek) in Pannonia, and Ursacius of Singidunum (Belgrad) in Mœsia, the stricter Arians put forward at the Council of Sirmium (357) a formulary, known as the second of Sirmium, in which the terms *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος* are both rejected as unbiblical and likely to arouse dissent, and in which the Son is distinctly made subordinate to the Father. Not to be outdone, the semi-Arians forthwith assembled, under the leadership of the two bishops Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea, in Council at Ancyra (358), and affirmed the perfect likeness of the Father and the Son; and as the emperor took the latter's side, semi-Arianism was for the moment victorious. A new Council was convoked at Sirmium (358) and a new creed composed, whilst some seventy Anomoians were sent into exile. This creed, the third Sirmian formulary, was a combination of previous conciliar decisions, among which was the decree of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata (§ 32, I), denying the consubstantiality of the Son. According to the clear statement of Sozomen (IV, 15), which, in the main, is confirmed by other witnesses, this formula was signed by Liberius, who—if we may credit, as it seems we must, the epistle *Pro deifico timore* preserved among the works of Hilary—had already, when in exile, subscribed to the first formulary, adding, however, a saving clause in which he declared excommunicate whosoever should refuse to acknowledge that the Father and the Son resemble each other in all, even in their essence.

<sup>1</sup> SOCR. II, 26-36; SOZ. IV, 1-11; THEOD. II, 10-14; SULP. SEV. II, 39; ATHAN. *De fuga sua*.

The stricter Arians did not, however, consider themselves vanquished, nor indeed was it long before fortune began again to shine on them. On a General Council being proposed by Constantius (359) for the purpose of restoring peace, they persuaded him to divide the bishops, and to hold a Council of the West at Ariminum (Rimini) and a similar one of the East at Seleucia in Isauria. The reason of this plan was to prevent a possible alliance between the orthodox Western bishops and the semi-Arians of the East. As a further precaution, the two Arian factions met at the imperial camp at Sirmium, and drew up the fourth formulary of Sirmium, which set aside the very term of *οὐσία*, and merely declared that, according to the Scriptures, the Father and the Son are in all things like. The emperor gave his sanction to this formula, and promised to secure its adoption by the Fathers at **Ariminum**. In the event the latter, by a large majority, declared their conviction in the Faith of Nicæa, and excommunicated all Arians. Constantius was, however, not discouraged, but was induced to proceed even further. At Nicæa in Thrace<sup>1</sup> the words *κατὰ πάντα* were erased from the fifth formula of Sirmium, with the consequence that the new Creed merely spoke of the likeness taught by Scripture. This was the profession of Faith which the Fathers of Rimini by deception, threats, and force were induced to sign. Some of them did so without further ado, others salved their consciences by launching an anathema against Arius and his teaching, and by declaring that the Son is coequal with the Father, has no beginning, and is not a creature like other creatures.<sup>2</sup>

The same formula was also imposed throughout the East. Though, on account of the dissensions between its members, the Council of Seleucia came to no definite result, the emissaries whom it dispatched to the emperor were obliged to subscribe to the Creed, and as soon as it had received the approbation of a Council held at Constantinople (360), all the bishops were called upon to sign it under threat of exile; the bishops who had the courage to refuse, among whom we must reckon Liberius, were very few, and Jerome is right in his exclamation: *Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est*. The victorious party was that of the Homoians, the Council of Constantinople having been the work of Acacius and his friends, whilst that of Seleucia, by rejecting the term *ἀνόμοιος*, had cut itself loose from the Anomoians. Deposition was also pronounced on Aëtius, as well as on the leaders of the semi-Arians.<sup>3</sup>

The triumph of the Arians was not of long duration. On the

<sup>1</sup> 'Une station postale . . . près d'Andrinople,' DUCHESNE, *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, vol. II, p. 299.

<sup>2</sup> SOCR. II, 37; SOZ. IV, 16-19; THEOD. II, 15, 16; SULP. SEV. *Chron.* II, 41-44; ATHAN. *De syn.* 8-II.

<sup>3</sup> SOCR. II, 39-41; SOZ. IV, 22-24; THEOD. II, 22-25; ATHAN. *De syn.* 12; HIER. *Dial. ad Lucif.* 19.

death of Constantius in the following year, the West immediately reverted to the Faith of Nicæa. In the East the stricter Arian party found, indeed, a supporter in the emperor Valens (364-78), and orthodox and semi-Arians had to undergo a violent persecution. The latter having held a synod at Lampsacus on the Hellespont (364), in which they denounced the Council of Constantinople, they were all of them banished, a measure which induced fifty-nine of them to accept the *ὁμοούσιος* and to re-enter into communion with Liberius (366), though their attitude changed as soon as the persecution reached its end. On the death of Valens the Creed of Nicæa soon found universal acceptance in the East also, its principal champions, after the death of Athanasius (373), being the three Cappadocians, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa, whilst its greatest protector was Valens's successor, Theodosius the Great. The latter, not long after ascending the throne, made the Nicene Creed obligatory on all the inhabitants of his empire,<sup>1</sup> and restored the churches of Constantinople to the Catholics (380).<sup>2</sup> In the year 381 a new Council, being the second General Council, was held at Constantinople, to settle definitively the question of faith, and the Arians were forbidden to worship publicly either there or elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> The error was, however, not yet expelled from the world; on the contrary, as we already know, it was at this juncture that the Germanic tribes were won over to it: but its force having been broken in the Roman Empire, its final disappearance was only a matter of time.

## § 49

### **The Pneumatomachic Quarrel and the Second General Council** <sup>4</sup>

Since Arius considered the Son as the Father's creature, by whom all other things are created, he necessarily looked on the Holy Ghost as a creature of the Son. This consequence was self-evident; and though in the beginning, when attention was wholly centred on the Son, it aroused no misgivings, yet, in the middle of the fourth century, a change became apparent. Not the Anomoians only, but also the semi-Arians, who believed the Son to be substantially like to the Father, and who did not reckon Him as a creature, held the doctrine that the Holy Ghost is a ministering spirit, differing from the angels only in

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* lib. XVI, tit. 1; *De fide cath.* I, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *SOCR.* V, 7; *Soz.* VII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Cod. Theod.* I, 6; *De hæret.*

<sup>4</sup> Th. SCHERMANN, *Die Gottheit des Hl. Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des 4. Jahrh.* 1901.

degree. It was against this view that Athanasius wrote his epistle to Serapion (c. 358) in defence of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and that the Council of Alexandria (362) defined the third Person of the Trinity to be of the same substance and Divinity as the others. The then chief defender of the opposite doctrine was Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople († 362). It was afterwards advocated also by Marathionius of Nicomedia; for this reason the Pneumatomachi were sometimes called Macedonians or Marathonians.

The error was condemned by the Councils of Alexandria (363), Rome (374), Illyricum (375), Iconium and Cappadocia (c. 376). But the most important condemnation was that pronounced by the Council of **Constantinople** in 381, in which the 150 Fathers there assembled adopted, with a few modifications, the baptismal Creed which had been put forward by Epiphanius (c. 374) in his *Ancoratus*. In this Creed the first article of the Nicene Creed is given word for word, the second is retained with a few alterations of slight importance, whilst the third, the better to confound the Pneumatomachi, adds to the original 'And in the Holy Ghost' the following words: 'Lord and Giver of life; who proceeds from the Father (*John xv. 26*), is adored and glorified with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets.' This profession of Faith, as soon as the Council had been acknowledged as a general one—in the East by the Council of Chalcedon (451), and in the West about a century later—received œcumenical authority and became known as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.

By the definition of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, the Arian theory stood condemned, but the position of the Holy Ghost was not as yet clearly determined. The relationship of the Holy Ghost to the Son was still a matter of debate, and the question received, in the East and in the West, answers which in appearance were different. The Greek Church taught a procession from the Father *through* the Son; the Latin, a procession from the Father *and* the Son. In Spain the *Filioque* was soon incorporated in the Creed, whence it found its way into the profession of Faith drawn up by Pastor of Palentia (c. 450), and into official use (cp. § 50, VIII), and was embodied in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan

Creed by the Council of Toledo in 589. The same word also found its way into the *Quicumque*, which, from the seventh century, was universally ascribed to Athanasius, and was in consequence called the Athanasian Creed, though it was certainly composed after his time, most likely in the first half of the fifth century, in Gaul or Spain, probably in the latter during the conflict with the Priscillianists.<sup>1</sup>

The **Constantinopolitan Creed** agrees with the Nicene substantially, though not verbally, in the article descriptive of the Son. The alterations may be accounted for by the use of this profession as a baptismal Creed; thus the Nicene clause: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς was rendered: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων. Epiphanius (*Ancoratus*, c. 118, 119) assigns the baptismal Creed to an earlier date than his own writing, without, however, stating that this date was comparatively recent. Hence it would be difficult to show that the passage in question was an addition made after the Council of 381, as Franzelin (*Tract. de Deo trino*, p. 556) and Jungmann (II, 114) would have us believe. On the other hand, there is likewise no foundation for the view of Hort (*Two Dissertations*, 1876) and Harnack (*RE. f. pr. Th.* XI, 12-28; *Dogmengesch.* II, 266-68 [Engl. Trans. *History of Dogma*, 1894-99]), which is also in part that of Kattenbusch (*Vergleichende Konfessionskunde*, I, 1892, pp. 252-63), that the Council neither composed nor sanctioned the Creed called after it, and that its name is based on a misunderstanding.<sup>2</sup> Still more unlikely is Vincenzi's supposition (*De processione Spiritus S. a Patre Filioque adv. Graecos*, 1878) that the Constantinopolitan Creed was a seventh-century forgery in support of the Greek teaching. That Socrates (V, 8), Sozomen (VII, 7, 9), and Theodoret (V, 8) should be silent, or speak only of a confirmation of the Nicene Creed by the Council, is not remarkable, considering how scanty are the details furnished by these historians, especially as Theodoret took part in the Council of Chalcedon, in which the Creed was read twice (Sess. II, V). Still less is Gregory Nazianzen a witness against this Creed; it is true that he mentions explicitly (*Ep.* 102 *ad Cledon.*) only the Nicene Creed, but as he goes on to say that the third article which concerns the Holy Ghost received a fuller explanation, he manifestly has the Constantinopolitan Creed in mind; possibly his silence may be explained by the grudge he owed the Council of 381. Cp. *RE. d. chr. A.* II, 810-13; *Neue k. Z.* X (1899), 935-85.

<sup>1</sup> A. KÜNSTLE, *Antipriscilliana*, 1905; *Das Comma Joanneum*, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, DUCHESNE has it that 'Nothing authorises us to believe that this Creed was promulgated by the Council of 381.' See his *Churches separated from Rome*, Engl. Trans. 1907, p. 53.

## § 50

## Disputes connected with, or contemporaneous with, the Arian Quarrel

Arianism, by giving rise within the Church to two hostile camps, led to many lesser dissensions and schisms. Of the latter, the more noteworthy were those of Antioch, of Rome under Liberius and Damasus, and that of Lucifer in Sardinia and Spain. Of the heresies connected with Arianism, the best known were those of Marcellus of Ancyra, and of Photinus, bishop of Sirmium. The other contemporaneous heresies were those of the Audians, Massalians, and Priscillians.

**I. The Schism of Antioch.** When Eustathius was deposed (330), a small portion of his Church remained true to him, whilst the larger part went over to the new Arian bishop. On Eudoxius being transferred to the see of Constantinople (360) and replaced at Antioch by Meletius, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia (361), there arose a new orthodox party distinct from the Eustathians, for the new bishop proved to be in favour of Nicæa, and was consequently soon abandoned by the Arians, though the Eustathians, owing to his having been consecrated by the Arians, refused also to acknowledge him as bishop. New grounds for dissension were soon found in the change which, about that time, occurred in the meaning of the term *ὑπόστασις*, which formerly, for instance at the Nicene Council, had been taken as identical with *οὐσία*, but which was now beginning to be used as a synonym of 'person.' The Eustathians held fast to the older meaning, the Meletians preferred the new. The later bishops of the Eustathians were Paulinus (362-88) and Evagrius (†394); they were recognised as legitimate by the West, whereas in the East Meletius and his successors were considered the rightful bishops. On the death of their last bishop the Eustathians soon lost their importance; most of the remaining schismatics were reconciled in 415, and the rest in 482. Cp. F. CAVALLERA, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, 1905; *Bulletin de litt. eccl. publ. par l'Inst. cath. de Toulouse*, 1906, 120-25.

**II. The Roman Schism.** On the banishment of Liberius (355) the deacon Felix was consecrated bishop of Rome. Though the clergy of the city had professed themselves devoted to Liberius, they nevertheless went over to the new bishop's side, to whom they remained true even after the return of the rightful Pope (358). With the death of Felix (365) the schism seemed to have reached its term; unfortunately Liberius also died soon after (366)

and the strife was renewed. The party of Felix elected **Damasus**, and that of Liberius, Ursinus. In the struggle for supremacy which followed, much blood was shed, and though Ursinus was defeated and banished to Gaul (367), the schism continued for yet fifteen years.

At an early date, *i.e.* before the composition of the *Liber pontificalis*, the real history of this schism was distorted in such wise as to reverse the parts played by the different characters. Liberius's mistakes were exaggerated, and his better qualities were kept out of sight, the Pope being made to appear in the light of a rabid heretic, whereas Felix, who was really an anti-Pope, was made into the orthodox and rightful bishop, and, probably through some confusion with the martyr Felix on the *Via Portuensis*, actually came to be considered as a saint. Cp. DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln*, 1863 (2nd ed. 1890), pp. 106-23; DUCHESNE, *Liber pontificalis*, I, pp. cxx. f.

**III. The Luciferian Schism.** Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, fell away from communion with his fellow-bishops owing to a twofold misunderstanding: first, he was displeased with the mildness shown by Athanasius towards repentant semi-Arians at the Council of Alexandria in 362; secondly, in his turn, he had offended Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, by too hastily consecrating Paulinus, bishop of Antioch. The acceptance of the Nicene formula (see p. 141) provided new fuel for the schism, which spread over Sardinia and Spain, but which nevertheless soon died out. Its principal supporter, after Lucifer, was Gregory, bishop of Elvira. Cp. G. KRÜGER, *Lucifer v. C. u. d. Schisma der Luciferianer*, 1886.

**IV. Marcellus of Ancyra** was the origin of another dispute. He had earned himself a name at Nicæa and elsewhere by his zeal against the Arians. By reverting to the older theory of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος προφορικὸς he came, however, to something very like Sabellianism, reducing the personal distinction between the Father and the Son to one of reason only. This accounts for his having been accused of heresy not only by the Arians, but also by the orthodox. According to Marcellus, the Logos is the very mind of the Father, and is therefore unbegotten. For the purpose of creating and redeeming the world, He however, thanks to a certain δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια, became distinct from the Father, and by His Incarnation was made the Son. At the end of time He will be reincorporated in the Father, and will again be part of Him as in the beginning. Hence the Sonship, and even the very individuality of the Logos, is transitory. The same must also be said of the Kingdom of Christ. When the work of redemption shall be accomplished, after the Last Judgment, when every foe shall have been defeated, Christ will again be subject to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 28). It was this error which led to the words of Luke i. 33, 'And of his kingdom there shall be no end,' being adopted in the Creed. Mg. by Th. ZAHN, 1867;

F. LOOFS (*Die Trinitätslehre Marcells v. A. u. ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition*), 1902.

V. **Photinus of Sirmium**, a disciple of Marcellus, returned to the views of the Ebionites. He taught that Christ was a mere man, though, if Epiphanius be right (*H.* 71, 1), he allowed Him to have been miraculously born of Mary through the action of the Holy Ghost. At any rate, Christ was godlike only in His power, and it was His miracles and virtues which led to His being adopted by God as His Son. After having been several times condemned, Photinus was finally deposed by the Council of Sirmium (351) and banished. He continued, however, to abide by his opinions, which survived among his own disciples even after his death (379). The same opinions were also advocated by the **Bonosians**, though the founder of this sect, Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, had at first confined himself to denying the virginity of Mary (§ 70).

VI. The **Audians**. Audius, a Mesopotamian, whose denunciations of the crimes of the clergy and of certain bishops had brought on him a persecution, quitted the Church (c. 325) with others who shared his views, and on being banished by Constantine to Scythia, founded some religious communities, of which the distinguishing characteristics were an attachment to the Protopaschite method of reckoning Easter, and an anthropomorphical conception of the Deity. The sect came to its end in the fifth century. Cp. *ΕΠΙΦ. H.* 70; *J. f. pr. Th.* 1890, pp. 298-305.

VII. The **Massalians** or Euchites, *i.e.* Men of Prayer, were a set of fanatics in Mesopotamia and Syria who made their appearance in the middle of the fourth century. They claimed that the evil spirit which is innate in man can only be overcome by uninterrupted prayer; all other means of grace they held in contempt; labour and property they eschewed as sinful, and preferred to gain a livelihood by begging. The name of the sect is derived from the Syro-Chaldaic ܡܫܠܝܢ, to pray. Cp. *ΕΠΙΦ. H.* 80; *Z. f. KG.* IX. (1888), 507-22.

VIII. The **Priscillianists**. In the latter half of the fourth century, a certain Mark from Memphis began to advocate in Spain a doctrine akin to Gnosticism and Manichæism. Through his first disciples, the matron Agape and the rhetor Elpidius, a rich and learned layman, Priscillian by name, was partially won over to the cause, or at least to its Gnostic leanings, though, as his writings show, he was by no means a strict Manichæan; the latter, in his turn, effected the conversion of others, notably of the bishops Salvian and Instantius, and of several women. The whole party was excommunicated by the Council of Saragossa in 380, and the usurper Maximus went so far as to put to death, at Treves, Priscillian, together with some of his associates (385). To this deed of blood the emperor had been urged by bishops such as

Ithacius of Sossuba, whilst Martin of Tours had tried in vain to dissuade him. Others who protested when it was already too late were Ambrose of Milan and Pope Siricius. Nor did these repressive measures secure their end. On the contrary, their result was a large increase in the number of the Priscillianists. They soon effected the conquest of Gallæcia, the bishops of the province joining them in a body. A little later, when the Germanic tribes seized possession of the Spanish peninsula, new advantages were secured by the heretics. It was only in the sixth century, subsequently to the Council of Braga (563), that they began to disappear. According to a profession of Faith drawn up against them (HARDUIN, I, 993), they held a modalistic Trinitarian doctrine and a Docetic Christology, made use of apocryphal works and practised astrology, ascribed to the soul a Divine nature, denied that God had created the world, and that the God of the Old Testament was one with the God of the New Testament, besides rejecting the resurrection of the body. They also forbade marriage and the use of flesh-meat. This profession of Faith, which has been preserved among the acts of the Council of Toledo (400), was ascribed by the Council of Braga (563) to a Council held under Pope Leo I, and has in consequence been frequently attributed to a Council of Toledo, held in 447, of which nothing is, however, known. According to the most recent research it was probably drawn up by Pastor, bishop of Palentia (c. 453). Cp. *Revue Bénéd.* 1893, p. 389; KÜNSTLE, *Eine Bibliothek der Symbole*, 1900; *Antipriscilliana*, 1905.

## § 51

### Origenism

In the Trinitarian dispute the name of Origen recurs frequently. The Arians claimed the great scholar as a witness to their doctrine. Generally speaking, the orthodox party were inclined to dispute this claim, continuing to hold in honour the Alexandrian teacher, though ready to grant that he had been misled by his speculations (§ 39). But to this rule there were exceptions. Not a few forsook Origen entirely, and even attempted to hinder the circulation of his writings, because they believed him to be the real father of Arianism, and also because of his teaching concerning the pre-existence of souls and his other errors. The question furnished matter for new controversies. Amongst Origen's principal opponents we may reckon Epiphanius, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Justinian I.

In his edict of 543 the emperor condemned nine propositions, and the very person of the famous Alexandrian, placing his name on the list of heresiarchs to be anathematised by every bishop and abbot on assuming office. Origen was thus placed on the same footing with Sabellius and Arius. Happily, a later age was to do better justice to Origen's name.

I. **Epiphanius**, following in the wake of Methodius of Olympus (§ 39), not only gave to Origen a place in his history of heresies (*H.* 64), but even assailed him by word of mouth, preaching against him (c. 392) in the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem. The result of this was a conflict of several years' duration, in which Epiphanius and Jerome found themselves pitted against John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Rufinus of Aquileia, who took up the cudgels for Origen. Jerome himself had formerly been an admirer of the Alexandrian, but had, a few years previous, and owing to the tactics of a certain Aterbius, changed his opinion. On the return of Rufinus to Europe, means were found to effect a reconciliation, but on his translating Origen's work *De principiis*, in the preface to which he represented Jerome as a panegyrist of Origen, the quarrel broke out anew, nor was Jerome's wrath soothed even by the news of Rufinus's death. Cp. ZÖCKLER, *Hieronymus*, pp. 238-66; RAUSCHEN, *J. d. chr. K. unter Theodosius d. Gr.* 1897, pp. 552-55; J. BROCHET, *Jérôme et ses ennemis*, 1906.

II. In the meantime a worse conflict had broken out in Egypt, and was to bring about the downfall of one of the best known of the Greek Fathers. **Theophilus of Alexandria** having in his Easter letter (399) attacked the doctrine that God has a body—an opinion then prevalent among the monks of the Sketic desert and elsewhere—the anthropomorphite party demanded that he should withdraw his words, and that he should pronounce the condemnation of Origen. The bishop, a man of evil repute, assented all the more readily to these demands, seeing that there were among the Origenists several men whom he disliked, especially Isidore the presbyter and the 'tall brothers,' who were as remarkable for their learning and piety as for their fine presence, and of whom one, Dioscorus, was bishop of Hermopolis. Effect was soon given to the adverse judgment. The Origenists were summoned to desist from reading the master's works, and on their replying that it was open to each one to discriminate between the true and the false, they were forcibly ejected from their preferments (401). They thereupon migrated in a body, some three hundred in number, to Palestine, and being unkindly received, some of them pushed on to Constantinople, hoping to secure protection there. In effect **John Chysostom**, who was then bishop, interested himself on their behalf, though it came about that his intervention turned to his

own prejudice. Being cited before the emperor Arcadius, Theophilus first caused a quarrel between Epiphanius and Chrysostom by representing the latter as a devotee of Origen's, and finally obeyed the summons only when he learnt that Chrysostom, by an untimely sermon on feminine failings, had offended the empress Eudoxia and endangered his situation. When Theophilus came to Constantinople, it was not as a culprit, but as a judge. The Council of Drys near Chalcedon (*synodus ad quercum*) in 403 pronounced the deposition of Chrysostom, and though he continued to hold his ground for some little time, the authorities having found it necessary, in view of the threats of the populace, to recall him from exile, yet in the very next year, on account of a new conflict with the empress, he was forced to relinquish his bishopric for ever. His followers remained, however, true to him, and refused to acknowledge his successors, Arsacius and Atticus. It was only when his mortal remains were brought back in triumph to Constantinople under the bishop Proclus that the Johannine Schism, as it was called, came to an end (438). Cp. SOCR. VI, 7-18; VII, 45; SOZ. VIII, 11-20; THEOD. V, 34-36; SULP. *Dev. Dial.* I, 6, 7.

III. In the sixth century Origen was the occasion of yet another quarrel. This dispute, which to begin with was confined to the monasteries of Palestine, came to a close with the utter collapse of the Origenist party. True, the action of the abbot Agapetus in expelling from the new Lavra four monks who were tainted with Origenism, had but little effect, for his successor Mamas allowed them to return, and for a time Origenism thrived. All the efforts of St. Sabas, the president of the monks of Palestine, to compel the emperor to take action against the Alexandrian were made in vain (531). On the death of Sabas (532) the feeling in favour of the weaker party became so strong that Justinian even elevated two of its adherents, the learned monks Domitian and Theodore Ascidas, to the bishoprics of Ancyra and Cæsarea in Cappadocia (537). Soon after this events took a different turn. The abbot Gelasius having expelled nearly forty Origenists from the old Lavra, the Origenists contemplated reprisals, and both sides began to cast about for outward support. About the year 542, Ephræm, patriarch of Antioch, condemned the erroneous teaching of Origen. A petition directed against the Alexandrian and presented to the emperor led to the edict of 543 (HARDUIN, III, 243-82). As the debate still continued, Justinian procured from the Fifth General Council (and not, as was formerly believed, from some other Council connected with the edict issued in 543) a new condemnation comprising fifteen anathemas. The Origenists were then banished from the new Lavra (554) and their places filled with orthodox monks (555), with the result that peace was again restored. Cp. DIEKAMP, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6 Jahrh.* 1899.

## § 52

The Donatist Schism <sup>1</sup>

On the death of Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, in 311, a double election occurred. Most of the votes were given to the deacon Cæcilian. A portion of the Church was, however, opposed to the choice, owing to his having taken the part of the deceased bishop in the Diocletian persecution, by seeking to prevent undue enthusiasm for martyrdom, and any exaggerated regard for the martyrs lying in prison. Some also bore a personal grudge against him; for instance, the rich and influential widow Lucilla, whom he had publicly rebuked for her practice of kissing, before receiving Communion, the relics of an unacknowledged martyr; also the presbyters Botrus and Celestius, who had set their hearts on the bishopric; likewise two elders who had hoped to be able to retain the treasures which Mensurius had committed to their safe keeping before his death. There was also abroad a report that Felix the bishop of Aptunga, who had consecrated Cæcilian, had proved a traitor during the Diocletian persecution. To crown all, the bishops of Numidia, who were offended because they had not been invited to the election, took the side of his opponents, and deposed him at the Council of Carthage, consecrating in his stead the lector Majorinus (312). On the latter's death three years later, he was followed by Donatus, from whom the schism takes its name.

The trouble soon spread. Owing to the importance of the Church of Carthage, it was not long before the schismatic movement had involved the whole of Africa. Less than twenty years later the Donatists were able to hold (c. 330) a Council at which 270 bishops were present. Their growth testifies to their activity; their obstinacy was even greater. All the means of reconciliation suggested by the Donatists themselves were essayed in vain; they remained obdurate. They were unable to establish their charges against Cæcilian at the court of Italian and Gallic bishops convened at Constantine's command in Rome (313); the proconsul of Africa had

<sup>1</sup> M. DEUTSCH, *Drei Aktenstücke z. G. des Donatismus*, 1875. VÖLTER, *Der Ursprung des D.* 1883; *Th. Qu.* 1884, p. 500 ff.; *Z. f. KG.* X (1887). 505-68; *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'hist.* 1890, pp. 589-650; THÜMMEL, *Zu Beurteilung des D.* 1893.

no difficulty in showing that Felix of Aptunga had not delivered to the pagans the Scriptures, as his enemies had alleged (*Gesta purgationis Felicis episc.*) ; lastly, the Council of Arles, in 314 (c. 13), declared that the consecration would have been valid even had it been conferred by a 'trahitor.' It turned out that the Donatists themselves were open to the charge they had brought against Felix ; that one of them, Silvanus of Cirta, and, according to the Acts of the Council of Cirta (305), others of their number, too, had delivered the sacred books at the demand of the pagan authorities. Having fruitlessly essayed all ecclesiastical means, the schismatics at last appealed to the emperor, who in his turn gave an adverse decision (316). On their refusal to submit, Constantine had recourse to sterner methods, and decreed the banishment of their leaders and the seizure of their churches. Even this failed. The edicts only made matters worse, and after a time they were accordingly revoked, and the movement was left to work itself out.

It was now the turn of the opposite party to make use of violence. Bands of fanatics, who called themselves *Agonistici* or *milites Christi*, but who by the Catholics were termed *Circumcelliones* from their habit of roaming about the neighbourhood of the peasants' hovels, kept the population in a state of turmoil, whilst the crowds who joined them committed many outrages. The emperor Constans was therefore induced to make a new attempt to appease the conflict. He first of all tried kindness, and then severity, and finally, on meeting with armed resistance, he proceeded to extremities and again banished the leading schismatics and closed their churches. But as Julian allowed the exiles to return, the attempt to force a union was ineffectual. Nor were those more successful who endeavoured to convince the Donatists of their error by word and pen, though by this means a few individual conversions were effected. Optatus of Mileve gave an account of the origin of the schism and an exposure of its history in his *De schismate Donatistarum* ; Augustine published a number of writings against it, but all in vain. Not even the great conference at Carthage in 411, in which 565 bishops of both sides took part, was able to bring about the wished-for union. The schism came to an end only with the conquest of Africa by the

Saracens, though it had been steadily losing ground ever since the Vandal invasion.

So far as the doctrine of the Donatists is concerned, they not only taught that the sacraments depend for their validity on the state of grace of the dispenser, but they also remained firmly attached to the ancient custom of the African Church, and rejected every Baptism bestowed by one outside their fold, and therefore re-baptised all converts. This twofold practice led them to a Novatian view of the Church. To them, in spite of the Parable of the wheat and the tares, it seemed that the true Church could only be that one which endured, at the very least, no public sinners among its members.

### § 53

#### The Beginning of the Christological Controversy—Apollinarius of Laodicea<sup>1</sup>

The Arians did not confine themselves to denying the Godhead of the Son; they also mutilated Christ's manhood, and denied to Him a human soul, being led to this, either by the difficulty of otherwise conceiving of Christ's oneness, or by the need of supporting their theology. They argued that the psychic manifestations of Christ really belong to the Logos, to whose created nature they testify. For long no great importance was attached to the error, and when finally it came to be condemned, first by the Council of Alexandria (362), and later by the Council of Constantinople (381), it was not against the Arians that the condemnation was directed. Apollinarius of Laodicea, who had been one of the principal defenders of the Nicene Faith, had come on this point to the same conclusions as the Arians. On the theory being proved, contrary to Scripture, he consented indeed to teach that in Christ there existed an inferior or animal soul (*ψυχὴ ἄλογος*). But the existence in Him of a human and reasonable soul (*ψυχὴ λογικὴ*) or spirit (*πνεῦμα*) he strenuously denied. This lessening of Christ's human nature seemed to him necessary, both for His sinlessness and oneness. Wherever there is a perfect man, so he opined, there we have sin, and as according to him sin and

<sup>1</sup> SOCR. II, 46; SOZ. VI, 25; THEOD. V, 3, 10; ATHAN. (?) *Adv. Apollin.*; GREG. NYSS. *Antirrheticus*; EPIPH. H. 77; FUNK, *A. u. U.* II, 354-56; VOISIN, *L'Apollinarianisme*, 1900.

freedom of choice are both of them properties of the soul, he considered it necessary to say that the Redeemer was devoid of a human soul. Two perfect beings, he explains, cannot become one (*δύο τέλεια ἐν γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται*). To say that Christ has a perfect human nature means that He has really two natures, which in turn involve two persons and two Sons of God, one begotten and the other adopted. He also appealed to *John* i. 14, taking the word 'Flesh,' which is there used as a *pars pro toto*, in its literal meaning. As, with him, nature is equivalent to person, two natures being equivalent to two persons, he accordingly confessed only one nature (*μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*), as we read in his epistle to the emperor Jovian, which his disciples afterwards fathered on St. Athanasius.

This doctrine found not a few adherents, and in Antioch, under Vitalis, they were numerous enough to constitute a Church by themselves. They indeed returned (c. 420) to the fold, but not all of them relinquished their error, and with the rise of Monophysitism they again came to the front.

## § 54

### Nestorianism—The Third General Council, 431<sup>1</sup>

It was not enough to maintain Christ's perfect manhood against the Arians and Apollinarists: it was also necessary to define its relation with His Divine nature. The contemporaries of Apollinaris mostly expressed themselves rather faultily on the subject, or at least their expressions were ambiguous. It was customary to speak of the mingling (*σύγκρασις*) of the two natures. By ascribing to Athanasius the Apollinarian document spoken of in the previous section (*De incarnatione Dei verbi*), the great Doctor was made to express his faith in *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* instead of in *δύο φύσεις*. As this seemed to impair the integrity of Christ's twofold nature, the school of Antioch did its utmost to insist on the distinction. Theodore of Mopsuestia, to whom the

<sup>1</sup> LARGENT, *Études d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 1892; W. KRAATZ, *Kopt. Akten zum ephes. Konzil* 431, 1904 (*T. u. U. N. F.* XI, 2); F. LOOFS, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius*, 1905; A. REHRMANN, *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrill v. A.* 1902.

Incarnation of the Word seemed to imply a metamorphosis of the Logos into man, preferred to speak of the Word's inhabitation (*ἐνοίκησης*) in man. His view that no nature is perfect without personality would lead to the further supposition that in Christ there are two persons, and though he speaks expressly of only one person, yet, in his eyes, the oneness was not real (*ἔνωσις*) but only moral (*ἔνωσις σχετική, συνάφεια*), like to that which exists between man and wife, or between a temple and its idol. It was a oneness which depended on the two being considered simultaneously: taken separately, each was a person. He refused, in consequence, to admit that the Son of God had been born: he who was born was a man in whom God dwelt, and Mary was therefore not the Mother of God (*θεοτόκος*), but merely the Mother of Christ (*Χριστοτόκος*).

To begin with, these views were confined to the Antiochene school, but on Nestorius, a disciple of Theodore's, being named bishop of Constantinople (428), they began to be preached publicly. The presbyter Anastasius, who followed Nestorius from Antioch to his new see, found the opportunity in his sermons to censure the custom of addressing the Blessed Virgin as *θεοτόκος*. The scandal caused by this pronouncement became yet more intense when Nestorius intervened on his friend's behalf and criticised other expressions founded on the *Communicatio Idiomatum*. Contradictions were soon forthcoming even from a distance. Cyril of Alexandria attacked the teaching of Nestorius in his Easter sermon of 430. Pope Celestine condemned it in the same year at a Roman Council, and, in his name, Cyril now called on Nestorius to retract, summing up in twelve chapters or anathemas the true teaching of the Church. The only result of all this was that Nestorius drew up a list of twelve anathemas directed against his adversaries. At the same time other dignitaries took the field on his side, being displeased with Cyril's teaching, among them being John of Antioch and Theodoret of Cyrus. Nor is it to be denied that Cyril's choice of words had not been of the best. Following the Alexandrian custom, and the example of St. Athanasius, he had in his third chapter opposed a *ἔνωσις φυσική* to the Antiochene *συνάφεια*, thereby denoting that the union of the two natures is real and true. Yet, though his thought<sup>t</sup> was right,

the word was ill-chosen, and by the Antiochenes it was understood as a *ἔνωσις εἰς μίαν φύσιν*.

The controversy grew in intensity as it lengthened, and even the General Council which was summoned to meet at **Ephesus** at Whitsun 431 was not able to mend matters: on the contrary the dissension increased. The beginning of the Council did not promise well: John of Antioch having, probably on purpose, delayed his arrival, the assembly was opened by Cyril, who refused to listen to the proposal of the emperor's agent, that the bishops of the province of Antioch should be allowed four days' grace. After having, in the first session, proved from tradition that Mary is truly *θεοτόκος*, and that there are really two natures in Christ, and after the deposition of Nestorius had been pronounced, John at last arrived at Ephesus, and proceeded to hold with his bishops, who numbered forty-three, a Council of his own, in which Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus were deposed. The Fathers of the greater Council retorted by a sentence of excommunication. The emperor, Theodosius II, began by approving the decrees of both Councils; he then suggested that both parties should send delegates to Chalcedon to treat for peace. On his offer being refused he assumed a stronger attitude: Nestorius was abandoned to his fate, the choice of his successor being left to his enemies, the Council was dissolved, and the decree against Cyril and Memnon was declared void. Dissensions continued to be rife among the episcopate; dissatisfied with Nestorius's treatment, the Antiochenes accused Cyril of Arianism and Apollinarism, and on arriving at their home they again excommunicated him with all his supporters. Peace was only established when, in 433, Cyril consented to accept the Creed which John had presented at the Council of Ephesus, and which is therefore called *Symbolum Ephesinum*, whilst John on his side undertook to ratify the sentence against Nestorius. But even the acceptance of this Creed did not bring universal contentment, for as in it the human nature of the Redeemer is termed the temple of the Logos, Cyril was accused of having subscribed to an expression savouring of Nestorianism. On the other hand, many of the friends of John refused to acquiesce in the excommunication of Nestorius. Most of them submitted only when the emperor threatened to remove them from their preferments.

In consequence of still further measures Nestorianism soon died out within the Roman Empire. As the study of the works of Nestorius was forbidden, the Nestorians turned to those of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus. A campaign was accordingly started against these works too, especially by Rabulas, bishop of Edessa, who obtained the closing of the school of Edessa, the headquarters of Nestorianism. On the other hand, the error survived in Persia, whither many of its adherents were driven by the Roman persecution, and where they received much help from Barsumas, bishop of Nisibis (450-90). Under the metropolitan Babæus of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (497-503), the Nestorians formally seceded from the national Church, and erected themselves into a separate Church, at the head of which was a *Catholicos* or Patriarch. This Church grew in importance in the following centuries, and spread its boundaries over a considerable portion of Asia. The Christians of St. Thomas in the East Indies belonged to this sect. Since the fourteenth century it has, however, been steadily decaying.

## § 55

### Monophysitism and the Fourth General Council, 451<sup>1</sup>

Whereas the Nestorians, by separating the natures, seemed to threaten danger to the oneness of the Redeemer, many of their adversaries, going to the other extreme, mingled these two natures, or held that the human nature had been transformed into the Divine. They admitted that two natures had gone to form Christ, but they considered that one only of these natures had persisted after the Incarnation. Hence to them the doctrine of the two natures—Dyophysitism—appeared in the light of a return to Nestorianism. The quarrel broke out on **Eutyches**, an archimandrite or abbot of Constantinople, raising a persecution against Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia, for his supposed heresy of Dyophysitism. The immediate result was, however, that Eutyches was deposed by a Council of Constantinople (*σύννοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*) in 448, which met under the presidency of the patriarch Flavian.

This was, however, only a prelude. Flavian proceeded to acquaint his brethren with his decision; in particular he sent an account of it to Pope Leo I, who thereupon replied with his

<sup>1</sup> See PERRY, *The Second Synod of Ephesus*, 1877.

famous *Epistula dogmatica ad Flavianum*, which comprises an excellent summary of the Church's teaching on the two natures. On the other hand Eutyches, having complained that he had been unjustly treated, and having won over the court to his cause, was soon able to improve his position. The emperor summoned a Council to meet at Ephesus (449), giving it as a president the patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria, who was himself a Monophysite. It was easy to foresee the result: Eutyches, having professed his belief in the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus, and anathematised all heresies such as those of Nestorius and Apollinaris, was declared orthodox. On the other hand, Flavian and Eusebius were deposed for having dared to venture beyond the doctrines defined by Nicæa and Ephesus. The same penalty was pronounced against other prelates who had opposed Eutyches, or who were suspected of Nestorianism, amongst others against Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa. The bishop of Constantinople was handled so roughly that he died three days later. The triumph did not last. The Robber-Synod, *Latrocinium Ephesinum*, *σύνοδος ληστρική*, as the Council came to be called, was rejected on all sides, and a new assembly was demanded. Marcian, the husband of Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius II, who ascended the throne in the following year, determined to hearken to the appeal.

The new Council, the Fourth General, was held in the autumn of 451 at **Chalcedon**. It was the largest of antiquity, its members numbering 630. The Council rejected the decisions of the Robber-Synod, deposed Dioscorus, and composed a Profession of Faith, in which, as a set-off against Nestorianism and Monophysitism, it asserted the one Lord in two natures, without confusion or conversion, without division or separation (*ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἁδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως*); the distinction between the two natures being in no wise abolished by their union; on the contrary, the properties peculiar to each being retained, and both being united in a single person or hypostasis.

Marcian also took the step of banishing Dioscorus and Eutyches, and issued severe enactments against their adherents. In spite of this, Monophysitism continued to thrive, and its partisans even contrived to take possession of the Eastern patriarchates. Jerusalem

fell to the monk Theodosius (452-53); under the emperor Leo (457-74) Timothy Ailurus (457-60) was elected to the see of Alexandria and Peter the Fuller to that of Antioch (c. 470). Though none of these succeeded in retaining their position, nevertheless their passing success had far-reaching results, especially in Egypt, where the patriarch Proterius, Dioscorus's successor, was murdered, and where all the sees fell into the hands of Monophysites. Timothy and Peter were, moreover, reinstated in their sees on the emperor's death. His successor, the usurper Basiliscus (476-77), to whom they owed their restoration, even pronounced an anathema on the Council of Chalcedon, in doing which he had the approval of some five hundred bishops. Nor did the emperor Zeno's success over his rival portend any good to the cause of Chalcedon.

Peter Mongus, on being promoted to the patriarchate of Alexandria (481), published a Creed in conjunction with Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, in which not only Nestorius and Eutyches, but also, indirectly, the Council of Chalcedon were anathematised, and in which it was explained that the Creed should consist exclusively of the formula of Nicæa together with the Constantinopolitan addition, of the twelve chapters of Cyril, and of the decisions of Ephesus. This new Creed was published by Zeno (482) and made a law under the name of the Henoticon. It was intended to produce harmony; as a matter of fact it accentuated the discord. Not only many of the Catholics, but also the stricter Monophysites rejected this half-measure. At Alexandria the latter party obtained the nickname of Acephali, because, being in schism with their own patriarch, they were without a head. Soon after it came to a break between East and West, Pope Felix II (III) excommunicating and deposing the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria as promoters of the Henoticon (484). The schism lasted thirty-five years. The general Vitalian succeeded, indeed, in wringing from Anastasius, Zeno's successor, a promise to reinstate the adherents of Chalcedon and to summon a Council at Heraclea (515). The emperor found, however, means of preventing the negotiations with Rome from coming to any good issue. It was Justin I who restored the Eastern Church to communion with Rome (519). Pope Hormisdas dispatched his *Libellus fidei*, in which it is argued from the words of our Lord, 'Thou art Peter,' &c. (*Matt. xvi. 18*), that in the Apostolic See the Faith will always be kept undefiled, and in which Nestorius, Eutyches, and all their partisans were put under the ban. To this formula (*Formula Hormisdæ*) the Eastern bishops were forced to subscribe.

At this time so-called Theopaschitism was also causing a difficulty. Peter the Fuller had added to the Trisagion the words  $\delta$   $\sigma$   $\tau$   $\alpha$   $\nu$   $\rho$   $\omega$   $\theta$   $\epsilon$   $\iota$   $\varsigma$   $\delta$   $\iota$   $\nu$   $\eta$   $\mu$   $\alpha$   $\varsigma$  (who was crucified for us), and the emperor Anastasius had ordered them to be embodied in the Liturgy. On the other hand, certain Catholic Scythian monks who were then in Constantinople advocated the adoption of the

Four points

cognate statement, 'One of the Trinity was crucified.' The formula was not assailable, being based on the *communicatio idiomatum*. However, because it had originated among the Monophysites, and because of the novelty of the expression, it caused some commotion. The Roman legates at Constantinople condemned it as dangerous, and Pope Hormisdas, to whom the monks had recourse, put them off with evasive answers. In course of time the formula proved itself more acceptable, and as it seemed likely to facilitate a union with the Severians, with a view to which a conference had been held in Constantinople in 533, it received the approbation of Justinian I, and, soon after, that of Pope John II.

Monophysitism now rallied. Justinian's wife, Theodora, favoured it, and at her instigation Anthimus, a secret Monophysite, was promoted to be bishop of the capital (535). As the latter was soon deposed, mainly owing to the action of Pope Agapetus (536), the empress sought to transplant the heresy to Roman soil, in the hope of making it supreme in the East with the help of Rome. Her plans were, however, foiled. The ambitious deacon Vigilius was willing enough to accept the papacy, but, having once received it, he was not to be induced to make any pronouncement in favour of the heresy.

In spite of all the efforts which were afterwards made to convert the Monophysites, it was not found possible to overcome the error completely. It continued to hold its own in Armenia, in Syria, and the neighbouring countries, Egypt and Abyssinia. In Egypt its followers called themselves Copts, or 'Old Egyptians,' whereas they named the orthodox, Melchites or Imperialists. In Syria and Mesopotamia they were called Jacobites, after Jacobus Baradai (541-78), who, after he had been established as metropolitan of the sect, laboured with great success to spread and strengthen his party in all these regions, and who fixed on Antioch as its headquarters. At the present day the Syrian and Armenian Monophysites have patriarchs at the Zapharan monastery near Bagdad, and at Etchmiadzin in the Russian Caucasus.

Since the sixth century the Monophysites have split into several factions, especially in Egypt. The most important are those of the Severians and the Julianists. They owe their origin to two bishops, Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus, who both lived at Alexandria under Justin I. The former held Christ's body to be corruptible, the latter believed it to be incorruptible; the former were accordingly called Phthartolatræ, the latter Aphthartodocetæ. As, at the death of the Monophysite patriarch Timothy of Alexandria (c. 537), they had elected Theodosius and Gajanas, they were also sometimes called Theodosians and Gajanites.

Both these sects separated into yet smaller parties. The Aphthartodocetæ divided over the question whether Christ's body was created, some, the Ctistolatræ (*κτιστολάτραι*), affirming, and

others, the Actistetæ (*ἀκτιστηταί*), denying. Some of the Phthartolatræ, the Agnoetæ (*ἀγνοηταί*) or Themistians, as they were called, after the deacon Themistius who first embraced this view, were inclined to admit that in some things Christ was ignorant. Among yet other factions must be numbered the Tritheites or followers of the philosopher John Ascunages in Constantinople, who ascribed to each person of the Trinity a distinct nature; the best known among them were John Philoponus and Stephen Gobarus. Contrariwise the Tetradites, or Quaternitarians, ascribed an existence of its own to the godhead dwelling in each of the persons; they were termed Damianites, from their leader Damian, a patriarch of Alexandria. Lastly, the Niobites, founded by Stephen Niobes in Alexandria, discarded the prevailing Monophysitism, contending that by its confession of one only nature in Christ it made impossible in Him the distinction between the human and the Divine. They were excluded from the communion of the other Monophysites, and later on mostly returned to the Catholic Church.

§ 56

The Three Chapters and the Fifth General Council, 553<sup>1</sup>

To divert the attention of Origen's persecutors, the Origenist bishop Theodore Ascidas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia proposed a new object to Justinian's zeal. He suggested that the Monophysites would willingly return to the fold were only the following condemned as savouring of Nestorianism, viz.:

(1) Theodore of Mopsuestia and his works.

(2) The writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus.

(3) The epistle of Ibas of Edessa to the Persian Maris.

This proposal suited the inclinations of an emperor who dearly loved to play the amateur theologian, and in 544 an edict was published, in which, whilst any attack on the Council of Chalcedon was disclaimed, it was enacted that the Three Chapters, as the above writings came to be called, and their writers, should be considered anathema.

This manner of proceeding was not arbitrary, for the writings in question were really infected with Nestorianism, and

<sup>1</sup> J. PUNKES, *P. Vigilius u. d. Dreikapitelstreit*, 1865; LÉVÊQUE, *Étude sur le pape Vigile*, 1887; A. KNECHT, *Religionspolitik Justinians I*, 1896; W. H. HUTTON, *The Church of the Sixth Century*, 1897; CH. DIEHL, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 1901.

Theodore was the spiritual father of Nestorius. Moreover, at the conference held at Constantinople in 533, the Severians had complained of the action of the Council of Chalcedon in rehabilitating Theodoret and Ibas. But this very complaint led the Catholics to see in the condemnation of the Three Chapters a covert attack on Chalcedon. Yet more, it also appeared beyond the province of a human agency to pronounce a personal condemnation on a man who had died at peace with the Church and who had already been judged by God. It was also commonly believed, though unfoundedly, in the West that the epistle of Ibas had been formally approved by Chalcedon. Hence the edict was received with protests. Though the attempt to impose it could not but lead to strife, the emperor determined to carry out his design. The Eastern bishops, headed by the patriarch Mennas of Constantinople, bowed to his will with as good grace as possible. It was now the turn of the Westerns to follow suit. Pope Vigilius had already opened the way, for, summoned to Constantinople, he, in the spring of 548, fourteen and a half months after his arrival, pronounced, in his *Judicatum*,<sup>1</sup> an anathema on the Three Chapters.

This step caused great excitement in the West; the Africans went so far as to excommunicate the Pope until he should have done due penance (550). To allay the trouble, it was settled that a General Council should be held, and that until then nothing should be done in the matter. One party, however, failed to keep to this engagement. At the instigation of Theodore Ascidas, Justinian published in 551 a new edict against the Three Chapters,<sup>2</sup> and thereby the negotiations already in progress were broken off. To secure his safety the Pope had to take refuge in the Church of St. Peter at Constantinople, from which he afterwards fled to that of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. In the meantime he pronounced the Church's censures against Theodore Ascidas, Mennas, and the other bishops. On the Council assembling, there again seemed some chance of peace, but as it was not found possible to come to any settlement, the deliberations were conducted without the Pope. This Council was held at **Constantinople** in 553, and,

<sup>1</sup> See the fragments in HARDUIN, III, 45-57; cp. HEFELE, II, 820 ff.

<sup>2</sup> HARDUIN, III, 287-322.

as was to be expected, it condemned the Chapters and all their defenders, lay and clerical, threatening the latter with excommunication and deposition.

In the meantime Vigilius was drawing up a memorandum, the *Constitutum*,<sup>1</sup> in which the opposite doctrine was laid down. The grounds which he there gave for his opinions are the same on which the Westerns had relied from the beginning. But Justinian was not the man to brook such contradiction, and though he hesitated to break with the Apostolic See, he prevailed on the Council to have the Pope's name erased from all the diptychs, alleging, contrary to all reason, that the Pope shared the impious opinions of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The Pope, with his companions, was compelled to retire into exile. It was only at the request of the Roman clergy, and on his consenting to ratify the decision of the Council,<sup>2</sup> that he was allowed to return. He died, however, on the way back to Rome.

In this wise the Roman Church had made peace with the emperor. The following Popes also gave their sanction to the Council of Constantinople, the Fifth General. The other Latin Churches were, however, in no great hurry to follow suit. Most of the African bishops waited several years, whilst the provinces of Milan and Aquileia delayed their submission even longer. They found herein a pretext for separating from the Roman Church, and the Lombard invasion (568), by rendering impossible any interference of the emperor, facilitated their revolt. The schism only died out completely under Sergius I, towards the end of the seventh century, but it had already long been confined within narrow limits, for the Milanese had begun to return to the Church in 570, whilst that portion of Aquileia which was under Byzantine rule was reunited in 607.

## § 57

### Monothelism and the Sixth General Council, 680-81<sup>3</sup>

Scarcely had the last been heard of the Three Chapters, when a new question presented itself: Had our Saviour a twofold energy (two principles of action) and a twofold

<sup>1</sup> HARDUIN, III, 10-47; *Corpus script. eccl. lat. Vindob.* vol. 35, 230-329.

<sup>2</sup> HARDUIN, III, 214 ff.

<sup>3</sup> OWSEPIAN, *Zur Entstehungsgesch. des Monothelismus*, 1898; UD-DWAYHI L'IHDINI. *Hist. des Maronites, publiée par AL-CHARTOUNI*, 1890.

will? The Church's doctrine of the twofold nature in Christ required an affirmative answer to the question, for each of these natures is a principle of activity. **Sergius**, patriarch of Constantinople (610-38), came, however, to the conclusion that, owing to the hypostatic union, there could be in Christ but one only will and one only energy, at once Divine and human. Not improbably he was influenced by a wish to discover an irenicon, at any rate this was the aim of the emperor Heraclius (610-41), who soon took the side of his patriarch. Amidst the dangers of the Roman Empire, which was threatened alternately by the Persians and the Arabs, a reconciliation of the Monophysites was much to be desired, whilst there was some hope that the new doctrine would facilitate this issue. In effect Cyrus, ~~pope~~ of Alexandria, succeeded in 633 by this means in making peace with the party of the Theodosians.

But at the same time this doctrine met with determined resistance. The Palestinian monk Sophronius condemned it as a resuscitation of Monophysitism, and on becoming bishop of Jerusalem, in 634, in his first circular letter he gave his unqualified adhesion to the doctrine that there are in Christ two wills and two energies. This reply induced Sergius to abandon the expression *μία ἐνέργεια*; so far as the other matter was concerned he kept to his own opinion, in which manner of acting he was confirmed by the action of Pope Honorius, who, though not himself a Monothelite, gave his approval to the written justification sent to him by Sergius. In consequence of this further steps were soon taken at Constantinople. Heraclius issued his *Ecthesis*, a Monothelite profession of Faith (638). This was revoked by his grandson Constans II (641-68), on account of the ill-will which it caused; yet this same emperor issued the *Typus* (648), a similar edict, which did not serve the cause of peace any better than the previous. It omitted all reference to either Dyothelism or Monothelism, and merely ordained that the old Creeds should be retained. The emperor soon had occasion to show that his threats of punishment against contraveners of the edict were far from idle: Pope Martin I, having at a great Council held at the Lateran in 649 pronounced in favour of the *duae naturales voluntates et operationes*, and sent a decree of

excommunication after the originator of the new doctrine, was maltreated and banished; a like penalty was incurred by other Dyothelites; the abbot Maximus († 662) and his disciples had their tongues torn out and their right hands amputated for a similar reason.

It was left to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus (668–85) to inaugurate a new policy. Desirous of putting a term to the conflict, after having concluded a treaty of peace with the Persians (678), he determined to convoke another General Council. Pope Agatho (678–81), delighted with the suggestion, immediately called together a great council in Rome (680) to ascertain the feelings of the West. Deputies were sent by this synod to the East, and the Council, which was held at **Constantinople** (680–81), and which is reckoned as the Sixth General, succeeded in restoring peace to the Church. Those who persisted in defending Monothelism—Macarius, patriarch of Antioch, his disciple the abbot Stephen, and others—were penalised, being deposed and banished, whilst the originators of the new doctrine were anathematised and their writings condemned to be burnt, among them being Honorius, because in his epistle to Sergius he had acquiesced in and approved the latter's impieties. The Council also drew up a new profession of Faith, in which the Creed of Chalcedon was supplemented by the following addition: We confess, according to the teaching of the holy Fathers, two natural wills and two natural energies, without division or change, without separation or confusion, two wills, not meaning thereby that they are opposed, but that the human follows the Divine, to which it is subordinate. The emperor Philippicus Bardanes (711–13) again brought the error to the fore, and the Sixth General Council was rejected by a new council held in 712. His attempt to reintroduce the heresy came to an end with his fall. After this Monothelism survived only among the Maronites of the Lebanon, until they too, beginning in the twelfth century at the time of the crusades, were gradually united to the Western Church. The opinion which has found favour among them of recent years, that, as a whole, they never professed Monothelism, is not historically defensible.

The following considerations may serve to show that **Honorius** was not at heart a Monothelite: (1) Though in his arguments he

constantly, like Sergius, starts with the hypostatic union as his premise, yet he never goes as far as the latter, never inferring from this premise the oneness of will or of energy. (2) The expression *una voluntas*, which he once uses with approval, is, as the context shows, not to be taken physically, but only morally—it does not mean that Christ has only one will-faculty, but that the will of His untainted human nature agrees (and in this sense is one) with His Divine will: it should therefore be taken as a testimony to Honorius's belief in a twofold will. Neither was he at all inclined to accept the doctrine of a single energy, as we may see from the fragments which remain of his second epistle to Sergius. After having therein again condemned as novel, and likely to cause dissent, the doctrines of a single or of a double will, he makes his own the words of the *Epistula dogmatica* of Leo I, and declares that in Christ's person the two natures work without division and without confusion, each in its proper sphere. Hence the judgment pronounced by the Council of Constantinople was too severe. A more measured condemnation was that uttered by Leo II, Agatho's successor. In his letter to Constantine Pogonatus he remarks: *Qui (Honorius) hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana prodicione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est* (= *permisit*, the Greek word being *παρεχώρησε*); in his epistle to the Spanish bishops he says likewise: *Qui flammam haeretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit* (HARDUIN, III, 1475, 1730). In a profession of Faith which the Popes of the Middle Ages were once accustomed to recite on assuming office, Honorius is put at the tail of a list, after the *Auctores novi haeretici dogmatis, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum Constantinopolitanos*, and is described as one: *Qui pravus eorum adsertionibus fomentum impendit*. Nevertheless, so strongly was his negligence reprobated at Rome that in the same Creed he is condemned with the heretics. Cp. *Liber diurnus Rom. Pont.* ed. SICKEL, 1889, pp. 100–102. The case of Honorius gave rise to many controversies. Some, like Baronius (*Ann.* 680, 19–34; 682, 3–9; 683, 2–22), have even expressed their disbelief in any condemnation of him by the Council of Constantinople, and have argued that the acts must have been falsified (the name of Honorius being substituted for that of Theodore, patriarch of Constantinople). Cp. HEFELE, III, 145 ff., 289 ff.

## § 58

### The Anthropological Controversy <sup>1</sup>

Whilst the East especially was engaged in the more speculative Christological discussion, the West was being torn

<sup>1</sup> NORIS, *Historia Pelagiana*, 1673.

by the anthropological and soteriological controversies. The dispute began at the commencement of the fifth century, and falls into two periods, in the earlier of which the false opinions on their very first appearance were condemned, and the idea of grace insisted on, whilst in the second the doctrine of grace was maintained inviolate against certain attempts to enfeeble it, though it was found advisable also to modify somewhat the rigour of the Augustinian teaching.

### I. Pelagianism <sup>1</sup>

The two monks **Pelagius** and **Celestius**, probably out of a mistaken moral zeal, saw fit to deny original sin and to contend that, even after the Fall, man retained the fullest power of doing right. On the doctrine migrating from Rome to Carthage, in 410, it began to meet with opposition. Celestius, who remained there awaiting ordination, whilst Pelagius continued his journey to Palestine, was accused of error by Paulinus, a deacon of Milan, and as he refused to recant, he was excommunicated by the Carthaginian Council of 411 (or 412). The errors charged against Celestius were comprised in seven articles, of which the first and fifth are the most important, the rest being merely explanatory.

(1) Adam was created mortal, and would have died even had he never sinned.

(2) Adam's sin injured himself alone, and not the human race.

(3) Infants at their birth are in the condition of Adam before his sin.

(4) Adam's sin is no more the cause of man's mortality than Christ's resurrection is that of his resurrection. (To this Marius Mercator, in his first *Commonitorium* or *Liber Subnot.* [c. 5], adds that children attain to everlasting life whether they have been baptised or not.)

(5) It is possible for man to be sinless, and to observe God's commandments with ease.

(6) Even before the coming of Christ there had been men without sin.

<sup>1</sup> WIGGERS, *Versuch einer pragmat. Darst. d. Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus*, 1821; WÖRTER, *Der Pelagianismus nach s. Ursprunge u. s. Lehre*, 1866; KLASSEN, *Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus*, 1882; A. BRUCKNER, *Julian v. E.* 1897 (*T. u. U.* XV, 3). The documents which relate to the controversy will be found in the appendix to St. Augustine's works edited by the congregation of St. Maur; they are also to hand in an abbreviated form in A. BRUCKNER'S *Quellen zur Gesch. des pelag. Streites*, 1906.

(7) The Law as well as the Gospel leads to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Soon after this condemnation, refutations began to make their appearance. St. Augustine, the great bishop of Hippo Regius, composed against it the work, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* (412), in which he mainly deals with the supposition that Adam's sin corrupts his posterity only by its bad example (*imitatione*), and not because it is truly transmitted to his children (*propagatione*). Though man with the help of God's grace and of his own free-will might refrain from sin, yet in actual deed and according to Scripture all men, with the exception of our Saviour, are sinners, none succeeding in performing all the commandments. In *De spiritu et littera*, another work of the same year, the second idea is worked out, and grace is shown to consist not in the Law, as the Pelagians had contended, but in the sanctification of our will. In yet another work, *De natura et gratia* (415), which is directed against Pelagius's work *De natura*, it is argued that man needs grace to accomplish his justification, having lost, through the sin of his first father, his earlier power and innocence, and that grace depends not on our merit but on God's good pleasure (*non meritis, sed gratis*).

In Africa, Pelagius had been unfortunate enough to stumble on an adversary whose authority was as great as his ability to detect heresy; elsewhere, partly by dint of dissimulation, he succeeded in concealing the weak side of his doctrine, and even in gaining his case against his accusers. A council held at Jerusalem in 415 under the bishop John, and at which the Spaniard Orosius was present to prosecute Pelagius, withheld its decision; whilst the Council of Diospolis (Lydda), which was assembled in the same year in consequence of a complaint of the Gallic bishops Heros and Lazarus, actually declared his teaching to be free from error. Deceived by the terms of the creeds and explanations which were circulated by the heretics, Pope Zosimus (417-18) announced that both Celestius and Pelagius were innocent, seeing that they admitted the need of grace. Simultaneously, Heros and Lazarus were deposed for having lodged a false accusation, whilst the Africans were publicly blamed for having, on receiving news of the happenings at Diospolis, assembled Councils at Carthage and Mileve

(416), and there condemned the two heretics and all who followed them, though this had been done with the sanction of Pope Innocent. Despite Rome's intervention, the Africans again returned to the charge at the plenary council of Carthage (418). In the same year Augustine, in his work *De gratia Christi*, showed how indefinite and imperfect was the Pelagian idea of grace, for when admitting that grace was required for every action, Pelagius by the term 'grace' meant either the Law, or the teaching or the example of Christ; in other words, to him grace was an illumination of the mind showing the commandment (*gratia externa*), not an inpouring of charity, nor a moving of the will to fulfil the commandment (*gratia interna*). By these proceedings Zosimus was induced to adopt stronger measures. In his *Epistula tractoria* he called on all bishops to submit to the ruling of the Africans. This epistle was accepted almost everywhere, the eighteen bishops who refused to sign it being sent into banishment by order of the emperor. With this the contest seemed closed, but the exiles having directed their steps to the East, the question again came up for discussion at the Council of Ephesus (431). Written works dealing with the matter also continued to circulate. Thus Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia, one of the opponents of the *Epistula tractoria*, accused Augustine of dishonouring marriage and dissolving all morals by his teaching on original sin. This led Augustine to devote his attention exclusively to the latter matter. In 419 he published his *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, and he continued occupied with the subject until the end of his life. His last and greatest work against Julian was never finished, for which reason it is styled the *Opus imperfectum*.

## II. Semi-Pelagianism <sup>1</sup>

In the course of his dispute with the Pelagians, **St. Augustine's** doctrine underwent some changes. Of these,

<sup>1</sup> WIGGERS, *Vers. einer pragmat. Darst. des Semipel. in s. Kampfe gegen den Augustinismus*, 1833; BALTZER, *Augustins Lehre über Prädestination u. Reprobation*, 1871 (*Oest. Vierteljahrsschrift f. k. Th.* 1870); ROTTMANNER, *Der Augustinismus*, 1892; A. HOCH, *Lehre des Joh. Cassianus von Natur u. Gnade*, 1895; A. KOCH, *Der hl. Faustus*, 1895; WÖRTER, *Beiträge zur Dogmengesch. des Semipel.* 1898-99; H. v. SCHUBERT, *Der sog. Prädestinatus*, 1903.

the most remarkable concerns his teaching on predestination, *i.e.* on the extent of God's will to save men, and of the power of grace. To begin with, the great doctor had ascribed to God the will to save all men, and had explained the fact that some believed whilst others disbelieved to man's will, or rather to his refusing to make use of his will. But in the course of time, becoming more and more convinced of the omnipotence of the Divine will, he came to be persuaded that God's will to save is a particular one. He accordingly refers back to the Divine will the difference between the faithful and unbelievers, between the good and the wicked, between the saints and the damned. According to his matured doctrine, the whole human race has become, through sin, a *massa perditionis*. God had, however, from all eternity willed to be merciful to a portion of the race and had elected it for salvation, with regard to the other portion He leaves it to its own ruin; as this ruin was merited, and as no man has any claim to grace, God's manner of proceeding is not open to any charge of injustice. The elect, aided by the irresistible power of grace, attain unfailingly to blessedness, whilst the reprobate, *i.e.* those who are not numbered among the elect, are hopelessly condemned to loss. That God has no general will to save men is evident, for were this the case, then, owing to His omnipotence, the salvation of all men would be assured. Nor can this be shown from the words of the Apostle Paul (1 *Tim.* ii. 4), speaking of God, 'Who will have all men to be saved,' for they only imply that all who are saved are saved only through God's will; or else the *omnes homines* of the text must be taken as *omnes predestinati*, the Apostle using the general term to indicate that the predestinate belong to all classes; or, lastly, they may mean: may God make us to desire the blessedness of all men.<sup>1</sup>

This theory encountered contradiction not only among the Pelagians, but among their very enemies, owing to the danger it seemed to threaten to the freedom of the will. The first to revolt was the monastery of Adrumetum in Africa, where some of the monks, in order to safeguard the freedom of the will, saw fit to fall back on the Pelagian dictum: *gratiam*

<sup>1</sup> The threefold interpretation will be found in *De corr. et gratia*, c. 14, 15, n. 44, 47; *epist.* 217, c. 6, n. 19.

*secundum merita dari*. Others, denying all freedom, maintained that God's judgment on men was not according to their works. One even went so far as to argue that it was useless to preach repentance to sinners: seeing that it is impossible to do good without God's grace, all that we can do is to pray for sinners that they may receive grace. To enlighten these monks Augustine penned his *De gratia et libero arbitrio* and his *De correptione et gratia* (426-27). The result of these last works was a new controversy in another locality.

The extremity to which St. Augustine here proceeded with his doctrine of predestination moved the monks at Marseilles and the neighbourhood, headed by **John Cassian**, to pronounce against him. The theory seemed to them contrary to the Gospel, and its fatalism dangerous to good morals. Cassian<sup>1</sup> went so far as to term it an *ingens sacrilegium*. For their part they explained that predestination depends not merely on God's pleasure, but on His prescience, God electing those whom He foresees will render themselves worthy of election; hence God's choice is conditional, not absolute, and the help He affords is general. Again they held, and a like view was favoured by a certain Vitalis of Carthage,<sup>2</sup> that faith and the will to be good arise in man himself, though they cannot be brought to perfection save by God's grace. Lastly, man's will precedes not only grace in general, but also the special gift of perseverance, which he can accept or refuse, seeing that Augustine was wrong in teaching that it is incapable of being lost.<sup>3</sup> Against these attacks Augustine defended himself in his *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and his *De dono perseverantiae*. After his death (430) Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary, who had been instrumental in bringing to his knowledge the occurrences in southern Gaul, continued the conflict with the semi-Pelagians, as their adversaries came to be styled, and it was at their request that Pope Celestine spoke the praises of the bishop of Hippo (431). Semi-Pelagianism nevertheless struggled on long after in Gaul; even the Council of Arles (473 or 475) favoured it. On the other hand, the Councils of Valence and Orange (529) pronounced for the opposite side, and the latter (*Arausicana II*),

<sup>1</sup> *Coll.* XIII, 7.

<sup>2</sup> AUGUST. *Ep.* 217.

<sup>3</sup> PROSP. et HILAR. *Epp. ad Aug. inter Aug. epp.* 225-226.

headed by Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, and confirmed by Pope Boniface II, succeeded in reaffirming the Augustinian doctrine.

One polemic against Augustine, which bears the title *Praedestinatius*, consists of a presentment of his predestinarian doctrine from the worst point of view, together with a refutation, and a history of heresies based on Augustine's work. The real leader of the semi-Pelagians was Faustus, bishop of Riez. He entered into conflict with the presbyter Lucidus, whose Augustinianism passed the boundaries of moderation. At the Council of Arles the latter was called upon to recant, whilst to the former was committed the charge of giving further expression to the feelings prevalent in Gaul. This he did in his work *De gratia*. It was against him also that the anger of Augustine's disciples vented itself. The Scythian monks of Constantinople, headed by John Maxentius, laboured at Rome for his condemnation, and on Hormisdas refusing to satisfy completely their desires, they turned to the bishops of Africa. In a synodal letter the latter denounced (523) the teaching of Faustus. Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, who probably drew up this letter, undertook a yet fuller work on the same subject: *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae Dei*. Another of his works, the *Contra Faustum*, in seven books, has been lost.

The defenders of the Augustinian doctrine did not, all of them, consider it necessary to retain it in all its original severity. To obviate scandal, Prosper had distinctly confined predestination to election, and made reprobation to depend on God's foreknowledge, while the unknown author of the *De vocatione omnium gentium* even went so far as to teach that God really wills the salvation of all men.

## CHAPTER III

### THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH

#### § 59

#### Church Offices<sup>1</sup>

THE spread of Christianity and the growth of the Churches during this period resulted in several changes in the ministry. In the first instance the oldest, or, to speak more correctly, the principal presbyters and deacons, obtained the titles, respectively, of Archpriest and Archdeacon; the former performed the bishop's priestly functions in his absence, whilst the latter acted as the bishop's right-hand man in matters of administration and jurisdiction, and thus came to be vested with no small authority; nor is it at all remarkable that, especially at Rome, the archdeacon was often appointed to succeed his bishop.

New ecclesiastical functionaries were also called into being: for instance, the Hermeneutae or interpreters, charged with translating into the vernacular the lessons and homilies of the sacred offices; the Cantors (*ψάλται*, *ψαλτωδοί*, *cantores*, *confessores*), to whom fell the task of performing the choral portions of the service; the Parabolani, who looked after the sick; the Copiatae (*κοπιάται*, *fossores*), who had charge of the funerals; the Mansionarii (or *custodes*), who were deputed to act as watchmen in the Churches; the Syncelli, the companions and counsellors of the bishop, whose conduct they supervised; the Administrators (*οἰκονόμοι*), in the West called *vice-domini*, concerning whom the Council of Chalcedon directs that one should be appointed in every diocese to attend to the possessions of the Church; the Defensores (*ἔκδικοι*), who had

<sup>1</sup> THOMASSIN, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* P. I, l. II, c. 97-108.

the conduct of cases at law; the Notaries (ὀξυγράφοι), who committed to writing the Church acts, and the Archivists (χαρτοφύλακες), who saw to their preservation; the Apocriarii, who acted as representatives of the patriarchs at the court of Constantinople, &c.

Most of the above offices were peculiar to the East, and, in one part of the Eastern Church, at least the Cantors formed a special Order; the other offices were filled by clerics of various degrees, or even by laymen. But with the rise of a new Order in the East several of the older ones disappeared, for it was about this time, or soon after, that the last is heard there of Exorcists and Porters. As to Acolyths, they never had any existence in the East.

In the West the Orders differed. In the tract *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*, preserved under the name of Jerome, the lowest Order is that of the Fossors, whilst Exorcists and Acolyths are not mentioned (*P.L.* XXX, 148-62).

With the rise of infant baptism the Order of deaconesses lapsed. In Gaul it was formally abolished by conciliar decrees (Orange, 441, c. 26; Epaon, 517, c. 21; Orleans, 533, c. 18); in other places it was destined to expire in the following period.

## § 60

### Concerning the Education, Election, Maintenance, and Duties of the Clergy<sup>1</sup>

I. Though the older method of training the clergy continued to be followed, yet we find it under new forms. Eusebius of Vercelli, and Augustine, may be said to have instituted seminaries when they compelled the clergy of their respective dioceses to dwell in community at the episcopal residence, and entrusted the education of the younger members to those who were more advanced. Similar institutions were founded in Spain for the benefit of those who had been consecrated to the ecclesiastical state in their childhood. In Italy the country clergy received into their homes young clerics, in order to train them to act as their successors, and this practice soon spread. The Council of Vaison (529, c. 1) directed its adoption

<sup>1</sup> THOMASSIN, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* P. I, l. iii, c. 2-5; PHILLIPS, *KR.* VII, i, 88, 99; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 121-55; *RE. d. chr. A.* I, 304-307; *Th. Qu.* 1900, pp. 157-60.

in the province of Arles. Lastly, many monasteries undertook to train the clergy; many indeed were the bishops who had been pupils of the monks, or had, at least, stayed with them.

II. Bishops continued to be appointed as formerly. The inclination shown here and there by certain bishops to nominate their successors was condemned by several Councils, which insisted that the custom of consulting the wishes of the Church and of the bishops of the province should be maintained. In the East, however, it was not long before the rights of the people were curtailed. Justinian I allowed a voice only to the clergy and notables of the diocese, and even these had only the right of presenting three names, from which the metropolitan was to choose the most worthy. At a still later date the clergy of the widowed Church lost even this semblance of power, and the right of election was vested in the bishops of the province. In the West, in the Frankish kingdom, the custom soon prevailed of seeking the royal approval; this is vouched for by the Council of Orleans (549, c. 10). The Ostrogoths and Byzantines, following the example of Theodoric the Great, who, on the death of John I (526), had taken it on himself to nominate Felix III as successor, claimed the right of confirming the election of the bishops of Rome. Nevertheless, in order not to keep the See vacant unduly long, this confirmation, from the time of Constantine Pogonatus and Benedict II, was no longer sought from the emperor, but from the imperial exarch at Ravenna.

III. The poorer clergy mostly continued to earn their living by manual labour. In the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, a collection of canons which purports to have been drawn up by the Fourth Council of Carthage (398), but which was really composed in the fifth century in Gaul or Spain,<sup>1</sup> home-work or agriculture is actually made obligatory on the clergy (c. 51-53). On the other hand, commercial undertakings which Constantine had promoted by abolishing the duties to be paid, were forbidden the clergy by Valentinian III, under pain of the loss of clerical privileges. In spite of this, the wealth of the Church grew steadily, especially on account of the right to receive legacies which had been granted her by Constantine. According to

<sup>1</sup> MALNORY, S. *Césaire*, 1894, pp. 50-62; *Congrès scient. internat. des catholiques*, 1894, II (1895), 220-31; *Th. Qu.* 1896, p. 693.

Roman practice, the revenues were divided into four portions, of which one went to the bishop, another to the rest of the clergy, whilst the other two were devoted to the maintenance of ecclesiastical buildings and the relief of the poor. In Spain three portions only were made, there being no special provision for the poor, and an identical custom probably prevailed in Gaul. It was not long before the country churches obtained possessions of their own, of which the revenues belonged to them, though the bishop was considered as the real proprietor, and possibly laid claim to a certain percentage of the income. At any rate, the country churches were bound to remit to the bishop one-third of the oblations made by the Faithful.

IV. It now came to be required that the clerical candidate should be a freeman. For a slave to be ordained, not only was the consent of his master required, but he had first to be set at liberty; this was deemed necessary to prevent the Church's ministers from being placed in a false position. The Apostle's injunction not to lay hands on a neophyte was rendered more comprehensive by the Council of Sardica (c. 10), which directed that no layman should be promoted to the episcopate before having been tried in the lower Orders. The vocation to the ecclesiastical state also came to be considered as something perpetual, and the return of a cleric to the lay state or the acceptance of public office was forbidden under pain of deposition, or even of excommunication. Bishops, priests, and deacons were also compelled to remain in the Church for which they had been ordained, and their translation to other Churches was forbidden by the Councils of Arles (314, c. 14), Nicæa (c. 15), Chalcedon (c. 5), and others. Such a removal from one diocese to another was considered justifiable only when demanded by the Church's well-being.

V. It was during this period that East and West began to disagree respecting marriage contracted by clerics. In the West, following the lead of the Council of Elvira, which had forbidden the higher clergy to contract marriage, Pope Leo I extended the prohibition even to subdeacons. As was to be expected, this reform was not carried immediately into practice; even in Spain, where it had originated, many of the clergy, according to the statement of Pope Siricius, were still leading married lives at the end of the fourth century. St. Ambrose

allows us to conjecture that this was the case generally in rural districts and in the smaller towns. But seeing the marked preference of Holy Writ for virginity, and that all the best minds were in favour of the reform, clerical celibacy could not fail ultimately to become the rule.

The Greek Church contrariwise retained the older custom, according to which higher clerics, though prohibited from contracting marriage after ordination, were allowed to continue their relations with the wife they had married previously. It is true that an attempt was made at the Council of Nicæa to introduce into the East the law of celibacy, but it was frustrated owing to the opposition of the Egyptian bishop Paphnutius. It was, moreover, the custom with many of the Eastern clergy to remain voluntarily celibate; thus the bishops were mostly unmarried, and Justinian I and the Synod in Trullo (692, c. 48), which is sometimes styled Πενθέκτη, or *Quinisexta*, because its canons were passed as a complement to the two preceding General Councils, even went so far as to make continence obligatory on bishops. Only among the Nestorians did a laxer discipline come to prevail; conciliar decrees were issued permitting priests (486) and bishops (497) to marry; at a later date, however, celibacy was again enjoined on the bishops (544).<sup>1</sup>

VI. Though the Nicene Council refused to prohibit priestly marriage, yet it issued a decree to govern the conduct of the unmarried clergy. To obviate the possibility of a fall, or the suspicion of the Faithful, it forbade (c. 3) any of the clergy to retain at home a woman (*συνείσακτος, mulier introducta, extranea*), save mother, sister or aunt, or other person above suspicion. This canon was repeatedly re-enacted by later Councils (cp. § 26).

## § 61

### The Legal Situation of the Clergy, the Clerical Privilege<sup>2</sup>

That they might experience no hindrance in the performance of their duties, Constantine had dispensed the clergy

<sup>1</sup> ASSEMANI, *Bibl. orient.* III, i, 429; III, ii, 872. *Synodicon orientale*, ed. I. B. CHABOT, 1902 (*Notices et extr. de la Bibl. nat.* t. 37).

<sup>2</sup> RIFFEL, *Verhältnis zw. Kirche u. Staat*, 1836, pp. 153 ff., 180 ff.; LÖNING, *Gesch. d. d. KR.* I; NISSEL, *Gerichtsstand des Klerus im Frankenreich*, 1886.

from the ordinary municipal offices,<sup>1</sup> whilst Constantius had freed them and their dependants from all save the common taxes.<sup>2</sup> As it was seen that this favour would induce some to seek ordination merely in order to escape the burdens of citizenship, Constantine forbade Decurions or the wealthy to enter the ecclesiastical state,<sup>3</sup> and this law continued to be enforced by succeeding emperors, though Theodosius I allowed Decurions to receive ordination on condition that they fulfilled their obligations to the State by renouncing their possessions in favour either of the Curia or of some of its members.<sup>4</sup> In France, where the clergy were exempt from many taxes and from compulsory military service, it was necessary to obtain the King's permission before ordination. An exception was, however, made for the children of the clergy.<sup>5</sup>

It was not long before the clergy of the Roman Empire acquired, besides the *Privilegium immunitatis*, also the *Privilegium fori*. The Third Council of Carthage (397) directs the clergy to make their complaints before the ecclesiastical judges, whilst the Council of Chalcedon (c. 9) hints that this should at least be done when both the parties are clerics. According to other councils,<sup>6</sup> clerics could appeal to the secular law only after having obtained the bishop's permission. In the beginning lay folk were not forced to seek redress against the clergy at ecclesiastical courts, but Justinian<sup>7</sup> enacted that they too should be thus obliged, thereby placing the clergy in a privileged position. In future it is the bishops who have to judge between clerics, while metropolitans and patriarchs act as judges in matters where bishops are at variance. In criminal cases, clerics, after having been found guilty by their superiors, were to be degraded and handed over to the secular power to be duly punished. In the West, especially in the Frankish kingdom, proceedings were somewhat different: here the secular judges had to crave the bishop's permission before taking action against a cleric; quarrels between clerk and layman were to be settled in the presence of the ecclesiastical superiors, and the bishop was

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 2, 1, 2; *Eus.* X, 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 2, 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* L, 3, 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* XII, 1, 104.

<sup>5</sup> *Conc. Aurel.* 511, c. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Counc. of Angers*, 453, c. 1; *Vannes*, 465, c. 9.

<sup>7</sup> *Nov.* 79; 83; 123, c. 8, 21, 22.

allowed to intervene in every case in which a cleric was charged with a crime.<sup>1</sup> Bishops, from the sixth century onwards, were generally indicted before councils, and, instead of incurring the punishment ordained by the laws of the State, were made to perform an equivalent ecclesiastical penance.

Nor was the bishop's intervention confined to cases in which the clergy were concerned; mindful of the warning of St. Paul (1 Cor. vi. 1 ff.) to his converts, not to carry their complaints before the heathen, but to judge them among the saints, it soon became a custom of the Christians to appeal to the bishop to act as arbitrator even in purely civil cases. Constantine, by decreeing (318-33) that any cause which one of the parties wished to be tried before the bishop could be decided thus in spite of any objections raised by the other party, practically allowed the bishops to exercise judiciary power in competition with the secular judges. This privilege was, indeed, revoked by the emperors Arcadius (398) and Honorius (408), but civil cases continued long after to be submitted to the arbitration of the bishop.

The landed possessions of the Church, save during a portion of Constantine's reign, were liable to the ordinary taxes. They were, however, early exempted from enforced labour and from special levies (*Cod. Theod.* XVI, 2, 34, 40), though an end was made to this exemption by Valentinian III (441), when all landed proprietors had their special privileges withdrawn (*Cod. Theod.* XV, 3, 3).

## § 62

### The Rise of Parishes<sup>2</sup>

As early as the third century we hear of country churches, and in the next, with the rapid disappearance of paganism, they became yet more numerous, so that it was found necessary to appoint bishops for their government, as we may see from the frequent allusions in this period to country bishops or *χωρεπίσκοποι*. The rise of these bishops seems to have been

<sup>1</sup> C. of Orleans (541), c. 20; Macon (581), c. 7; *Chlotaric II capit.* 614.

<sup>2</sup> THOMASSIN, *Vet. et nov. eccles. discipl.* P. I, l. II, c. 21-23; HINSCHIUS, *KR.* § 90; LÖNING, *Gesch. d. d. KR.* II, 346 ff.; *Th. Qu.* 1892, p. 700; IMBART DE LA TOUR, *Les paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France*, 1900; S. ZORELL, *Die Entwicklung des Parochialsystems*, 1901; F. GILLMANN, *Das Institut der Chorbischofe im Orient*, 1903; H. BERGÈRE, *Étude hist. sur les chorévêques*, 1905.

attended by certain inconveniences. The Council of Ancyra in 314 (c. 13), and one of Antioch (c. 10; the twenty-five canons in question are usually ascribed to the Councils held at Antioch between 330 and 341, especially to the last), were compelled to prohibit the country bishops to ordain priests or deacons without leave from the bishop of the city. The Council of Sardica (c. 6) even forbids the stationing of bishops in villages and small towns, lest the episcopal dignity and authority should suffer. The Council of Laodicea, about 380 (c. 57), expresses its wish that the country bishops should be replaced by *Periodeutae* (*περιοδευταί*), *i.e.* by priests sent as missionaries from the cities. In consequence of these measures the country bishops came to be considered as of a lower caste than the city bishops, with whom they had formerly been equal. They gradually lost episcopal rank, and with the eighth century (Nicene Council of 787, c. 14) they disappear from the orthodox Church of the East, whilst the sects which retained them came ultimately to consider them as simple priests. Under the new circumstances it was necessary to commit the charge of the village churches to priests, who, to begin with, were not appointed permanently nor furnished with any ample powers; it was not, however, long before their status was changed, and they acquired both fixity of tenure and enlarged faculties. It thus came about that the country districts were divided into parishes, in each of which there was a church where Divine worship was carried out by a priest; whereas in the cities the bishops continued to perform all the services, the priests merely serving as assistants; whilst in greater towns, as in Rome, where there were many churches, the consecration of the elements could take place only in the cathedral church (§ 23). Though history is silent concerning it, the new institution must have made rapid progress. For the East this is attested by the sixth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which lays down that no one be ordained save when a position has been found for him beforehand. The frequent allusions in the sixth century to rural churches prove the existence of parishes in the West. Most of these churches were foundations of rich landed proprietors, who, in return for their donation, claimed the right to nominate the incumbents (§ 96). As a general rule, however, it was the bishop who

appointed the parish priest, and who sanctioned new foundations; on him there also devolved the duty of annually visiting them and of advising for their improvement.

Frequently other churches were erected within the limits of a parish, either as chapels of ease for the convenience of the Faithful living at a distance, or out of devotion to certain saints. The priests who ruled the greater parishes, where they were assisted by other clerics, received after the sixth century the title borne by the head priest of the cathedral, being styled archpriests.

### § 63

#### New Patriarchates

I. The Nicene Council had enacted (c. 6) that the rights of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, and of the other chief metropolitans, should be maintained. A few years later, however, the foundation of **Constantinople**, or New Rome, made inevitable a change in the Church's hierarchy. As the metropolitan constitution of the Church was closely bound up with the political divisions of the Roman Empire, it became necessary to assign to the bishop of the new capital a corresponding rank. A beginning was made by the Council of Constantinople in 381, which (c. 3) gave to the bishop of New Rome a position inferior only to that of the bishop of Old Rome; the Council of Chalcedon further enacted that the bishop of Constantinople should have the right of consecrating the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. In this wise the Church of Constantinople took rank with the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, her bishops being likewise styled patriarchs, and the exarchates of Cæsarea, Ephesus, and Heraclea passing under their domination. Leo I, in the name of the Roman See, immediately raised his voice in protest, though in vain; the bishops of Constantinople retained their new rank, and, from the sixth century, were accordingly described as œcumenical patriarchs. In one of his statutes<sup>1</sup> Justinian even terms the Church of Constantinople the head of all the Churches. Gregory I opposed the

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Iust.* I, 2, 24.

usurpation of this title by John the Faster, but in spite of all it remained, and whereas to begin with it had been given to the patriarch only by others, it was now assumed by the patriarchs themselves.<sup>1</sup>

II. At about the same time the see of **Jerusalem** also received a promotion, but in this case the motive was sentimental rather than political. So far the bishop of the holy city had been subject to the see of Cæsarea, though his situation was considered a privileged one by the other bishops of the province. The Nicene Council, without, however, determining his position relatively to the metropolitan, decided (c. 7) that on him the same honour should continue to be bestowed which ancient custom had assigned to the bishop of Ælia. This honorary position was not enough for later bishops, who were anxious to attain patriarchal rank, and Juvenal finally obtained of the Council of Chalcedon at least jurisdiction over the three Palestinian provinces, after having already secured from Theodosius II, by means of a trick, the control of Phœnicia and Arabia.<sup>2</sup>

III. Two new patriarchates, which, however, were never more than titular, arose as a result of the quarrel regarding the Three Chapters. In the beginning of the seventh century the province of Aquileia separated into two portions on the metropolitan of **Grado**, or Aquileia-Grado, becoming reconciled with Rome, whereupon the metropolitan of **Aquileia** proper assumed the title of Patriarch as a sign of his independence. That the bishop of Grado might not be inferior in rank to his schismatic colleague, the title of Patriarch had accordingly to be conferred on him by the Apostolic See. The patriarchate of Grado was transferred in 1451 to Venice, and the other, after the destruction of Aquileia, was removed to Udine, and abolished in 1751. Cp. HEFELE, II, 922 ff.; W. MEYER, *Spaltung des Patr. Aquileja*, 1898 (*Abh. Göttingen, N. F.*, II. 6).

## § 64

### The Roman Church and its Primacy<sup>3</sup>

Many testimonies were given to the primacy of the Church of Rome. The Councils of Constantinople in 381 (c. 3) and of

<sup>1</sup> *Th. Qu.* 1889, pp. 346-48.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. LE QUIEN, *Oriens christianus* (1700), III, 133 ff.; HEFELE, II, 213, 477, 502; *Rev. de l'Orient chrétien*, 1899, pp. 44-57.

<sup>3</sup> H. GRISAR, *Gesch. Roms. u. der Päpste im MA.* 1, 1901 [Engl. Trans. *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages* (in the press)]; FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, No. 9 (on the genuineness of the canon of Sardica).

Chalcedon (c. 28) presuppose it in their decrees concerning the rank to be taken by the bishop of Constantinople. It was also the Roman Church which took the first place in the Councils of the period (cp. § 65). The right of appeal to Rome was acknowledged by the Council of Sardica, which decreed (c. 3-5) that a bishop, when deposed by a provincial Council, could appeal to the Pope, when, if the latter disapproved of the judgment, a new trial was to take place before the bishops of a neighbouring province (*Iudices in partibus*) under the presidency of the papal legates. This decree, which is definite enough as to the primacy of Rome, could not easily be applied in practice in distant provinces. In the East, which was far removed from Rome, little attention was paid to it. The same may be said of Western Africa, where the canons of Sardica were only received later, together with those of Nicæa, to which Council an attempt was made to ascribe them; this circumstance, coupled with the fact that the canon as read by the Africans applied to priests as well as bishops, excited resentment. Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca, having been deposed by his bishop, lodged an appeal with Pope Zosimus, who insisted on his reinstatement. This measure, no doubt, proved displeasing to the Africans, on account of the disadvantages which they foresaw would be the result of a further extension of the right of appeal. However this may be, in the great Council of 418 they forbade priests, deacons, or other lower clerics to appeal to any tribunal beyond the seas; and as Zosimus attempted to uphold his decision, it came to a quarrel which endured for several years. The Council of Carthage in 424 roundly declared that Rome's claim to try cases in Africa was an infringement of the rights of the African Church. Yet, in spite of all this, appeals were made to Rome from Africa, nor was it long before the canons of Sardica were accepted by the whole Church as binding. In these canons the primacy of the Roman Church is attributed to her foundation by Peter, the privilege in question being granted in honour of that Apostle. It is true that the Council of Chalcedon (c. 28) ascribes the primacy to the political position of Rome, but this is only because the Council was seeking for a pretext to make the see of Constantinople superior to the Eastern patriarchates. Even in the East

Rome's primacy was thought to be the outcome of Peter's episcopate; let it suffice to mention in this connection the declaration of the Eastern bishops to Pope Symmachus, of the emperors Anastasius and Justinian to Pope Hormisdas,<sup>1</sup> of the emperor Constantine Pogonatus to Leo II, and of the bishops Stephen of Larissa and Stephen of Dor.<sup>2</sup>

As yet there was no special title assigned to the occupant of the Roman See. The expressions *papa*, *apostolicus*, *vicarius Christi*, *summus sacerdos*, *summus pontifex*, *sanctus*, &c., were also used by other bishops. Yet as early as the sixth century Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, and Cassiodorus had attempted to reserve the use of the title *Papa* for the bishop of Rome, and their example was gradually followed everywhere. The title *Servus servorum Dei* was first used by Gregory I.

Most of the points of interest connected with the papacy during this period have already been dealt with in our general description of events, but there remain a few more. The number of the Popes, owing to the shortness of their pontificates, was very considerable (53). Those to reign the longest were Silvester (314-35) and Leo I (440-61). The latter, owing to his famous encounter with Attila, occupies a place even in secular history, nor was he less remarkable in his government of the Church. Convinced that, as successor of St. Peter, he was called on to lead the whole Church, he laboured to make his counsel prevail everywhere where it was needed, whether in the East during the Eutychian controversy, or in the West when Hilary of Arles was disposed to stretch his metropolitan rights. In the latter cause Leo was aided by Valentinian III, who issued an edict (445), according to which nothing might be undertaken without the leave of the Holy See: *ne quid præter auctoritatem sedis istius inlicitum præsumtio attentare nitatur*. Cp. *Leon. Epp.* 10-11.

Yet four more double elections and subsequent schisms occurred after the time of Liberius and Damasus (§ 50).

I. On the death of Pope Zosimus (418) the archdeacon **Eulalius** and, a day later, the presbyter **Boniface** were elected, and the split occasioned many troubles. A Council of Italian bishops was summoned by the emperor Honorius, but was able to effect nothing, and a yet larger council was proposed. In the meantime, however,

<sup>1</sup> *Epp. Rom. pont.* ed. THIEL, pp. 710, 742, 875 i.

<sup>2</sup> HARDUIN, II, 1116; III, 711, 1462.

Eulalius having dared to infringe a decree of this council by coming to Rome to take part in the Paschal ceremonies of 419, he was discarded by the emperor, and Boniface thus became acknowledged as sole bishop. Cp. BARON. *Ann.* 418-19; *Corpus script. eccl. lat. Vindob.* XXXV, 59-84; *Liber pont.* ed. DUCHESNE, I, 228.

II. At the death of Anastasius II (488) there were elected the deacon **Symmachus** and the archpriest **Lawrence**, the latter being the nominee of the senator Festus, who hoped to make an end of the Acacian schism by inducing this Pope to accept the Henoticon. Both parties having appealed to king Theodoric, the latter decided in favour of Symmachus (499), who generously assigned to his rival the see of Nuceria. In 501 complaints were, however, made against Symmachus by the senators Festus and Probinus, and at their request Theodoric appointed Peter, bishop of Altinum, administrator or 'Visitor' of the Roman Church. This measure turned out to be ill-advised, as Peter openly espoused the Laurentian cause. The King now directed that the charges should be examined, whereupon the Roman Council of 502 decided that Symmachus was innocent. In spite of this the opposition continued, and as Lawrence soon after returned to Rome, the schism became yet more pronounced. It was only when Theodoric ordered (506) the Laurentians to hand over to Symmachus all the churches which they retained, that unity, though not indeed peace, was restored. Lawrence spent the rest of his life (he died before 514) in retirement on the estate of his protector Festus. Cp. PFEILSCHIFTER, *Theoderich d. G.* 1896, pp. 55-125.

III. Felix III (IV), who owed his elevation to the king of the Ostrogoths (§ 60), fearing doubtless that there would be a quarrel over the succession, appointed on his death-bed the archdeacon **Boniface** (530-32) as his successor. The choice of the majority of the Church fell, however, on **Dioscorus**. This schism soon came to an end, for Dioscorus died within a few weeks, and Boniface II was then acclaimed by all. The proceeding of Felix in nominating his own successor was admittedly incorrect, nevertheless Boniface too appointed the deacon Vigilus to succeed him, though he afterwards revoked his choice as contrary to the canons. Cp. HOLDER, *Die Designation der Nachfolger durch die Päpste*, 1892; *A. f. k. KR.* 1894, II, 409-33.

IV. Yet new dissensions occurred towards the end of the period. A schism, already threatened at the death of John V (686), broke out on the demise of Conon (687). One portion of the Church elected the archpriest Theodore and the other the archdeacon Paschal. After some time the majority of the Church fixed on **Sergius**, though his selection did not bring about unity, for Paschal, seconded by the exarch of Ravenna, continued to maintain an opposition. Cp. *Liber pont.* ed. DUCHESNE, I, 371.

## § 65

**The Councils<sup>1</sup>**

One result of the many controversies of the age was the holding of frequent Councils. The very beginning of the period was signalled by a General or Œcumenical Council, which was followed by yet five others. Two of these, the first and second of Constantinople (381 and 553), were in reality only General Councils of the East, since Eastern bishops only had been summoned to the former, whilst the Roman See had of set purpose held itself aloof from the latter; both these Councils obtained, however, œcumenical authority through being afterwards ratified by the West. The remainder were Councils of the Roman Empire, being attended in general only by Roman subjects; they were, nevertheless, considered œcumenical, because as yet Christianity had scarcely passed the frontiers of the empire, and where it had done so the power was chiefly in the hands of the Arians. Some Councils, those of Sardica (343) and Ephesus (449), which were originally intended as general, failed to be afterwards considered as such, one not succeeding in the appointed task, and the other actually teaching a false doctrine.

The right of summoning a General Council belonged to the emperor, the Councils being really synods of the empire. Invitations were addressed to the metropolitans, who were expected to bring with them a number of their suffragans. Above all, the presence of the patriarchs or of their representatives was considered necessary. The West, on account of the distance, was almost invariably represented merely by Apostolic legates or by delegates of a Roman Council. Not only did the emperor summon the Council, he also saw, either personally or by his agents, to the preservation of outward order, and, owing to the excitement which often accompanied the Councils, the presence of his police was not only desirable but often absolutely necessary. Finally, it was the emperor who confirmed the decrees of the Council by giving them the force of a law. The actual deliberations were, however, left

<sup>1</sup> HEFELE, *CG.* I, 1 ff. FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 39-121; 498-508; III, No. 7. *RE. der chr. A.* I, 317-323.

to the assembled Fathers. Among the latter we may single out the Popes, or rather—seeing that no one of them was present personally at any Council of the period—their legates. These took precedence of all those present, taking the first seats and usually being also the first to append their signatures. Through his legates the Pope signified his assent to the decrees of the Council, nor was any subsequent ratification judged necessary. This is apparent from the fact that the emperor gave his confirmation as soon as the canons were passed, or at the close of the Council, *i.e.* before the papal ratification could possibly have been secured.

Besides the Councils in which the whole Church was represented, there were others, such as those of Constantinople in 381 and of Rome in 680, which were attended only by the Western or Eastern branch of the Church; there were also patriarchal, national, provincial, and diocesan Councils or synods, at which the bishops or clergy gathered under the presidency of their superior. Mention must also be made of the Plenary Councils (*concilia plenaria*), as the general assemblies of the western provinces of Africa were called. According to the directions given by the Councils of Nicæa (c. 5) and Chalcedon (c. 17), provincial synods were to be held twice yearly; according to the Council of Orleans (533, c. 2) and others of the sixth century, it was sufficient to hold them once annually. The Councils of Auxerre (585, c. 7), Huesca (598, c. 1), Toledo (693, c. 7), also order the holding of a yearly diocesan synod.

The so-called *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* of Constantinople deserves a special record. It was an assembly of the bishops who happened to be present (*ἐνδημοῦντες*) in the capital, summoned by the patriarch to assist in the solution of difficulties and disputes which had been referred to him. The custom afterwards was to appoint a certain number of bishops as consultants, who thereupon took up for a time their residence at the capital.

The right of taking part in the synods belonged only to the episcopate and clergy. In Spain, however, the secular grandees after the middle of the seventh century were in the habit of attending the Councils and of apposing their signatures to the acts after the bishops and abbots. At a later date similar

*Concilia mixta* make their appearance in the Frankish kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

Various matters were discussed at the synods, their object being to solve all the difficulties which arose in the Church, whether they affected a personal form or concerned the Faith or discipline. In the latter instances the replies of the Council were couched in the form of canons. For the sake of convenience these canons were early codified, the most noteworthy collections being, for the Greek Church, (*a*) that of John the Scholastic (c. 550), a native of Antioch who afterwards became patriarch of Constantinople; for the Latin Church, (*b*) that of the Council of Carthage in 419 (*Codex canonum ecclesiae Africanae*); (*c*) that of Dionysius Exiguus (c. 500), which contains not only the conciliar decrees, but also those of the Popes from Siricius (384) to Anastasius II (498);<sup>2</sup> and (*d*) the Spanish collection which was compiled in the seventh century and was long ascribed to Isidore of Sevilla.<sup>3</sup> In *a* and *c* we find also the *Apostolic Canons*. They are really the conclusion of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (§75), and belong without a doubt to the redactor of the latter work. Altogether they number eighty-five, though Dionysius retains only the first fifty.

The signatures of the members of the General Councils will be found in HARDUIN, I, 312, 1527; II, 627; III, 1423. At the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus the signatures of Osius of Corduba and Cyril of Alexandria precede those of the papal legates, but the latter, and possibly also the former, acted on behalf of the Pope; and if in other instances certain bishops take precedence of the legates of the Church of Rome, we must recollect that the latter was never represented by her bishop in person. The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon were not signed by the legates because of their opposition to Canon 28, though their precedence is attested by the accounts of the several sessions. Cp. HARDUIN, II, 366, 383, 446, 458, 467, 502, &c. The Second and Fifth Councils are exceptions to the rule, but the Seventh and Eighth again show us the legates occupying the highest rank. HARDUIN, IV, 455; V, 922.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. LÖNING, *Gesch. d. d. KR.* II, 138 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *P.L.* LXVII.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* LXXXIV.

## CHAPTER IV

### WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS <sup>1</sup>

#### § 66

#### Baptism and the Catechumenate <sup>2</sup>

To begin with, no change was made in the administration of Baptism. So long as pagans remained to be converted, there were numerous adults to baptise. Nor was it the custom to baptise the children of Christian parents until they were advanced in age, Baptism being frequently delayed until the hour of death. Infant Baptism became the general practice only in the fifth century, and the new custom was largely a reaction against Pelagianism.

Hence the Catechumenate continued to be preserved as an institution for some time yet, and we likewise come across a practice which, though not indeed new, is met with for the first time under a definite name. Those of the catechumens who decided to receive Baptism and whom the Church found fit to enter into her society, during the Lenten or other season previous to their Baptism, were specially prepared for the reception of the sacrament. They were called φωτιζόμενοι, βαπτίζόμενοι, *competentes* (sc. *baptismum*), *electi*. The instructions bore mainly on the Faith, the Creed being given to them to learn by heart; when this was done they had to return it, or to show their knowledge of it by reciting it in the Church: this was the *Traditio* and *Redditio symboli*. The Lord's Prayer was treated in the same manner. The instructions were accompanied by

<sup>1</sup> DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrét.* 1889; 3rd ed. 1902 (Eng. Trans. *Christian Worship*, 2nd ed. 1904). CABROL, *Étude sur la Pèlerinage de Saint-Jacques*, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> Bibl. § 22, F. PROBST, *Katechese u. Predigt vom Anfang des 4 bis z. Ende des 6 Jahrh.* 1884; *Studien zur Gesch. der Theol. u. K.* IV, 2 (1899). J. ERNST, *Die Ketzertaufangelegenheit in der altchr. K. nach. Cyprian*, 1901.

exorcisms, confession of sins, fasts, and other practices, the object being both to prepare and to make trial of the candidates. Both at Rome and in Africa these proceedings were called the *scrutinia*. The reception of Baptism was followed by instructions on the sacraments, delayed until then owing to the Discipline of the Secret, according to which only the baptised could be admitted into the mysteries. This latter course of instruction was called by the Greeks the mystagogical catechesis. It is true that the Creed and the Our Father were also reckoned as mysteries, and for this reason, in some Churches, only the baptised were made acquainted with the latter; but the matter was of a nature to require a breach in the rule, a further excuse being that the newly baptised were admitted with but little delay to full communion with the Faithful. The spread of infant Baptism naturally led to a change in this discipline, though most of the old ceremonies were retained in the later rite of Baptism.

Baptism was administered in baptisteries—*i.e.* chapels constructed for the purpose in the neighbourhood of the church—and consisted in a triple immersion. A single immersion was customary only in Spain and among the Eunomians and Aëtians, in one case out of opposition to the Arians, and in the other through heretical motives. In the East the Epiphany began to be reckoned among the days on which Baptism might be administered, whilst in Spain any feast could serve for the purpose; Rome preferred to keep to the older order. On the other hand, in Thessaly and some Churches of Gaul it was customary to baptise only at Easter. This was the practice even in baptising infants, save, of course, in cases of necessity. Towards the end of the period a change occurred in the Visigothic kingdom, the Councils of Toledo (693 and 694, c. 2) enacting that children should be baptised within thirty days of birth, though not in the Lenten season.

Whilst in the Latin Church Ambrose and Augustine<sup>1</sup> acknowledged that baptism of desire could replace the true Baptism, we find elsewhere the belief prevalent that only martyrdom or the baptism of blood could thus serve.<sup>2</sup> In the Greek Church this latter became the common teaching.

<sup>1</sup> AMBR. *Consol. de obitu Valentiniani*, c. 30; AUG. *De Bapt.* IV, 22, No. 29.

<sup>2</sup> GENNAD. *De eccl. dogmat.* c. 41; *Lib. dogmat.* c. 74 (Migne, P. L. 83, 1242);

Baptism conferred by heretics was not again made the pretext of a quarrel, though the question continued to be solved differently in different localities. The milder practice recommended itself to the greater portion of the Latin Church, the contrary practice of the Africans being reprobated by the Council of Arles (314, c. 8), which decreed that those who had been baptised by heretics in the name of the Trinity should be merely admitted to receiving the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands. It was at this juncture that the advocates of the stricter practice, the African Donatists, broke with the Church. On the other hand, in a large part of the East a different view was taken of the matter. In the *Procatechesis* of Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 7), in the canonical epistles of Basil the Great (c. i, 47), in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi, 15) and *Canons* (46, 47), heretical baptisms are declared invalid, whilst the Nicene Council (c. 19) rejected the Baptisms conferred by the Paulinists or followers of Paul of Samosata. The spurious seventh canon of the Second General Council is the first sign we have that a distinction was made between Baptism validly and invalidly conferred by heretics; it acknowledges the validity of the Baptism administered by Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Apollinarists, but rejects that of the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians. This canon testifies to the practice in the fifth century, for it agrees with a letter sent by the Church of Constantinople to Martyrius, bishop of Antioch (460-70), and besides was adopted with some additions by the Council in Trullo (692 c. 95).

The opinion, at one time very common, that there were several classes of catechumens, is now known to be unfounded. Candidates for Baptism were not considered as a category of catechumens, but as occupying a position intermediate between the Faithful and the catechumens. The assumption that there existed three classes—(1) ἀκροώμενοι, *audientes*; (2) γόνυ κλίνοντες, *genu flectentes*; (3) φωτιζόμενοι, *competentes*—is based on a misapprehension of the fifth canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea (314-25). In the passage in question the words ἀκροώμενος and γόνυ κλίνων are used of penitents, not of catechumens. Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 209-41; III, No. 3.

## § 67

Liturgy, Communion, and Eulogies <sup>1</sup>

I. The Liturgy remained essentially what it had been before, though some small changes were inevitable. As infant baptism grew common and the penitential discipline was relaxed, the dismissal of the catechumens and penitents in the middle of the Mass either was discontinued or lost its earlier meaning. A fragment of the *De traditione divinae liturgiae* (by Proclus ?) tells us of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom, that they abridged the liturgy owing to the impatience manifested by those compelled to be present at the lengthy services. Like reforms were undertaken in the West by Popes Damasus, Gelasius (492-96), and Gregory I, and also by Ambrose, bishop of Milan; and as, after the time of Damasus, variations suitable to the different seasons of the year came to be admitted into the Liturgy, definite lessons from Scripture were assigned to each day, whilst the prayers, the preface, and even certain portions of the Canon were altered to suit the feasts. In the East, on the other hand, the Liturgy made no account of the feasts. The reforms led to a great variety of Liturgies, though it is probable that divergencies existed even before; we thus find that each of the greater Churches had its own particular Liturgy.

In Jerusalem and Antioch the prevailing Liturgy was that called after St. James; in Alexandria it was that of St. Mark; in Constantinople there were two, bearing, one the name of St. Basil and the other that of St. Chrysostom. The latter was the one in common use, whilst the former served for the feast of St. Basil, for the Sundays in Lent (Palm Sunday excepted), Maundy Thursday, and the Vigils of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter. A Liturgy older than all these is the Clementine, found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*; having been incorporated in an important literary work and preserved

<sup>1</sup> Cp. §§ 3, 5; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, IV, 2, 3; PROBST, *Liturgie des 4 Jahrh. u. deren Reform*, 1893; *Die abendkänd. Messe vom 5 bis 8 Jahrh.* 1896; A. BAUMSTARK, *Liturgia Romana e Liturgia dell' Esarchato*, 1904; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 293-301 (for the rite of Communion); III, No. 5 (for the Canon); *Revue Bénéd.* 1890-91 (for the Eulogies).

together with it, it has escaped the alterations to which other Liturgies were exposed.

The Latin Liturgies bore the names of the Churches or of the countries in which they were used. Chief among them were the Roman, Milanese, Gallican, Spanish, British, and Irish, the Roman being in use in the whole of Southern Italy and in Latin Africa, the Milanese or Ambrosian being employed in upper Italy, and the others prevailing in the countries from which they derive their denomination.

No doubt in the beginning the Roman Liturgy was in general agreement with the others, just as these generally agreed among themselves, but owing to the reforms made in this period, it acquired many peculiarities. The Epiclesis following the words of consecration, in which the Holy Ghost was invoked to come down on the oblation and transform the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, that they may be productive of salvation to the faithful, disappeared from the Roman Liturgy; or if it has been preserved in the *Supplices te rogamus*, at any rate the characteristic invocation of the Holy Ghost is wanting. The intercessory prayers which all of them followed the Consecration (though in the Alexandrian, Gallican, and Spanish rites they come before the Preface) were divided in the Roman Liturgy, the prayers for the living coming before, and those for the dead after the Consecration. The Pax, which at Rome was given just before the Communion, preceded the Consecration in the East, whilst it immediately followed in the Western non-Roman Liturgies. The latter peculiarity may, however, go back to the previous period, seeing that it was known to Innocent I and to Augustine. The origin of most of these reforms is very obscure; the extant Sacramentaries, having been supplemented in later times, do not bear witness to the state of the Liturgy when their originals were composed. The Gelasian Sacramentary corresponds with the year 700, the Gregorian with the time of Adrian I (772-95), and though the prayer for Pope Simplicius († 483) shows that the Leonine goes back further, yet its want of order points to this book having been merely a private compilation.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Sacramentaries were reprinted in Migne, the Leonine in *P.L.* LV, the Gelasian in *P.L.* LXXIV, the Gregorian in *P.L.* LXXXVIII. The Gelasian was re-edited by WILSON, 1894, and the Leonine by FELTOE, 1896.

The Eucharist in some localities continued to be celebrated<sup>1</sup> only on Sunday, in other places also on the 'stations.' In the East (§ 69) it came to be celebrated also on Saturdays, whilst here and there it began to be offered daily.

We first meet with the word **Mass** applied to the Eucharist at the end of the fourth century, the earliest witnesses being Ambrose (*Ep.* 20, 4) and the so-called *Peregrinatio Silviae* (§ 76, 9), and without a doubt it arose from the *Ite missa est*, or dismissal formula; that the formula should have come to denote the whole Liturgy is not to be wondered at, seeing that in antiquity there were two dismissals, that of the catechumens and that of the Faithful. The other derivations are very doubtful. In the Middle Ages the expressions *missa catechumenorum* and *missa fidelium* were taken as meaning a Mass of the catechumens and a Mass of the Faithful; in reality, the *missa* only refers to the dismissal. As the same formula was used at the end of the other services also, we come across such expressions as *Missae matutinae* (Matins), and *Missae vespertinae* (Vespers). Cp. *Counc. of Agde*, 506, c. 30; HEFELE, *Beiträge*, II, 273-76; FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, No. 6.

II. **Communion** was still received very frequently. Augustine (*Ep.* 54) speaks of the practice of communicating weekly or even daily; when, however, Constantine's conversion had brought many merely nominal Christians into the Church, this practice soon ceased to be the general rule. Many of the Fathers, Chrysostom for instance, complained of the paucity of Communion. The Council of Agde in 506 (c. 18) confined itself to directing that the Faithful should approach the sacrament thrice yearly. The practice remained of putting the consecrated Bread into the hands of the communicant, though in Gaul the custom arose, in the case of women, of placing it, not in their bare hand, but on a linen cloth.

III. As Communion became less frequent, a kind of substitute was found for it. Those who had not communicated were, at the end of the service, presented with a morsel of blessed bread. The loaves used for this purpose were termed the **Eulogies**, or, to denote that they were a substitute for the *δῶρον*, they were called the *ἀντίδωρον*; they were taken from the oblation after a portion of it had been set aside for consecration. The custom is retained to the present day among the Greeks, and it also continues to exist in some parts of the

<sup>1</sup> AUG. *Ep.* 54; EPIPH. *Expos.* c. 21.

West, for instance in France. In the course of time it lost, however, its primitive character, the Eulogies being no longer consumed in Church, but carried away by the Faithful, whilst they came to be given even to those who had communicated.

IV. The pre-eminence granted to the Church by Constantine enabled her to carry out her ceremonial with greater pomp than heretofore. Great attention was now paid to ecclesiastical **chant**.<sup>1</sup> Pope Silvester (c. 330) established a special choral school in Rome, and, somewhat later, St. Ambrose of Milan introduced a chant (*Cantus Ambrosianus*) combining rich melody with a good rhythmic movement; lastly, Gregory the Great was the creator of Plain Chant (*Cantus Gregorianus, Romanus, firmus, choralis*) and the inventor of a new mode of writing it, namely by means of neumes.

V. Besides the Eucharistic service, the so-called canonical **Hours**, consisting in the singing of psalms, the reading of Scripture, and prayers, began to take a prominent place in the Church's life. In the previous period mention is often made of three hours of prayer, but when Christianity had been victorious the practice assumed much more importance. We now find that the times of prayer are sunrise, the third, sixth, and ninth hours, evening and midnight. It was not, however, long before Compline was separated from Vespers and became the real evening prayer. The monks, following the example of the ancient Roman night-watches, divided the night, or at least certain nights, into four periods of prayer, the three Nocturns and the Matins; but the four portions of the nocturnal office soon came to be recited at dawn. As the time from dawn to Terce seemed too long to remain unoccupied, the hour of Prime was introduced. It was not merely the monks and clergy who took part in these offices; until the sixth century it was customary to consider them as part of the public service, the laity attending at least Matins and Vespers, as we may see from the *Peregrinatio Silviae* and the Council of Agde (506, c. 30). As late as 666 we find the Council of Merida (c. 2) obliging the Faithful to be present at Vespers. We may understand this if we bear in mind that as yet there was, in many churches, no Eucharistic celebration on week-days, and that Matins and Vespers were made to serve in its stead. Cp. BATIFFOL, *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain*, 1894 (Engl. Trans. 1898); BÄUMER, *Gesch. des Breviers*, 1895.

<sup>1</sup> MORIN, *L'Origine du chant grégorien*, 1892; DREVES, *Aur. Ambrosius 'der Vater des Kirchengesanges'*, 1893; P. WAGNER, *Einführung in die Gregor. Melodien*, 1895; 2nd ed. 1901; CASPARI, *Unters. zum Kirchengesang im Altertum*, Z. f. KG. 1905-06.

## § 68

Penance<sup>1</sup>

I. As we may see from the penitential canons of the Councils of Ancyra (314), Neo-Cæsarea, and Nicæa, and from the canonical epistles of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa, public penance was still in full swing in the Eastern Church during the fourth century. The category of penitents was even enlarged, a new and lowest class, that of the Weepers, *προσκλαίοντες*, now making its appearance. The third class of capital sins now began to be considered pardonable, the Council of Ancyra (c. 22) allowing murderers to receive Communion on their death-bed, and Basil the Great deciding (c. 56) that they might be readmitted after twenty years' penance. But towards the end of the same century a change occurred. Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, was induced by the presbyter Eudæmon, in view of the evil consequences of public confession, to abolish (391) the office of penitentiary, and to leave it to each of the Faithful to approach the sacred mysteries when so moved. The example of the capital proved infectious, though both here and elsewhere notorious crimes still continued to be subject to the old ecclesiastical discipline; for all other sins the penitent was left free to choose his own penance, Socrates (V, 19) even complaining, probably with good reason, of the remissness which ensued.

II. Alterations were also made in the West. The old view that there was only one penance still held the field, and in Spain, where it had become customary to readmit backsliders, the old rule was again stringently laid down by the Council of Toledo (589, c. 11). Yet milder counsels began to prevail, and those who had fallen a second time, though not readmissible among the penitents, were nevertheless allowed to attend the services, and on having shown due signs of repentance were admitted to Communion on their death-bed. Those who had been guilty of capital sins, and who repented only when in danger of death, were now held to be capable

<sup>1</sup> Cp. § 24; G. RAUSCHEN, *Jahrbücher der christl. K. unter Theodosius d. Gr.* 1897, pp. 537-44; H. KELLNER, *Das Buss- und Strafverfahren gegen Kleriker in den 6 ersten Jahrh.* 1863.

of penance and pardon, whereas formerly they had been merely admitted to penance. Among some of the newly converted nations, *e.g.* among the Anglo-Saxons, public penance was never introduced. Finally, by an enactment of Leo I, the practice was entirely abrogated.

III. Penance was imposed by a laying on of hands by a priest and by the bestowal of a hair shirt. The penitent had henceforth to lead a life of mortification, to shave his hair, and to wear monastic or mourning garments, besides being obliged to refrain from all business, from practising in the courts, and from military service. He was also obliged to observe continence, for which reason no married person was admitted to penance save with the consent of his consort. Penitents were forbidden to contract a new marriage or to resume their former conjugal relations, even at the conclusion of their penance, though an exception was made for young men who accepted penance when in danger of death, but who afterwards regained their health. The reconciliation took place at Rome on Maundy Thursday, and in other places on one of the following three days.

IV. In the previous period clerics had been subject to the same penitential discipline as the laity. In the fourth century arose the custom of deposing without excommunicating them, thus merely reducing them to the position of laymen without imposing any obligation of penance, this exception being made that clerics might not be doubly punished (*cp. Apostolic Canons*, c. 25). In the Roman Church they were even forbidden to undertake voluntary penance, doubtless through fear of scandal; in Gaul such a prohibition did not exist.

## § 69

### Festivals and Fast-days<sup>1</sup>

I. So far the feasts of the Church had been almost of a private character; they now assumed greater publicity

<sup>1</sup> AUGUSTI, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, I-III; NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale*, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1896-97; USENER, *Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen*, I, 1889; *Rhein. Museum f. Philol.* 1905, pp. 465-91; FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 258-66; *RE. d. chr. A. I.*, 486 ff.; *Th. Qu.* 1891, p. 528; 1906, p. 158; BONACCORSI, *Noël*, 1903.

Constantine decreed the closing of the law-courts and the cessation of all public work on Sundays,<sup>1</sup> and soon after shows and public games were also prohibited.<sup>2</sup> This prohibition was, by Theodosius II, made to cover all the greater feasts and the period between Easter and Whitsun,<sup>3</sup> then called Pentecost or Quinquagesima. Agricultural labour, which Constantine had allowed on Sundays, was afterwards forbidden by several Councils. The number of the feasts was also notably increased.

II. In the East during the fourth century the Saturday came to be treated as a Sunday, service being held on it and fasting being forbidden. The latter prohibition was even enforced by the *Apostolic Canons* (c. 64) with a threat of excommunication, and with deposition in the case of clerics.

III. The feast of the Epiphany, which had existed fairly generally in the Greek Church even in the third century, is now found in the Latin Church also. In migrating, the feast acquired, however, a new meaning. Whilst in the East it commemorated more especially Christ's Baptism, in the West it came to be a festival in honour of His manifestation to the Gentiles. The other meanings of the feast gradually passed into the background, one of them, that of Christ's birth, becoming the object of an entirely new festival, **Christmas**. The origin of the latter is by no means clear: the Armenian Ananias the 'Computer,' writing at the beginning of the seventh century, tells us that it was kept at the imperial court under Constantius (337-61); we have also an allusion of the so-called Chronographer of A.D. 354. If his notice at the head of the *Depositio Martyrum* is to be taken as indicating that December 25 was merely reckoned as Christ's birthday, then the feast may have arisen subsequently to 354, but if it refers, as quite possibly it may, to a festival, then Christmas must have been kept as a feast not only in 354, but, as is clear from a comparison with the Chronographer's *Depositio Episcoporum*, as far back as 336. However this may be, the feast certainly existed in Rome before 360, and from thence it spread throughout the Church; Justin I

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* VIII, 8, 1, 3; *Eus. Vit. Cons.* IV, 18; *Soz.* I, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XV, 5, 2; *Cod. Ecl. Afric.* c. 60; *Conc. Carth.* IV. c. 64, 88.

<sup>3</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XV, 5, 5.

(518-27) was, nevertheless, obliged to issue decrees making its observation compulsory throughout the empire. Armenia alone refused to accept it, and there Christ's birth is still commemorated on the Epiphany. December 25 seems to have been chosen on account of the Roman custom of keeping this day as the festival of Sol Invictus—*i.e.* of the re-birth of the sun; it was judged fitting to substitute for the pagan feast a Christian one commemorating the birth of the true Sun of the world and Redeemer of mankind. In preparation for the coming festival it was customary in Gaul from the fifth century to fast three days in each of the previous six weeks (Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays). In the Roman Church the season of Advent was kept even before the time of Gregory I, and consisted of four weeks, or rather of a period comprising four Sundays. The day after Christmas was kept, even at the end of the fourth century, as the feast of St. Stephen the Protomartyr, and the Octave of Christmas (as we learn from the Council of Tours, 567, c. 17) was devoted to commemorating the Circumcision of Christ, this being the lastcomer among the Christmas solemnities.

In the fourth century two new feasts were brought into connection with Easter, Palm Sunday, and Ascension Day, of which the latter had formerly been commemorated with the Descent of the Holy Ghost on Whit-Sunday. In a sense every day in Holy Week (*Hebdomas magna*) and Easter Week was reckoned a holy day, being all of them days of rest on which Divine service took place; Maundy Thursday and Good Friday were, nevertheless, days of special devotion. Mamertus, bishop of Vienne (c. 470), introduced the custom of keeping three Rogation Days in preparation for the Ascension, and this custom was prescribed by the first Council of Orleans (511) for the whole of Gaul (c. 27); at a later date (c. 800) it was also adopted at Rome. A similar feast on St. Mark's Day had, however, been long kept at Rome, as St. Gregory testifies, being a Christian equivalent of the old pagan Robigalia.

IV. In connection with Saints' feasts it is to be noticed that some martyrs now came to be honoured universally who formerly had received a cultus only in the place of their martyrdom. Such was the case with St. Stephen, and the Apostles Peter and Paul; in the Greek Church we now find

also the feast of All the Martyrs (Octave of Pentecost). It also became the custom to celebrate not only the *Dies natalis* of the martyrs, but also the day on which other saints went to their reward; this was early the case in Gaul for St. Martin of Tours. On the other hand, St. John the Baptist, having been sanctified in his mother's womb, had two feasts, that of his martyrdom and that of his birth. Customs, however, differed in different Churches: Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, in 475 ordained that the feasts of ten saints should have vigils.

V. Lastly, we must mention the **Feasts of our Lady**. Of these the most ancient are the Purification and the Annunciation, and the reason of their greater antiquity is, no doubt, that the events they commemorate bear on the history of the Redeemer. In a sense they may be called feasts of Christ Himself: the first of these feasts has by the Greeks always been considered as the remembrance of the meeting of Christ with Simeon, and been called in consequence Ἐπιφανία or Ἐπαπαντία. According to the *Peregrinatio Silviæ* it existed in Jerusalem in the fourth century, and was kept on the *Quadragesima de Epiphania*, i.e. on February 14. The introduction of the feast of Christmas rendered it necessary to transfer the Presentation or Purification to February 2. The feast of the Annunciation is first mentioned in the homilies of Proclus, bishop of Constantinople (c. 440). That of the Assumption (κοίμησις = Dormitio) seems to have been first kept in Palestine at the beginning of the sixth century; it was imposed on the whole Church by an edict of the emperor Mauritius (582-602). If the poet Romanus (§ 77) really lived in Justinian's time, then the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin must have originated at about the same time as the previous feast; at any rate it existed in the seventh century. These feasts were all of them first observed in the East, though, on account of the union between the two portions of the Church, they soon were adopted in the West. The *Life of Sergius* in the *Liber pontificalis* proves that all four of them existed at Rome at the end of the period. They were introduced into the other Churches as the use of the Roman rite began to spread. Some Western countries already kept certain feasts of the Blessed Virgin, though on days different from those usual elsewhere: in Gaul, for instance, the feast of the Assumption began to be observed

in the sixth century (January 18), and in Spain the Council of Toledo (656, c. 1) decreed that special solemnities should accompany the feast of the Annunciation (December 18).

VI. The Council of Arles in 314 (c. 1) had issued a decree to the effect that **Easter**<sup>1</sup> should be kept everywhere on the same day, and that the bishop of Rome, according to custom, should fix the date for the other Churches. This decree was not acted on, and, as the question was one which interested the Eastern as well as the Western Church, the matter was again dealt with at the Nicene Council, this time with better results. The Orientals, so runs the new decree (*i.e.* the Christians of Cilicia, Syria, and Mesopotamia), who formerly 'observed the Passover with the Jews,' shall now keep it with the Romans and other Christians; after some hesitation this decree was adopted everywhere, and subsequent to the Council of Antioch, in 341, which pronounced censures on all who should refuse to accept it (c. 1), we hear no more of any opposition in the East. The Nicene Council had also resolved that the Church of Alexandria should each year reckon the date of Easter, and that the bishop of Rome should make known this date to the whole Church. This enactment was slow in securing obedience. True, agreements were frequently made respecting the date of the feast, and at Sardica it was even settled beforehand for the period of fifty years, but it was only in the sixth century that unity was secured, Rome consenting to relinquish her calculation (the eighty-four-year cycle, the spring equinox reckoned for March 18, and Easter falling, according to the lunar calendar, between *Luna* xvi-xxii) and following the advice of Dionysius Exiguus (525) by adopting the Alexandrian calculation (cycle 19, March 21, *Luna* xv-xxi); the example of Rome was soon followed by the remaining Latin Churches.

The Irish and Scots adopted the new reckoning in the seventh century, after having so far agreed with the Britons in keeping the eighty-four-year cycle, with March 25 as equinox, and *Luna* xiv-xx as the Paschal limits. Gaul followed suit in the eighth century; here the 532-year Paschal calculation of Victorius

<sup>1</sup> HEFELE, *CG.* I, 325 ff.; J. SCHMID, *Die Osterfestberechnung auf den britischen Inseln*, 1904; *Die Osterfestfrage auf dem Konzil von Nicäa*, 1905; E. SCHWARTZ, *Christl. u. jüdische Ostertafeln*, in *Abh. Göttingen N. F.* VIII (1904-05), 6.

of Aquitania had been in use since the fifth century and had received the approval of the Council of Orleans (541, c. 1). This calculation was built on the cycle of nineteen years, but agreed with the Roman usage in taking March 18 as the equinox, and *Luna xvi* as the earliest day on which Easter could fall. A like change was made in that part of Spain which had not yet acquiesced in the Roman reckoning. The same custom was imposed on the Britons at the conquest of Wales by the Saxons in the beginning of the ninth century. A usage peculiar to some parts of Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries, was the commemorating of Christ's death on March 25, and of His resurrection on March 27. (GREG. TUR. *H. F.* XI, 31; *Martyrolog. Hieron.*; MARTIN. BRACAR. *De Pascha*, 1.) A similar dependence on the solar year prevailed in certain sects; thus the Montanists identified the 14 Nisan with April 6 and invariably kept Easter on the following Sunday, whilst others kept it on the Sunday following March 25. (SOZ. VII, 18; EPIPH. *H.* 50, c. 1.)

VII. From the very beginning of the period the fast previous to Easter was known as *Quadrages* (τεσσαρακοστή), as we see from the Council of Nicæa (c. 5). The Lenten period comprised in the West six weeks, and in the East seven weeks, *i.e.* the six weeks preceding Palm Sunday; in some Churches (Antioch and Constantinople) Holy Week was not held as part of Lent, but everywhere the number of fast-days was thirty-six. The divergence just mentioned made no difference in the number, seeing that, in the East, Saturdays, with the exception of Holy Saturday, were never kept as fast-days.

As Lent grew lengthier, the Station-Fasts fell into disuse. On the other hand, in the Roman Church, during the pontificate of Leo the Great, a three-day fast was prescribed for the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of Whit week and of two other weeks, one in the seventh and the other in the tenth month (September and December). Cp. *Rev. Bénéd.* 1897, pp. 337-46.

## § 70

### Saint and Image Worship; Pilgrimages<sup>1</sup>

I. The love and reverence which the Christians of the previous period had lavished on those of the brethren who

<sup>1</sup> LEHNER, *Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrh.* 2nd ed. 1886; LIELL, *Darstellungen der allersel. Jungfrau M. in den Katakomben*, 1887; E. v. DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder*, 1899; E. LUCIUS, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in d. chr. K.* 1904; H. DELEHAYE, *Legends of the Saints* (Engl. Trans.), 1905; J. E. WEIS-LIEBERSDORF, *Christus- und Apostelbilder*, 1902; H. GÜNTER, *Legenden-Studien*, 1906.

had testified to their faith with their blood, continued now to be shown to their earthly remains. It became the custom to visit their tombs and to erect churches and chapels in their honour (*memoriae, μαρτύρια*); the feast-day of some of the martyrs was even observed far from the scene of their martyrdom. Such practices, deeply ingrafted in human nature as they are, when restrained within due limits are permissible and praiseworthy. The Christians were, moreover, fully conscious of the difference between adoration given to God and worship bestowed on saints, nor did the Fathers fail to appeal to the distinction when rebutting the insinuations of the adversaries of the practice.<sup>1</sup>

With the passing of the persecutions, besides the olden martyrs new saints came to be venerated—men who had not, indeed, attained the martyr's crown, but who had been distinguished for their virtue and piety—more especially hermits, monks, and bishops. But the greatest veneration was bestowed on her who, in her lifetime, had stood closest to Christ, namely, on **Mary**, the Mother of God. It is true that both her virginity after our Saviour's birth, and her right to be styled the Mother of God, were called into question—the former by the Antidicomarianites, an Arabian sect, by the monks Helvidius and Jovinian at Rome, by the Spanish presbyter Vigilantius, and by Bonosus, bishop of Sardica; and the latter by the Nestorians. But these attacks were successfully warded off by Epiphanius, Jerome, and other Fathers,<sup>2</sup> with the result that the views of these sectarians never prevailed in the Church. In Arabia women went so far as to offer, pagan-wise, cakes to the Blessed Virgin; their practice was, however, condemned by Epiphanius, who nicknamed them Collyridians.<sup>3</sup>

II. Owing to the stern disapproval of images inculcated by the Old Testament, and so long as the Christians were surrounded by pagans, religious pictures could not fail to encounter enemies

<sup>1</sup> EPIPH. *H.* 79, 7, 9; AUG. *Contra Faust.* XX, 21; *De Civ. Dei*, X, 1; CYRIL. ALEX. *Contra Iulian.* VI, p. 203; THEODOR. *Graec. aff. cur.* II, VIII, ed. SCHULZE, IV, 754, 921; ISID. *De eccles. off.* I, 35.

<sup>2</sup> EPIPH. *H.* 78; HIERON. *De perpet. virgin.* B. M. *adv. Helvidium*; *Adv. Iovinianum*; *contra Vigilantium.* Against Bonosus see AMBR. *De instit. virg.* 5; SIRIC. *Ep. ad. Anys.*; W. HALLER, *Jovinianus*, 1897 (*T. u. U. N. F.* II, 2).

<sup>3</sup> *H.* 79.

among the Christians. Among the canons of the Council of Elvira we read (c. 36): *Placuit picturas in ecclesia non esse debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur.*<sup>1</sup> Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>3</sup> and, as late as c. 600, Serenus of Marseilles<sup>4</sup> denounced the use of pictures. But with the fall of paganism the main objection against the practice fell to the ground, and the use of paintings gradually became general. In some localities—for instance, at Rome in the catacombs—the innovation had been introduced earlier. Pictures were early appreciated as a means of beautifying churches, and of instructing and edifying the Faithful. We even hear of such pictures being made the object of adoration (for which we must probably read ‘worship’),<sup>5</sup>—an abuse which was reprobated by some, such as Gregory the Great, who were far from unfriendly to the legitimate use of pictorial representations. When, however, it was made clear that the object of such worship was not so much the pictures themselves as the saint depicted, the practice was allowed to spread, and soon loomed very large, especially in the East. Pictures were kissed, candles were lighted in front of them, and incense offered, &c. This rapid development may be partly accounted for by the miraculous origin ascribed to certain pictures which made their first appearance in the sixth century: that of Camuliana in Cappadocia, that of Abgar, and the other so-called *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι* of our Saviour, of His Mother, and of some other saints.

III. The places which had been sanctified by the earthly conversation of Christ were the object of even more frequent pilgrimages than the tombs of the martyrs. We still possess a couple of descriptions of pilgrimages undertaken in the fourth century, the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (A.D. 333), and the *Peregrinatio Silviæ* (§ 76, 9). So exaggerated was the account made of this pilgrimage that several of the Fathers were compelled to write against it. Jerome, for instance, remarks (*Ep.* 58 *ad Paulin.* c. 2): *Non Ierosolymis fuisse, sed Ierosolymis bene vixisse laudandum est.*

<sup>1</sup> Cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 346–52.

<sup>2</sup> PITRA, *Spicil. Solesm.* I, 383–86.

<sup>3</sup> *Inter Hieron. Ep.* 51, c. 9.

<sup>4</sup> GREG. M. *Ep.* IX, 105; XI, 13.

<sup>5</sup> AUG. *De morib. eccl. cath.* I, c. 34, No. 75; GREG. M. *Ep.* XI, 13, cp. IX, 52.

## § 71

Sacred Buildings, Vessels, and Vestments <sup>1</sup>

The churches which had been constructed in the course of the third century having been destroyed during the Diocletian persecution, more commodious and finer buildings now made their appearance everywhere. According to their shape they belong to two classes: that of the Basilica and that of the Rotunda.

I. The ground plan of the **Basilica** is an elongated rectangle. Not unfrequently a transept was added, giving the whole the shape of a T or cross. At the end occupied by the altar, the building usually terminated in a semicircular Apse (*ἀψίς*, *concha*, *tribuna*). At the opposite end of the Church, *i.e.* at the entrance, there was a vestibule (*νάρθξξ*), and in front of this a court or Atrium, which was usually surrounded by a colonnade, but was left uncovered. The *Didascalia* and the *Constitutions of the Apostles* (II, 57) mention that the altar is at the east end of the church; we must therefore infer that the orientation of churches was usual from the beginning. In Rome, however, until the commencement of the fifth century, the churches were sometimes built to face the opposite direction, whilst there are numerous instances in which they deviated from the line due east and west. The church was divided longitudinally, by two or four rows of columns, into two or four aisles and a central nave (or ship). The nave, which was the highest, was covered with a pent roof, whereas the aisles were provided with lean-to roofs. The windows were placed in the space immediately below the roof of the great nave, which afterwards was known as the clerestory. Where the church contained a double aisle on both sides it was necessary to make windows in the outer walls also. Within, there was usually a ceiling, though sometimes there was none, the beams of the roof being left visible. The

<sup>1</sup> W. LÜBKE, *Vorschule z. St. d. k. Kunst*, 6th ed. 1873 (Engl. Trans. *Introd. to a Hist. of Church Architecture*, 1855); H. HOLTZINGER, *Die altchr. Architektur*, 2nd ed. 1899; KIRSCH, *Die christl. Kultusgebäude im Altertum*, 1893; KRAUS, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst*. I-II, 1895-1900; F. WITTING, *Die Anfänge christl. Architektur*, 1902; K. M. KAUFMANN, *Hdb. d. christl. Archäologie*, 1905.

apse was vaulted; the inner walls of the building, where cost was no object, were coated with a veneer of marble, whilst the apse and the walls of the great nave were adorned with pictures, usually in mosaic.

II. The **Rotunda**, or circular form, was used chiefly for baptisteries and mortuary chapels. In the East this shape soon came, however, to be preferred even for the greater churches, and, though such churches continued to be frequently built in a rectangular shape, means were found to make their upper works resemble a rotunda, and to cover them with a dome, or, rather, with a cluster of cupolas. This system came to be known as the Byzantine style. Amongst its other peculiarities is the shape of the capitals and that of the apse, which is round only on the inside, whilst without it is polygonal in shape. The most remarkable example of this style of architecture is the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, an erection of Justinian I.

III. The inner arrangement of the church was as follows. In the middle of the apse was the bishop's throne (*θρόνος, cathedra*), on either side of which were placed the stalls of the presbyters. The altar stood in the centre of the transept, or at the end of the nave; the whole of this space was called the Presbyterium (also *ιερατεῖον, ἄδουτον, altarium*). Originally it was shut off from the rest of the church only by low railings (*κιγκλίδες, cancelli*, whence 'chancel'). In the course of time, the better to secure privacy, columns came to be erected, between which veils were hung. In the East, later still, the same end was obtained by interposing a light screen, which, on account of the pictures with which it was adorned, was called the Iconostasis. The lower clergy took their place in front of the altar or in that portion of the nave nearest to it. This portion also was inclosed by a balustrade, at the edge of which there was an elevated position occupied by the reader when giving forth the lessons or the psalms. This was called the Ambo (*gradus*), and soon came to be used by the bishop as a pulpit; previous to 400 the latter had been wont to address the congregation either from his throne or from the altar. In many churches there was an ambo for the Epistle and another for the Gospel, one on each side of the lower choir. The laity sat or stood, divided off according to sex and age, in

the room left vacant. Among the Greeks the women were placed in galleries over the side aisles (*ὑπερῶα, γυναικεία*). Lastly, a place at the back of the nave was set aside for the catechumens and the second class of penitents or hearers; the weepers remained without in the atrium.

IV. As a rule the **Baptistry** was built in the neighbourhood of the church, with which it was connected by a covered way. The bath (*piscina, fons, κολυμβήθρα*) was in the middle and was provided with steps leading down to it. For the sake of modesty curtains were spread over the surrounding railings. When infant baptism grew common, the font took the form of a small upstanding vessel such as is used at the present day. In many places the need of a separate edifice for baptism being now no longer felt, the font was transferred to the church; a large number of ancient churches retained, nevertheless, their baptisteries down to the Middle Ages.

V. The **Altar**<sup>1</sup> was originally in the shape of a table. One result, however, of the use of the catacombs for the celebrations of the sacred mysteries was the introduction of a new form in the shape of a sarcophagus or rectangular chest. The material used was at first wood, and later, stone. The upper portion or mensa was covered with a linen cloth, whilst the sides were often encased with precious metal, this being the case especially with the front, of which the decoration went by the name of antependium. Above the altar rose a baldachin, the so-called ciborium (*κιβώριον, umbraculum*), which was supported by pillars; from the ciborium, veils (*tetravela*) were hung to hide the altar, and within the enclosure a vessel in the form of a dove was suspended (*περιστήριον*) in which the Eucharist was reserved. Originally there was only one altar in each church, a system which is still respected by the Greeks; the multiplying of altars was a result of the later Western practice of private masses.

VI. The principal sacred vessels used in the Liturgy were the **chalice** and **paten** (*patina, δίσκος*; a plate),<sup>2</sup> which were to receive the elements to be consecrated, viz. the bread and the wine. They were composed of a variety of substances; we hear of the chalice being made of wood, clay, glass, gold, silver,

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by LAIB and SCHWARZ, 1857; A. SCHMID, 1871.

<sup>2</sup> HEFELE, *Beiträge z. KG.* II, 322-30.

tin, &c. In the Middle Ages the use of metal was, however, made obligatory. Besides the *calix offertorius* or *sacrificatorius* used by the priest, so long as Communion continued to be administered under both kinds, there was another chalice for the laity—the so-called *scyphus* or *calix ministerialis*, sometimes also named the *calix ansatus* on account of the handles with which it was usually provided.

VII. In Christian antiquity there were no specifically ecclesiastical vestments.<sup>1</sup> The ministers of the altar performed the services clad in their ordinary best clothes, or sometimes in the dress usually assumed by public functionaries. This dress consisted in the fifth century of the tunic, a long white undergarment, with or without sleeves, and the penula, a sleeveless garment with a hole in the middle, usually either brown or violet in colour, which was worn above. It, however, became early the rule not to wear outside the churches such garments as had been used for the service.<sup>2</sup> Time brought other alterations; the tunic was transformed into the alb, and the penula into the chasuble (*casula*, *planeta*). Both these vestments are mentioned as distinctive clerical garments by the Fourth Council of Toledo (633, c. 28), when it enacts that a wrongly degraded cleric must again assume before the altar the Orders of which he had been deprived, the priest putting on the orarium and planeta, and the deacon the orarium and alb. The orarium, which is here mentioned as a piece of dress common to both priest and deacon, is what we now know as the stole; it had been already alluded to by the Council of Laodicea, which had forbidden its use by subdeacons (c. 22), lectors, and cantors (c. 23); in other words, had reserved it to the higher clerics. In the *Liber pontificalis*<sup>3</sup> we hear of a *pallium lino-stimum*, which afterwards became the maniple. Among the episcopal insignia mentioned by the Council of Toledo, we find, besides the orarium, the ring and crozier. Besides the latter, the pallium—the lorum of the imperial officials—was

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by HEFELE (*Beiträge*, II, 150–244); BOCK, 3 vol. 1851–71; MARRIOT, 1868; J. BRAUN (*Die priesterl. Gewänder des Abendlandes*, 1897; *Die bischöflichen Gewänder*, 1898); WILPERT, 1898 (*Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrh.*); DUCHESNE, *Origines*, pp. 365–84; *Festschrift z. Jub. d. d. Campo santo in Rom*, 1897, pp. 83–114; *St. a. ML.* 1898, I, 396–413.

<sup>2</sup> *Liber pontif. Stephanus I*; *Can. Apost.* 73.

<sup>3</sup> *Vita Silvestri et Zosimi*.

frequently considered as part of the episcopal dress, especially in the East, where it was called the *ὀμοφόριον*. In the West this article was later on restricted to metropolitans, and was obtained from the Holy See. Lastly, the Pope and his deacons wore, besides the tunic, another sleeved under-garment called the dalmatic. It early became customary to allow bishops and priests of other Churches to wear this garment as a token of honour, and gradually this vestment came to be used generally by bishops and deacons, the latter wearing it as an outer garment. Hence we may say that the liturgical dress was invented almost in its entirety in the second period of the History of the Church. In the succeeding ages further developments followed, affecting principally the bishop's vestments; they took place under Old Testament influences, mediæval liturgists labouring to establish an analogy between the Jewish high-priest and the Christian bishop. It was in the Middle Ages also that different coloured vestments came into use; in earlier times the prevailing colour had been white; the earliest witness to the present use of colours is Innocent III.

## § 72

### Monasticism<sup>1</sup>

Monasticism is a new form of the Christian life which we meet in this period, or, to be more exact, which then began to flourish, for to tell the truth it may be traced much farther back. Certain sayings of Christ and of His Apostles regarding perfection induced many Christians, even in the first centuries, to observe continence and to practise other mortifications, without however quitting their homes. Such people were called *Ascetics* (*ἀσκηταί*, *continentes*), and they were the real forerunners of the monks. Information concerning

<sup>1</sup> ALTESERRA, *Asceticon s. Orig. rei monasticae*, 1674; MONTALEMBERT, *Hist. des moines en Occident*, 7 vol. 1860-77 (Engl. Trans. 1861-79); ALLIES, *The Monastic Life*, 1893; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden u. Kongregationen der kath. K.* 2 vol. 1896-97; ZÖCKLER, *Ascese u. Mönchtum*, 1897; LADEUZE, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pachomien*, 1898; BESSE, *Les moines d'Orient antérieurs au concile de Chalcedoine*, 1900; S. SCHWIETZ, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum*, I, 1904; *Kath. 1905 (Neuere Forsch. z. Gesch. d. alten Mönchtums)*; J. DE DECKER, *Contribution à l'étude des Vies de Paul de Th.* 1905.

them is forthcoming in the pseudo-Clementine epistle *Ad Virgines*.

A higher form of asceticism was practised by those Christians, who, having sought peace in the time of persecution, by escaping into the desert, grew to like their new life so well that they continued it even when the persecutions had come to an end. Of these solitaries or **Anchorites** the most famous were the hermit Paul of Thebes († 341) and St. Anthony († 356). The latter, after having lived in utter solitude for some twenty years, was induced to take some pupils, who, by erecting their cells in the neighbourhood of his, came to form a kind of settlement of anchorites under the saint's direction. Hence St. Anthony has been described as the Father of hermits and the patriarch of monasticism.

Lastly, the same period witnessed the institution of the **cœnobitic life** (*κοινὸς βίος*). St. Pachomius († 346) founded in the hamlet of Tabennisi (Tabenna), in the Thebais near the Nile, a monastery, and by composing for it a rule, he established it on a firmer footing than the community of St. Anthony, which depended wholly on the personality of its founder, and of which the members were all hermits.

The growth of monasticism was truly prodigious. To house the pupils who flocked to him, Pachomius had soon to build new monasteries, and as certain other institutions put themselves under his direction, it was not long before nine houses with several thousand inmates were subject to him. The headquarters of the community was the monastery of Peboou, to which the founder transferred his domicile. The same rule was introduced into the Nitrian Mountains by Ammonius, into the Sketic Desert by Macarius the Elder, also known as the Egyptian, and into Palestine by Hilarion. In Asia Minor it found a strong supporter in Basil the Great († 379), who drew up two new Rules, the Great and the Little. In some localities, however, the hermit life again came into favour, the monks dwelling in cells under the direction of an abbot; such a settlement was called a *Lavra*.

The West soon became acquainted with the new mode of life mainly through St. Athanasius's descriptions (*Vita S. Antonii*), and monasteries sprang up in several places. St. Martin († c. 397) founded many in Gaul, among them being that

of Marmoutier (*Monasterium maius*) near Tours. St. Honoratus, who afterwards became bishop of Arles, established (c. 410) a monastery on the isle of Lerinum, near Nice, from which many bishops came forth. A few years later the monastery of St. Victor near Marseilles was founded by John Cassian.

The then monks were almost all laymen. They occupied their time with manual labour and prayer; in Egypt they were chiefly engaged on the fabrication of chairs, coverlets, mats, and baskets; these they sold, and the proceeds went to support the monastery and help the poor. As a rule the number of clerics in a monastery was only barely sufficient for the carrying out of the services, this of course depending on the size of the community. Pachomius went so far as to exclude clerics altogether from his communities, that his monks might not hanker after honours and dignities. In his houses the services were performed by the neighbouring clergy.

The monastic life was found to appeal strongly to the weaker sex also, who had been prepared by the practice, already prevalent in the third century, of Christian virgins consecrating themselves by vow to lead an ascetic life.<sup>1</sup> Convents for women were not seldom erected near the monasteries for men, partly that the monks might perform the necessary services in the convent, partly because in those troubled times it was well to have male assistance at call. The neighbourhood of the establishments was, however, a constant source of moral danger; the Council of Agde (506, c. 28) and the emperor Justinian were therefore induced to forbid double monasteries, while the Council of Nicæa (787, c. 20) forbade the founding of new houses of this kind, and drew up rules for the regulation of those already in existence.

It was not long before it became a custom for parents to dedicate irrevocably their children to the monastic life, and to hand them over to the monks. Such children were called Oblates (or Donati), whereas the monks who entered the monastery later in life were called Conversi. The practice was condemned by Gregory the Great, who desired that none should be admitted to the religious life before the age of eighteen (*Ep.* I, 51); the Council in Trullo (692, c. 40) simply

<sup>1</sup> *Conc. Illib.* 300, c. 13; *Ancyra.* 314, c. 19; *Z. f. k. Th.* 1889, pp. 302-30.

ruled that the lowest age for admission should be ten years. These orders were, however, never observed everywhere; the Council of Toledo (633, c. 49) has it that '*Monachum aut paterna devotio aut propria professio facit*,' and this expresses the general mind of the West during the whole of the Middle Ages.

In the case of adults it was very necessary to find means to oblige them to remain true to the life they had vowed. The Council of Chalcedon forbade, under pain of excommunication, any monk to return to the world (c. 7) or to contract marriage (c. 16). The Council also strove to regularise the position of the monasteries, and therefore enacted further (c. 4) that each house should be subject to the bishop's inspection, that no new monastery should be erected without his leave, and that no monk should quit his community save with his permission, also that slaves should not be professed without the prior consent of their masters.

St. Benedict of Nursia (490-543)<sup>1</sup> was instrumental in introducing a great reform into the West. After having dwelt a solitary life at Subiaco, whence he directed the neighbouring monastery of Vicovaro, he erected for his many disciples twelve small houses, and finally the great monastery of Monte Cassino near San Germano (529). He also composed a new rule, which, being recommended by both popes and kings, was soon adopted over the whole of the West. A remarkable element of the rule is the vow of stability which it imposed on the monks, requiring each one to remain until his death in the house into which he had first sought admission. This arrangement not only made an end of any lurking designs of returning to the world, it also prevented the constant change of abode and the monkish habit of tramping about the country.

At about the same time Cassiodorus, after having resigned the office which he had held in the Ostrogothic kingdom, made other important reforms in the monastery of Vivarium, which he founded near Squillacium in Lower Italy (538); he obliged his monks to undertake literary work and to act as

<sup>1</sup> MABILLON, *Annales O. S. B.*, 6 fol. (down to 1157) 1703-19; GRÜTZMACHER, *Bedeutung Benedikts v. N. u. s. Regel*, 1892; CLAUSSE, *Les origines bénédictines*, 1899; L'HUILLIER, *Le patriarche Saint Benoît*, 1905.

copyists. The Benedictines followed his example, and their Order became the prime educatory factor of the Middle Ages. Not only did it turn the wilderness into cultivated fields, but by its literary activity it was the means of transmitting to later ages the treasures of antiquity.

The Irish monastic rule of Columban subsequently earned a great name. Columban himself introduced it towards the end of the sixth century into Burgundy, where, during his sojourn of twenty years (590–610), he founded three monasteries, at Anegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaines; and into Italy, where he called into existence the monastery of Bobbio, not far from Piacenza (614). His rule was not, however, destined to endure, and with the end of the seventh century it was gradually exchanged for that of St. Benedict, with which it had been already for some time past combined and to a certain extent confounded.

Monastic life also assumed other forms besides the above. Side by side with the cœnobites and anchorites there existed Sarabaitæ or Remoboth who dwelt in cells, two or three together without a superior, usually in towns and hamlets; Gyrovagi, who travelled from one monastery to another, staying as guests not more than three or four days at each house. There were also several classes of anchorites; for instance, Recluses, who shut or even immured themselves in a cell; Stylites, who lived on the top of pillars, the manner of life being the invention of Simeon the Stylite (near Antioch, † 459, cp. *Rquh.* 1895, 1); Grazers (Βοσκοί), of Syria and the neighbouring lands, so called because they had no dwellings, and subsisted on the herbs of the fields. Among the cœnobites likewise we find the sect of the Acœmeti (Ἀκοίμητοι, 'sleepless'), who, divided into choirs, kept up a ceaseless round of prayer. They were founded by St. Alexander († c. 430), and their best-known house was the Studium at Constantinople, a foundation of the Consular Studius (460). There were also other differences, too numerous to mention, which all arose from the fact that for long there was no uniform rule in use everywhere, nearly every monastery being governed by its own peculiar laws (CASS. *De instit.* II, 2).

Christian monasticism is shown by its history to be a thoroughly Christian growth. It is fanciful to argue that it was derived from the monks of Serapis in Egypt (WEINGARTEN, *Ursprung d. M.* 1877), or from Buddhism (*Z. f. w. Th.* 1878, p. 149), or from Neo-Platonism (KEIM, *Aus dem Urchristentum*, I, 215 ff.). Cp. E. PREUSCHEN, *Mönchtum u. Serapiskult*, 2nd ed. 1903; D. VÖLTER, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, 1900.

## § 73

**Christian Influence in the Social and Moral Life<sup>1</sup>**

In the previous period the Church's influence had been confined to a limited circle, but, when Christianity had been established on the throne, a wider field was opened. It is true that, owing to the political influences brought to bear on the people, many of the new converts were Christians only in name, but the spirit of charity and self-denial, which in former times had made so great an impression on the pagans, still remained. We hear of many and great works of charity: a portion of the Church's revenues was set aside for the poor; bishops were compelled to provide clothing and food for the indigent; the Council of Tours (567, c. 5) made it obligatory on each town to assist the poor according to its means; finally there arose a multitude of institutions for the help of the sufferers and needy: hospitals, almshouses, orphanages, hostels for foundlings and travellers, &c.; all of them institutions quite unknown in the ancient world, but to the influence of which even Julian bore a grudging testimony when he attempted to introduce them among the pagans. Especially famous was the hospital which was founded by Basil the Great at Cæsarea, which was called after him the Basiliad, and which furnished a model for other similar establishments in Cappadocia and elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

Slavery was not, indeed, abolished.<sup>3</sup> The Church recognised it, on the contrary, as a legal institution, and she herself retained slaves on her properties. But a change soon became apparent. The freeing of slaves was recommended as a work of mercy, a recommendation which was followed by many and which was

<sup>1</sup> L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Sittengesch. Roms.* 3 vol. 1862; 6th ed. 1888-90; 7th ed. 2 vol. 1901. LECKY, *Hist. of European Morals*, 2 vol. 1869; BRIN et LAVEILLE, *La civilisation chrétienne*, 2 vol. 1895; H. KURTH, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne*, 2 vol. 4th ed. 1902; L. LALLEMAND, *Hist. de la charité*, 2 vol. 1900; G. GRUPP, *Kulturgesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit*, 2 vol. 1903-04.

<sup>2</sup> RATZINGER, *Gesch. der kirchlichen Armenpflege*, 2nd ed. 1884; UHLHORN, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit in der alten K.* 2nd ed. 1882 (Engl. Trans. *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church.* 1883).

<sup>3</sup> MÖHLER, *Ges. Schr.* II, 54-140; HEFELE, *Beitr. z. KG.* I, 212-26; OVERBECK, *Studien z. Gesch. d. alten K.* 1875, I, 158-230; ALLARD, *Les esclaves chrétiens*, 3rd ed. 1900; Th. ZAHN, *Skl. u. Christent.* 1879; WALLON, *Hist. de l'escl. dans l'antiquité*, 3 vol. 1879.

facilitated by new civil laws. Constantine enacted that the reception of a slave into the Church should be the equivalent of a formal manumission ; clerics were also to be allowed to set free their slaves without any formalities. The Church also strove to soften the relations between master and slave by the Christian idea of the equality of all men, and thus to turn a merely legal bond into something moral. In purely ecclesiastical matters no class distinctions were allowed ; slaves had at their disposal the same means of grace as their masters, and a born slave was, to begin with, equally eligible for ecclesiastical preferment ; again, in the case of a fall, the same penance was imposed on the master as on the slave. State legislation, which had been growing gradually milder from the very beginning of the empire, and, especially under the humanitarian emperors of the second century, had much improved the condition of the slaves, now, under Christian influences, proceeded still further. Especially praiseworthy were the efforts of Constantine, who decreed that the wilful slaying of a slave should be considered as equivalent to murder ; and of Justinian, who abolished all legal formalities for setting free a bondsman, did away with the intermediate class of freedmen, gave to the emancipated slave all the rights of a citizen, and allowed a slave to marry a free woman with the consent of his master.

Another direction<sup>1</sup> in which Christian influences were felt was in the abolition of several cruel proceedings which had been tolerated in the administration of justice. The custom of branding the forehead was formally abrogated ; crucifixion, even if it was not abolished by Constantine himself,<sup>2</sup> fell into disuse in the fourth century ; the same emperor was also instrumental in securing to prisoners a kinder treatment than heretofore. A later law (409) commissioned the bishops to visit regularly the prisons, inspect the prisoners, and prevent any cases of unjust detention. The Council of Orleans (549, c. 20) gave directions for the material support of the prisoners. The bishops were thus fully empowered to remedy any undue harshness in the laws, and their influence was still

<sup>1</sup> RIFFEL, *Verh. zw. Kirche u. Staat*, 1836, pp. 91 ff. ; K. KRAUSS, *Im Kerker vor u. nach Christus*, 1805.

<sup>2</sup> ZESTERMANN, *Die Kreuzigung bei den Allen*, 1868, pp. 17 ff.

further increased by the right of sanctuary granted to ecclesiastical edifices.

Even more salutary were the innovations made with respect to the value of human life. Suicide had, it is true, been denounced by many of the olden philosophers, but others, such as the Stoics, looked on it as not only permissible but as a real duty under certain circumstances, and the general feeling was decidedly in favour of this doctrine. The practice was, however, effectually vetoed by Christianity: St. Augustine, in his *City of God* (I, 22-27), proved its utter sinfulness; the Council of Braga (563, c. 16) excluded suicides from the commemoration of the Mass and refused them Christian burial. Even more determined, if possible, was the Church's opposition to abortion and to the exposal or killing of infants. In this matter her efforts reach back to the very beginning of Christianity, the *Didache* (II, 2) and the *Epistle of Barnabas* (XIX, 5) already condemning such practices. The civil law now came to the Church's help in making provisions for the protection of children. The right of life and death which the father had possessed, according to ancient Roman law, over his child had practically fallen into desuetude before the commencement of the period; it was, however, formally abolished only by Constantine, who decreed the punishment of a parricide against the father who should dare to stretch his right so far as to slay his child.<sup>1</sup> The same emperor also endeavoured to prevent the exposal of children, first by granting their foster-parents parental rights, and then expressly forbidding such exposals by law.<sup>2</sup> Needless to say, the law did not succeed in putting an end to the evil, but so far as was possible the practice stood condemned. The gladiatorial games were also an object of the Church's animadversions, and, as the matter was a public one, legislation in this case sufficed to bring about their cessation. These games, which had been denounced from the beginning by the best of the Christians, were, though not exactly forbidden by Constantine, at least blamed and greatly hindered by his prohibiting the use of criminals in the arena.<sup>3</sup> After the monk Telemachus had paid with his life at Rome for his

<sup>1</sup> *Cod. Theod.* IX, 15, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* VIII, 51, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* XV, 12, 1; *Eus. Vit. Cons.* IV, 25; *Socr.* I, 18; *Soz.* I, 8.

zeal against the sanguinary display (404), the combats were suppressed entirely by Honorius.<sup>1</sup>

With regard, finally, to the moral life. It must not be supposed that the olden world was utterly devoid of any sense of decency; nevertheless, at the time when Christianity first appeared, the pagans whose lives were pure were decidedly in a minority. Generally speaking, laxity prevailed both in theory and in practice. Unnatural intercourse of men with boys was a widespread vice, especially in the Grecian world; adultery alone was judged severely, and even this not always. So long as the pagan mythology was predominant nothing else could be expected. The gods themselves were accredited with sins against nature; many temples were mere houses of infamy; some of the festivals were open orgies; nor can we exaggerate the demoralising influence of the shows. Christianity at its coming brought with it a conviction of the need of a higher moral conscience. The Church was not content with attacking adultery: she condemned all illicit unions. With respect to the grosser forms of vice, they were proceeded against by the first Christian emperors.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> THEOD. V, 26; cp. PRUD. CLEM. *Contra Symmach.* I, 1124 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Cod. Theod.* IX, 24, 1-3; XV, 7, 4, 10.

## CHAPTER V

### ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE <sup>1</sup>

#### § 74

#### General Character of the Literature of the Period

WITH the conquest of the Roman Empire by Christianity in the fourth century Patristic literature reached its prime. The great theological controversies sharpened men's wits, and many who flung themselves into the contest were not only highly gifted by nature, but had also received by way of education the very best that the time could afford. As their efforts were mainly devoted to protecting Christian belief against attempts to modify it, the literature of the period is principally of a dogmatic or polemical character, though the other branches of theology were far from being entirely unrepresented. This great forward movement in the theological world held on till the Council of Chalcedon, beginning to fail only with the middle of the fifth century; a few productions of importance belong, nevertheless, to a somewhat later date.

The headquarters of literary life in the East were Alexandria and Antioch, from which the two most important theological schools of the time took their names. These two schools differed chiefly on the point of exegesis, the Alexandrians having an especial fondness for that allegorical interpretation of which Origen had been in former times the most determined and also the most scholarly exponent, whilst the Antiochenes preferred to seek the grammatical and historical sense of the Scriptures. The latter school, which had

<sup>1</sup> For bibliography, see §§ 36-40. KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Literatur*, 527-1453, 2nd ed. 1897; R. DUVAL, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes*, II, *La litt. syriaque*, 2nd ed. 1900.

been founded by Lucian and Dorotheus at the end of the previous period, now reached its full development, the false interpretations of the Arians making the more thorough exploration of the Scriptures a matter of necessity. At Antioch Holy Writ was studied scientifically, whereas the efforts of the Alexandrians, in spite of all their talents and perspicacity, were prevented by their one-sided tendency from bearing any fruit.<sup>1</sup> Another point on which the two schools were divided concerned the Christological question. The Antiochenes, who held a more matter-of-fact view of Christianity, carefully strove to keep apart in Christ the human and the Divine, some, indeed, going so far as to endanger our Saviour's oneness; on the other hand, the Alexandrians laid stress especially on the union in Christ of the Divine and human nature—a tendency which ultimately issued in Monophysitism.

Literary progress was not, however, confined to these two schools: the whole Church was more or less involved in it, and great doctors arose throughout Christendom, even Syria and Armenia contributing their quota to Christian literature.

## § 75

### Eastern Writings of the Fourth and Fifth Century

I. The series of the Greek writers of the period is opened by the father of Church History, **Eusebius Pamphili** (\*), bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine († c. 340),<sup>2</sup> who earned a name not only in the field of history, but also in that of apologetics. He published refutations of the antichristian libels of Porphyrius and Hierocles; in his *Praeparatio evangelica* he proved the error of heathenism, and in his *Demonstratio evangelica* the superiority of Christianity. In theology he—like his friend and protector Pamphilus, who was a devoted supporter of Origen—was not altogether devoid of subordinatist leanings. Though, after much hesitation, he did finally accept the Nicene Creed, his opinions made him a confederate

<sup>1</sup> Mg. on the Antiochene School, by KIHN, 1866; Ph. HERGENRÖTHER, 1866.

<sup>2</sup> Opp. ed. DINDORF, 4 vol. 1867-71, P.G. 19-24.

and friend of Arius and an opponent of the Nicene Fathers, especially of Marcellus of Ancyra, whom he assailed in two works (*Contra Marcellum*; *De eccles. theologia*).<sup>1</sup>

Whereas Eusebius was a secret foe of the Nicene Faith, his younger contemporary, **Athanasius** († 373),<sup>2</sup> was the greatest of its supporters. His life's task was to battle against the Arian heresy. As a mere deacon he had attacked it at the Council of Nicæa, and having been elected to the See of Alexandria (328) he continued the struggle with still greater energy, conscious of his greater responsibility. No suffering or oppression, not even his being five times banished, could withdraw him from the controversy. His writings, too, were mostly devoted to the same object. Among his chief works must be mentioned his *Orationes IV contra Arianos*, the fourth oration being, however, of doubtful authenticity; of his other works we have already spoken in dealing with the history of Arianism.

The life of the three great Cappadocians was also spent in the struggle with Arianism and Pneumatism, though their literary work is not so wholly circumscribed by the heresies. **Basil the Great**, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (370-79),<sup>3</sup> also earned a name as a writer on exegesis and asceticism. Passing mention must be made of his works *Adv. Eunomium* and *De Spiritu S.*, of his homilies on the Hexaemeron, his Monastic Rule, and of his many epistles. **Gregory of Nazianzus** († c. 390),<sup>4</sup> a friend of Basil's, by whom he had been consecrated bishop of Sasima, was famed as an orator and poet. Of his orations the most important are the five which, during the short period of his administration of the Church of Constantinople (379-81), he wrote in defence of the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. It is to them that he owes his name of the Theologian. Two of his epistles, addressed to Cledonius, are of great dogmatic interest.

<sup>1</sup> For their authenticity, see *Th. St.* VI (1905), 512-21; *Z. f. neutest. W.* 1906, pp. 39-76.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. MONTFAUCON, 3 fol. 1698; JUSTINIANI, 4 fol. 1777; *P.G.* XXV-XXVIII. Mg. by MÖHLER, 2nd ed. 1844; F. LAUCHERT (*Lehre des hl. A.*), 1895; K. HOSS (*Schrijftum u. Theologie*), 1899; STÜLCKEN, 1899 (*T. u. U. N. F.* IV, 4).

<sup>3</sup> Ed. GARNIER, 3 fol. 1721-30; *P.G.* XXIX-XXXII. Mg. by KLOSE, 1835.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. CLEMENCET and CAILLOU, 2 fol. 1778-1842; *P.G.* XXXV-XXXVIII. Mg. by ULLMANN, 1825; 2nd ed. 1867; A. BENOÎT, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1884.

Lastly, St. Basil's brother, **Gregory of Nyssa** († c. 395),<sup>1</sup> left behind him, not only many homilies, epistles, and writings both exegetical and ascetical, but also two larger works against Eunomius and Apollinaris, an *Oratio catechetica magna* forming an excellent treatise on dogma, besides an interesting dialogue with his sister Macrina dealing with the soul and the Resurrection. His preference was for speculative thought. To Origen he was especially devoted, and borrowed from him at least the idea of the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων.

The renown of another great doctor of the Church, **John Chrysostom** of Antioch,<sup>2</sup> was founded on his power as an orator. By far the larger portion of his many writings consists of homilies, some of which are explanatory of Scripture, while others deal with matters moral, dogmatic, or polemical, and yet others are discourses pronounced on memorable occasions (such as his oration on statues) or sermons preached on special feasts. After having been for twelve years a priest at Antioch, he was promoted to the see of Constantinople (398). On account of his interference in the matter of Theophilus of Alexandria, and of his subsequent quarrel with the empress Eudoxia (§ 51), he was banished to Cumana in Pontus, where he died in 407.

Other scarcely less well-known Fathers of the fourth century are **Cyril of Jerusalem** († 386), of whose works we have the *catecheses* preached by him when he was yet a simple priest at Jerusalem. They range over all the objects of the Christian Faith, dealing also with Baptism and the Eucharist.<sup>3</sup> Of **Didymus the Blind** († 395),<sup>4</sup> who, though he lost his sight at the age of four, became master at the catechetical school of Alexandria, and one of the most learned men of his time, we have a *De Trinitate* (incomplete) and (in St. Jerome's translation) a *De Spiritu Sancto*, also certain other works, it being probable that Books IV-V of Basil's work against

<sup>1</sup> Ed. FRONTO DUCAEUS, 1618; P.G. XLIV-XLVI. Mg. by RUPP, 1834; DIEKAMP, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. MONIFAUCON, 13 fol. 1718-38; P.G. XLVII-LXIV. Mg. by NEANDER, 2 vol. 3rd ed. 1848 (Engl. Trans. 1836); PUECH, 1891, 1900; MARCHAL, 1898; NÄGLE, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. REISCHL et RUPP, 2 vol. 1848-60; P.G. XXXIII. Mg. by MADER, 1892.

<sup>4</sup> Mg. by J. LEIPOLDT, 1905; cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* 11, 291-329; III, No. 16.

Eunomius is an abstract from Didymus's *De Dogmatibus* or *De Sectis*. As Didymus adopted from Origen the ideas of the pre-existence of the soul and of the Apocatastasis, he too was later on anathematised (553). To **Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus († 403), we owe the *Panarium*, the fullest of the older refutations of the heresies; though the work may be wanting in critical acumen, the abundance of its details gives it a great worth. Another of the same writer's works is the *Ancoratus*, an exposition of the Trinitarian doctrine.<sup>1</sup>

Other writers were Macarius of Magnesia, who published his *Apocritica*<sup>2</sup> against a heathen opponent, who was probably Porphyrius; Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus († c. 394), who had formerly been a monk and presbyter at Antioch, and his disciple Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia († 428), who were the first to make a name for the exegetical school of Antioch.<sup>3</sup> As these writers were held responsible for the Nestorian heresy, they subsequently fell into such disrepute that practically all their works have perished. Of Theodore there only remains his commentaries on the lesser prophets, on the fourth Gospel (preserved in a Syriac translation, published by Chabot, 1897), and on the Pauline Epistles (in a Latin translation).

About the year 400 there was published in Syria the so-called **Apostolic Constitutions**, a recension of yet earlier writings.<sup>4</sup> In effect the first six books are based on the *Didascalia* of the Apostles, and the seventh on the *Didache*. The eighth book consists principally of the Liturgy and Canons of the Apostles. The whole forms a breviary of Church discipline, of which the redactor, or rather the publisher, is said to have been Clement of Rome. Its real compiler is, however, probably identical with the author of the lengthier recension of the Ignatian epistles—who certainly lived at the same time and in the same country—and whose work shows many points of resemblance with the *Apostolic Constitutions* (§ 37). If this be so, then pseudo-Clement belonged to the party of the Apollinarists, the influence of that sect's

<sup>1</sup> Opp. ed. DINDORF, 1859-62; *Panar.* ed. OEHLER, 1859-61; P.G. XLI-XLIII.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. BLONDEL, 1876. Mg. by DUCHESNE, 1877.

<sup>3</sup> KIHN, *Theodor v. M. und Junilius Afr. als Exegeten*, 1880; cp. FUNK, *A. u. U.* III, No. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Mg. and ed. by FUNK, 1891-1905; cp. above p. 113, note 2.

theology being unmistakable in the pseudo-Ignatian works. Because the work was thought to have been interpolated by heretics, the Council in Trullo (692, c. 2) decreed that it should not be used in the Church. It continued, nevertheless, in high esteem; the Trullan Council itself admitted that parts of the work were truly apostolical, and gave its formal sanction to the Apostolic Canons which form the conclusion of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

A modification of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, of which we still have an abstract, forms the basis of the Egyptian Canons, extant in Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, and, partially, in Latin. The new recension in its turn gave rise to the recently discovered Syriac *Testamentum Domini nostri* (ed. RAHMANI, 1899) and to the *Canones Hippolyti*, of which only the Arabic translation has been published, but which also exists in Ethiopic. H. Achelis (*Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, 1891, T. u. U. VI, 4) came to the conclusion that the last-mentioned work, at least in the form in which he had re-established the text, was really genuine, in consequence of which he proposed to reverse the order in which these works are believed to have been produced, taking as the earliest the Canons of Hippolytus, then the Egyptian Canons, then the parallel text to the eighth book of the *Apost. Constit.*, and finally the eighth book itself. Though other critics have followed him, there is little doubt but that Achelis was mistaken. Cp. FUNK, *Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften*, 1901; A. u. U. III, No. 18-19; G. HORNER, *Statutes of the Apostles*, 1904; *Th. Qu.* 1906, pp. 1-27.

Another similar work, the *Canones ecclesiastici apostolorum* (ed. FUNK, in *Doctrina xii Apostolorum*, 1887, pp. 50-73), in its present form probably belongs at the earliest to the fourth century, though it may well be based on older works, the commencement, e.g., being an adaptation of the *Didache*, 1-4, 8. Cp. FUNK, A. u. U. II, 236-51.

**Amphilochius** of Iconium († 394-403), who takes rank with the three great Cappadocians, was, so far as we know, the first to make use of the expression *τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως* with reference to the Trinity; until recently this author had received scarcely any attention, owing to the doubts which existed as to the authenticity of the homilies preserved under his name. Mg. by K. HOLL, 1904; G. FICKER, *Amphilochiana*, I, 1906.

**Apollinaris** the Younger, of Laodicea, was another noteworthy contemporary of the Cappadocians, who in his earlier days not only earned a name as an apologist and opponent of Arianism, but also composed many exegetical works, besides recasting the Bible in classical form, that the Christian youth might not suffer from Julian's enactment which closed to them the classical schools. At a later date, however, his teaching on the human nature of Christ

brought him into conflict with the Church—a fact which accounts for the almost total disappearance of his works. A few of the writings belonging to the second period of his life have, nevertheless, been preserved, owing to his disciples having fathered them on more orthodox ancient writers. Among these works we may mention the *Katà μέγος πίστις*, ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. H. LIETZMANN, *Apollinaris v. L. u. s. Schule*, 1904.

**Evagrius Ponticus** first served the Church of Constantinople under Nectarius, and then became a monk in Egypt († c. 399). Long after his death (553) he was condemned as an Origenist, though so long as he lived he had been highly esteemed as an ascetic and writer. Very few of his works remain. P. G. XL; mg. by ZÖCKLER, 1893.

The best-known fifth-century writers are two bishops representing two antagonistic schools. One of these was **Cyril of Alexandria** († 444),<sup>1</sup> the great opponent of Nestorius, whose teachings he confuted in numerous writings. He also entered the lists as an apologist with his work against Julian the Apostate, and was known as an exegetist and defender of the Trinitarian doctrine. The other was **Theodoret of Cyrus** († c. 458),<sup>2</sup> equally renowned as an historian, apologist, polemic and exegetist. His *Compendium fabularum haereticarum* is the last of the ancient histories of the heresies; the fifth book comprises a short treatise on dogma. His commentaries on the Bible, in point of method, depth, and precision, are greatly superior to those of his contemporaries.

**Synesius of Cyrene** († c. 414) was one of the queerest characters of the later Christian antiquity. By birth he was a pagan, and for a time belonged to the school of the ill-fated Hypatia. Later on he became a Christian and was made bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis, without, however, abandoning entirely the Neo-Platonic philosophy which he had professed all along. The story of his life emerges clearly enough from his discourses, hymns, and epistles. P. G. LXVIII; mg. by A. J. KLEFFNER, 1901; *Hist. J.* 1902, pp. 751-74; C. VELLAY, *Études sur les hymnes de S.* 1904.

**Palladius**, a pupil of Evagrius Ponticus, and bishop in Asia Minor, composed (c. 420) a series of popular lives of monks, which, from their having been originally addressed to Lausus, came to be known as the *Historia Lausiaca*. The writer is probably identical with the biographer of St. John Chrysostom. P. G. LXV; mg. by PREUSCHEN, 1897, ed. by BUTLER, 1904 (*Texts and Studies*, VI).

<sup>1</sup> Ed. AUBERT, 7 fol. 1638; P. G. LXVIII-LXXXVII. Mg. by KOPALLIK, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. SCHULZE, 5 vol. 1769-74; P. G. LXXX-LXXXIV; *Graeca affectionum cur*, ed. J. RAFFER, 1904; J. SCHULTE, *Th. als Apologet*, 1904.

**Isidore Pelusiota**, a monk living on a mountain near Pelusium († c. 440), was the writer of a huge number of epistles, mostly dealing with questions of exegesis, and of which more than 2,000 have been preserved. *P.G.* LXXVIII.

**Nilus** the Elder, a pupil of Chrysostom's, for some time prefect of the city of Constantinople, and lastly hermit on Sinai († c. 440), was a prolific writer on matters ascetical. *P.G.* LXXIX.

II. The oldest Syrian Christian writer was **Aphraat**, bishop of Mar Mattai (near Mosul), and otherwise known as Mar Jacob or James, and as the wise man of Persia. Until quite recently this writer was persistently confused with an elder contemporary of his, James, bishop of Nisibis, who died in 338. Cp. BERT (a translation of Aphraat's homilies), 1888; GRAFFIN, *Patrologia syriaca*, I, 1894. The most renowned teacher of the Syrian Church was, however, **Ephraem**, a disciple of James of Nisibis, and, later, deacon of Edessa. By turn a poet, an exegetist, and an orator, he was known sometimes as the Prophet of the Syrians, sometimes as the Harp of the Holy Ghost († 373 or 378). Opp. ed. ASSEMANI, 6 fol. 1732-46. *Carmina Nisibena*, ed. BICKELL, 1866. *Hymni et serm.* ed. LAMY, 4 tom. 1882-1902. Mg. by EIRAINER, 1889. *L'Université Cath.* 1890. Other Syrian poets and homilists of repute were the presbyter **Isaac** the Great of Antioch († c. 460; ed. G. BICKELL, 2 vol. 1873-76) and **James of Sarug**, bishop of Batnae († 521).

III. The founder of Armenian literature was **St. Mesrop** († 441) who, as soon as he had fixed the Armenian characters, translated the Holy Scriptures into that language and also composed a number of homilies. Two other names of literary importance are those of Eznic (or Esnac), bishop of Bagrevand, and of **Moses of Khoren** († c. 487). It is, however, doubtful whether the famous History of Greater Armenia, said to be the work of the latter, is not really a production of the eighth century. Cp. CARRIÈRE, *Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren*, 1893-94; *Byz. Z.* X, 489-504.

## § 76

### The Latins of the Fourth and Fifth Century<sup>1</sup>

The life of the most famous of the Latin writers of the period, **Hilary of Poitiers** \* († 366),<sup>2</sup> was, like that of the great doctor of Alexandria, taken up with the Arian dispute. He had to undergo four years' exile in the East on account of his

<sup>1</sup> M. SCHANZ, *Gesch. der röm. Literatur*, IV, 1, 1904.

<sup>2</sup> *P.L.* IX-X. Mg. by REINKENS, 1864; BALTZER, 1879-89; A. BECK, 1903; M. SCHIKTANZ (*Die Hilarius-Fragmente*), 1905.

belief, and his long and successful fight with the error procured him the name of the Western Athanasius. Most of his writings are controversial, though he also composed some commentaries and hymns. His *opus magnum* was the work *De Trinitate* in twelve books. He was the first to introduce Grecian speculation into the West.

One who was still more dependent on Grecian influence was **Ambrose**, another great doctor of the West († 397).<sup>1</sup> Having been unexpectedly torn from his civil governorship and acclaimed bishop of Milan (374), he busied himself in acquiring the necessary theological knowledge by studying the Greek Fathers. The result of this course of study is noticeable in several of his many controversial, ascetic, and exegetical works. His was one of the most striking characters of Christian antiquity. Unbending in his defence of the Church's rights against paganism and Arianism, indefatigable in fulfilling the duties of his pastoral office, he was also a staunch defender of ecclesiastical discipline, as Theodosius I found to his cost; the latter having caused a barbarous massacre of the inhabitants of Thessalonica, Ambrose, in the emperor's own words, proved himself the only bishop worth the name, *i.e.* had sufficient courage to protest against a wanton act of cruelty.

The two greatest of the Latin doctors belong to a date only slightly later. Of these the first is **Jerome**,<sup>2</sup> who was born at Stridon on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia, but most of whose life was passed in the East. He successively chose as his residence the Desert of Chalcis, Antioch, and Constantinople; then, after a three-year sojourn in Rome, he spent the remaining thirty-four years of his life at Bethlehem (386-420), where he died. His principal works are his commentaries and his translation of the Bible, the Latin Vulgate. He also wrote a number of controversial works against the Luciferians, against Helvidius, Vigilantius, and others, a *Liber de viris illustribus* (the first Christian literary history), a Latin translation of Eusebius's *Chronicle*, which he also continued down to the year 378, &c. His whole life was given up to study and mortification. He possessed considerable ability as a

<sup>1</sup> P.L. XIV-XVII. Mg. by BAUNARD; A. DE BROGLIE, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. VALLARSI, II fol. 1734-42; ed. II, 1766-72; P.L. XXII-XXX; T. u. U. XIV, I (*De viris illustr.*). Mg. by ZÖCKLER, 1865; von SYCHOWSKI, 1894; BERNOULLI, 1895; GRÜTZMACHER, I-II, 1901-06.

writer and exponent, but in controversy he was far too inclined to be bitter and contentious.

The second is **Augustine** (\*).<sup>1</sup> He was born at Tagaste in Numidia, and after many years of doubt was received into the Church by St. Ambrose of Milan (386); returning to his country, he became a priest, and afterwards bishop of Hippo Regius (396-430). He was as remarkable for his mental power as for his ability as a dialectician. Most of his writings are devoted to refuting the Manichæans—among whom he had spent nine years—the Donatists, Pelagianism, semi-Pelagianism, and other errors of the period. So powerful was his refutation of the error of Pelagius that he is rightly considered to have vanquished it by force of argument (§ 58). Among his non-controversial works two especially deserve some allusion: they are the *De Civitate Dei*, a kind of philosophy of history, and his *Confessions*, a sketch of his life, of his mistakes and many struggles until his conversion.

A Spaniard who gained a name as a Christian poet was **Prudentius Clemens**<sup>2</sup> († after 405). Among his works are the *Cathemerinon*, a collection of hymns for daily use, and the *Peristephanon* or poems in praise of the martyrs, and besides these several other poems of a controversial or apologetic nature.

The best-known secondary writers and works of the period are:

1. The Spaniard **Juvencus** (\*), who composed a *Historia evangelica* in hexameters (c. 330). Cp. *Z. f. w. Th.* 1890.

2. **Firmicus Maternus** (\*), who wrote the apologetical work *De errore profanarum religionum* (c. 347).

3. **Lucifer** of Calaris (\*) († 371), a great opponent of the Arians and especially of the emperor Constantius, to whom all his writings were dedicated. Cp. § 50, III.

4. **Ambrosiaster**, as the author is called, who wrote at Rome during the pontificate of Damasus (366-84) a commentary on St. Paul, which in the Middle Ages was commonly ascribed to St. Ambrose. The author has been identified with several writers of the period, though at the present date it is impossible to decide with certainty who he really was. *P.L.* XVII, 45-508. Cp. *Rev. Bénéd.* 1903, pp. 113-31; *Texts and Studies*, VII, 4;

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Bened. (BLAMPIN et COUSTANT), II fol. 1679-1700; *P.L.* XXXII-XLVI. Mg. by BINDEMANN, 3 vol. 1844-69; WÖRTER, 1892; WOLFSGRUBER, 1898; McCABE, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. OBBARIUS, 1845; DRESSSEL, 1860. Mg. by RÖSLER, 1886. *Th. Qu.* 1894, pp. 77-125.

J. WITTIG, *Der Ambrosiaster 'Hilarius,'* 1906 (*Kircheng. Abh.* ed. SDRALEK, IV).

5. **Optatus of Mileve** (\*) († after 384), who wrote a history of the Donatist schism. Cp. § 52.

6. **Zeno**, bishop of Verona († c. 370), a homilist. *P.L.* XI, ed. GIULIARI, 1900; mg. by A. BIGELMAIR, 1904.

7. **Philastrius**, bishop of Brescia (\*), who wrote the *Diversarum haereseon liber* (383-84).

8. **Priscillian** (\*) († 385), the writer of many recently discovered treatises, of which some are in defence of his tenets. Cp. § 50.

9. The **Peregrinatio Silviae** (\*), a description of a pilgrimage to the Holy Places undertaken at the end of the fourth century (381-88). The work is incomplete, and Gamurrini, who discovered and first published (1887) it, ascribed it to Silvia, the sister of the politician Rufinus; as a matter of fact it is more likely to be the work of the Spanish maiden Etheria. *Rquh.* 1903, II, 387-97. *Kath.* 1905.

10. **Pacian of Barcelona** († c. 391), to whom belongs the saying: 'Christianus mihi nomen, catholicus cognomen' (*Ep. ad Sempron.* c. 4). *P.L.* XIII; A. GRUBER, *Studien zu P.* 1901.

11. **Sulpicius Severus** (\*) († after 406), a Church historian and the biographer of St. Martin of Tours.

12. **Rufinus of Aquileia** († c. 410), the writer of a Church History, of a commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and the translator of several Greek works (for instance, of the *De Principiis* of Origen, and of the *Recognitiones Clementis*). *P.L.* XXI.

13. **Orosius** (\*), a Spanish presbyter († after 417) who opposed the Priscillianists and Pelagius, and produced a sort of general history of Christianity in his *Historiae adv. paganos*.

14. **Niceta**, bishop of Remesiana (Romatiana) in Dacia (Bela Palanka in Servia), who died c. 410, a friend of St. Paulinus and compiler of a course of instruction for the use of catechumens, of which the fifth book, the *Explanatio Symboli*, has been preserved; he was also the author of certain other writings, among them being probably the *Te Deum*. Mg. and ed. by A. E. BURN, 1905.

15. **Paulinus of Nola** (\*) († 431), a great admirer of the martyr Felix of Nola, in whose honour he composed several poems. Mg. by BUSE, 1856; LAGRANGE, 1877, 2nd ed. 1882; P. REINELT, *Studien über die Briefe des hl. P.* 1904.

16. **Marius Mercator** († c. 450), a native of the West who lived at Constantinople; he was an opponent of the Pelagians and Nestorians. *P.L.* XXXIII.

17. **John Cassian** (\*), abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles († c. 435), did much to introduce monasticism into the West (*Instituta coenobiorum; Collationes patrum*).

18. **Prosper of Aquitaine** († c. 455), a supporter and defender of the Augustinian doctrine of Grace; he continued Jerome's *Chronicle* to the year 455. *P.L.* LI.

19. **Vincent of Lerins** († c. 450), whose *Commonitorium adv. haereses* comprises an investigation into the criteria of the Catholic Faith, and comes to the conclusion that such a criterion is found in the 'quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est' (c. 3). *P.L. L*; G. RAUSCHEN, *Florilegium*, V, 1906; *Th. Qu.* 1899, pp. 396-434.

20. **Eucherius** (\*), bishop of Lyons, whose *Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae*, and *Instructiones*, or aids to the understanding of sacred Scripture, were highly appreciated in the Middle Ages († c. 450).

21. **Peter Chrysologus**, bishop of Ravenna († c. 450), was famed as an ecclesiastical orator. *P.L. LII*; mg. by DAPPER, 1867; STABLEWSKI, 1871.

22. **Maximus of Turin** († after 465) is known as a homilist. *P.L. LVII*.

23. **Leo I** of Rome († 461), who composed many epistles and orations. Ed. BALLERINI, 3 fol. 1753-57; *P.L. LIV-LVI*; mg. by ARENDT, 1835; PERTHEL, 1843.

24. **Salvian** (\*), a presbyter of Marseilles († after 480) who penned a defence of Divine Providence, *De gubernatione Dei*, and who, on account of his woeful description of the decadence of the empire, was known as the Jeremias of his period. Mg. by ZSCHIMMER, 1875.

25. **Faustus** (\*), abbot of Lerins and bishop of Riez († 490), a homilist and opponent of Predestinarianism in its more absolute form (§ 58), of Arianism, and of the Pneumatomachi. Mg. by W. BERGMANN, *Dogmatische Schriften u. Briefe*, 1898; *Handschriftl. bezeugte Nachlass*, 1898.

26. **Gennadius**, a presbyter of Marseilles († c. 485), whose *Liber de viris illustribus* supplements the like-named work of Jerome; we have also his *De dogmatibus ecclesiasticis*, which may be a different name for his *Epistula de fide* addressed to Pope Gelasius, or, more probably, is the concluding portion of his work, *Adversus omnes haereses*. *P.L. LVIII*.

27. **Vigilius**, bishop of Tapsus, in Africa, a confuter of the heresies of the period. *P.L. LXII*; mg. by G. FICKER, 1897.

28. **Victor** (\*), bishop of Vita, who composed a *Historia persecutionis Africanæ provinciae*. A. SCHÖNFELDER, *De Victore Vitensi episcopo*, 1899.

## § 77

### Greek Writers of the Sixth and Seventh Century

It is in the sixth century, or, to be more exact, in 533, when the Severians appealed to it at the conference held at Constantinople, that we first hear of a certain group of mystical

writings, consisting of dissertations and epistles, which attained to great celebrity both in the East and in the West, and which, as the translations and commentaries show, was studied even among the Syrians, Arabs, and Armenians. The whole is the work of a Neo-Platonist philosopher, who seeks to serve the cause of Christianity by combining it with his own peculiar philosophy. The author gives himself out to be **Dionysius the Areopagite**,<sup>1</sup> the disciple of St. Paul, and, though this statement was questioned by some, it was generally accepted as true until comparatively recent times. The contents and the history of the work show, however, that it was composed at a much later date, in fact not long before its publication. Though the ancients were wrong in admitting that the work really dated from apostolic times, yet they were perfectly right in surmising that the author wished to be taken for the Areopagite; that the work is pseudonymous cannot now be contested, and there is really nothing to be said for the modern hypothesis<sup>2</sup> which ascribes the writings to the abbot Dionysius of Rhinocolura in Egypt towards the end of the fourth century.

Another writer of the time is **Leontius** of Byzantium († c. 543),<sup>3</sup> one of the defenders of the Theopaschite formula (§ 55), a monk of the New Lavra, and, by his work *Adv. Nestorianos et Eutychnianos*, one of the great opponents of Nestorianism, which he had professed in his youth, and of Eutychnianism, the two principal heresies of his time.

To the first half of the sixth century also belong, according to tradition and some other indications, the recently found works of **Romanus**,<sup>4</sup> the greatest of the poets of the Greek Church, though his hymn for the feast of our Lady's Nativity, which can only be traced back to the end of the seventh century, may be alleged in favour of the view that the author lived at a later date, and that Anastasius, under whose reign he came from Berytus to Constantinople, was really the second

<sup>1</sup> Ed. CORDERIUS, 2 fol. 1634; emend. 1755-56; P.G. III-IV.

<sup>2</sup> HIPLER, *Dionysius d. A.* 1861; KL. III, 1789 ff. For the contrary, see STIGLMAYR, *Programm von Feldkirch*, 1895; *Hist. J.* 1895. H. KOCH, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus u. Mysterienwesen*, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> P.G. LXXXVI. Mg. by LOOFS, 1887; RÜGAMER, 1894; ERMONI, 1895.

<sup>4</sup> PITRA, *Analecta sacra*, I, 1876; RE. f. pr. Th. XVII<sup>3</sup>, 124-31; Byz. Z. XV (1906), 1-44, 337-40.

emperor of that name (713-16). We shall probably learn more of the date when he lived when the promised new edition of his works sees the light.

Other noteworthy writers were :

1. **John Philoponus**, an Alexandrian grammarian (c. 550) who attempted to do for the Aristotelian philosophy what pseudo-Dionysius did for Neo-Platonism; he was an opponent of the Neo-Platonist, Proclus.

2. **Cosmas Indicopleustes**, or the Indian traveller, as he was called on account of his journeys to Arabia and other remote countries, was originally a merchant at Alexandria; he afterwards became a monk and hermit. Many of his works have been lost, among them his *Cosmography*, but we still possess his *Topographia Christiana*, composed c. 547 (*P.G.* LXXXVIII).

3. **John Climacus**, a monk of Mount Sinai († c. 649), wrote on asceticism (*Κλίμαξ, Scala paradisi*). *P.G.* LXXXVIII; *Byz. Z.* XI, 35-37.

4. **Sophronius**, a monk who became patriarch of Jerusalem († c. 638), is known as an opponent of Monothelism, as a homilist, and poet. His principal work is the *Pratum spirituale*, a collection of anecdotes relating to monks and recluses. The work has been frequently ascribed to his friend, John Moschus († 619), who may have helped in its composition. *P.G.* LXXXVII; *Rev. de l'Orient chrét.* 1902.

5. **Maximus Confessor** († 662), the author of *Mystagogia*, an advocate of orthodoxy against the Monothelites and a commentator on the Dionysian writings. *P.G.* XC-XCI.

6. **Anastasius Sinaita** († after 700), opposed the Monophysite sects, against whom one of his many works, the *Via Dux* (Ὁδηγός), is directed. *P.G.* LXXXIX.

7. Finally, we have the **Chronicon paschale**, one of the most valuable of Christian chronicles, composed under Heraclius (610-41) and reaching down to 629. *P.G.* XCII; cp. H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Afrikanus u. die byzan. Chronographie*, 2 vol. 1880-98; PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Enzyklopädie*, III, 2460-77.

## § 78

### Latin Writers of the Sixth and Seventh Century

The two most important Latin writers of the age were, first, **Fulgentius**, bishop of Ruspe († 533),<sup>1</sup> an earnest adversary of Arianism and defender of the Augustinian doctrine of grace. He was the mouthpiece of the Africans at the commencement

<sup>1</sup> *P.L.* LXV; *Z. f. KG.* XXI (1901), 9-42.

of the sixth century, and was, perhaps, the best theologian of his time. Besides being the author of many controversial tracts, he composed, under the title *De fide, sive de regula verae fidei*, a valuable compendium of dogmatic theology.

The other was Pope **Gregory I** († 604).<sup>1</sup> With Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome he is reckoned as one of the greatest doctors of the West. Apart from his epistles, his works deal with questions of exegesis, morals, and liturgy. Deserving of special mention is his *Regula pastoralis*, a rule of conduct for the clergy, which was translated into Greek in the author's lifetime, was done into English at the command of King Alfred, and which during the whole of the Middle Ages was highly esteemed as a text-book of pastoral theology. He also wrote an *Expositio in B. Job, seu Moralia*, a summary of morals cast in the form of a commentary on Job, and a *Sacramentarium* comprising the prayers of the Mass and the blessings according to his revised edition of the Liturgy; this work is extant only in an enlarged form (§ 67).

Among other important writers in Italy may be mentioned :

1. **Ennodius** (\*), bishop of Pavia († 521), who composed many epistles, orations, and poems, and also some historical and liturgical works.

2. **Boethius** the senator, who fell a victim to the political circumstances of the time, for, having been accused of sympathies for Constantinople and of having betrayed his country, he was by command of the Ostrogoth Theodoric imprisoned, arraigned before the senate, and condemned to death (524). He translated and wrote comments on Aristotle and other philosophers, was the author of several theological treatises, and during his imprisonment, just before his death, wrote his *De consolatione philosophiae*, which has in recent times led to his being unjustly suspected of not being a Christian at all. P.L. LXIII-LXIV.

3. **Cassiodorus**, first an officer in the Ostrogothic kingdom († c. 565), and then a monk; an earnest worker, he did much to promote culture in his monastery. P.L. LXIX-LXX; *MG. Auct. ant.* t. XII, 1894 (*Variae*); mg. by A. FRANZ, 1872; MINASI, 1895.

4. This is the place to speak of the **Liber Pontificalis**. It originated (c. 530) in the work of an unknown writer who enlarged the already existing Liberian Catalogue and brought it down to Felix III (IV), who was Pope from 526 to 530. The work has been

<sup>1</sup> P.L. LXXV-LXXIX; *Regist. epist. Greg.* edd. EWALD ET HARTMANN, 1887-90; *MG. epist.* tom. I-II. Mg. by LAU, 1845; WOLFSGRUBER, 1890; CLAUSSIER, 1891; SNOW, 1892; F. H. DUDDEN, 1905.

preserved in the Catalogues of Felix and Conon, in the latter the history of the Popes being continued down to P. Conon († 687). The complete work brings us to Stephen V (891). Duchesne's edition also comprises the lives of the Popes until Martin V (1431). In consequence of an error of Onofrio Panvinio (note to the *Vitae pont. Rom.* ed. by Platina, Colon. 1610, p. 139) the work until recently was ascribed to the Roman Librarian Anastasius in the ninth century (§ 107). Ed. DUCHESNE, 2 tom. 1886-92; MOMMSEN, I, 1898 (*MG. Gest. Pontif. Rom.* tom. I); ROSENFELD, *Über die Komposition des L. P.* 1896.

The remaining writers of note belong to Africa, Gaul, and Spain :

1. **Fulgentius Ferrandus**, a deacon of Carthage, biographer of Fulgentius of Ruspe and composer of a *Breviatio canonum*. P.L. LXVII.
2. **Facundus**, bishop of Hermiane, who defended the Three Chapters in his *Defensio trium capitulorum*. P.L. LXVII.
3. **Liberatus**, archdeacon of Carthage, who wrote the *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutyichianorum*. P.L. LXVIII.
4. **Primasius**, bishop of Adrumetum, one of the Africans who were called to the negotiations at Constantinople in connection with the Three Chapters. He wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse. P.L. LXVIII; HAUSSLEITER, in Zahn's *Forschungen*, vol. IV, 1891.
5. **Junilius**, by birth an African, held high office at Constantinople, and composed, on the model of the *Isagogic* of Paul of Nisibis, a work which was highly esteemed in the Middle Ages, the *Instituta regularia divinae legis*. Ed. and mg. (*Theodor von Mopsuestia u. Jun. Afric.*) by KIHN, 1880.
6. **Cæsarius**, bishop of Arles († 542), a homilist whose sermons were afterwards frequently ascribed to St. Augustine. Mg. by C. F. ARNOLD, 1894; MALNORY, 1895; P. LEJAY, 1906 (*Le rôle théologique*); *Rev. Bénéd.* 1906.
7. **Gregory of Tours**, who wrote a history of the Franks and an account of the wonders of the Saints († 594). Latest edition of the *Hist. Francorum* in *MG. Script. rer. Merov.* t. I, 1884. Mg. by LÖBELL, 2nd ed. 1869.
8. **Venantius Fortunatus**, bishop of Poitiers († 603), a poet. Latest edition in *MG. Auct. ant.* t. IV, 1881. Mg. by LEROUX, 1885; NISARD, 1890; *Abh. Göttingen*, 1901, N.F. VI, 2.
9. **Isidore**, bishop of Seville († 636), the most famous writer of the seventh century, among whose many works the foremost are the *Origines seu Etymologiae*, a brief encyclopædia of knowledge, and the book *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, describing the ceremonies in use in the Church. P.L. LXXXI-LXXXIV.

# I. THE MIDDLE AGES

## FIRST PERIOD

FROM THE END OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY TO ALEXANDER II,  
692-1073

### CHAPTER I

PROGRESS AND VICISSITUDES OF CHRISTIANITY

#### § 79

#### The Alemanni, Bavarians, Thuringians, and Frisians<sup>1</sup>

I. THE battle of Zülpich (496), which marked the turning-point in the religious history of the Franks, had its influence also on that of the **Alemanni** or **Swabians**<sup>2</sup> settled in that portion of south-western Germany bounded by the river Lech, the Alps, the Vosges, and the Frankish frontier. Being subject to a nation of which the conversion had been so rapid that it was now almost entirely Christian, a like change among the Alemanni was rendered easy. The latter were not, however, so eager as their conquerors to embrace the new Faith, and even subsequently to the middle of the sixth century the greater part of the people seems to have been heathen. The Greek Agathias, to whom we owe this information, alludes nevertheless to the powerful influence for good exercised by the Franks over those with whom they came in contact. Doubtless the bishops of Augst and Windisch or Vindonissa (bishoprics which in the course of the sixth century

<sup>1</sup> *KG. Deutschlands*, by RETTBERG, 2 vol. 1846-48; J. FRIEDRICH, 2 vol. 1867-69; A. HAUCK, I-IV, 2 ed. 1898-1903; I-III, 3-4 ed. 1904-6.

<sup>2</sup> HEFELE, *Gesch. d. Einführung des Christent. im südwestl. Deutschl.* 1837; P. F. STÄLIN, *Gesch. Württembergs*, I, 1882-87; F. L. BAUMANN, *Gesch. des Allgäus*, 3 vol. 1882-95; EGLI, *KG. der Schweiz bis auf Karl d. Gr.* 1893 (see also *Kath. Schweizer Blätter*, 1896, pp. 211-23); *Württembergische KG.* Calw and Stuttgart, 1893; F. DAHN, *Könige der Germanen*, IX, 1902.

were transferred respectively to Basel and Constance), together with those of Strasburg and Augsburg, took measures to help on conversions. From the end of the sixth century these sees were all regularly filled, and it is quite possible that they were occupied by an unbroken series of bishops even from Roman times. Lastly, numerous missionaries laboured among the people, whilst the monasteries which some of them founded carried on the work of evangelisation still further. The *Lex Alemannorum*, which belongs to the beginning of the eighth century, testifies to the existence of a complete religious organisation. In the second quarter of the eighth century Christianity became supreme even in the Allgäu, or south-eastern corner of the country.

At the commencement of the seventh century **Columban**, an Irish missionary, after having sojourned a long while among the Burgundians (§ 72), proceeded to preach the Gospel at Tuggen on the Lake of Zürich, and then, at the invitation of the priest Willimar of Arbon, passed over to Bregenz, where he restored to Christian worship the desecrated Church of St. Aurelia. On his departure to Italy, Gallus, one of his twelve companions, established, in the forest of Arbon, a cell which became the nucleus of the famous monastery of **St. Gall**. (*N.A.* 1896, pp. 359-71). **St. Trudpert** (+643) founded the monastery in Breisgau which bears his name, whilst **St. Pirminius** (724) established that of Reichenau. In Allgäu the labour was shared by two monks of St. Gall, **Magnus** (+750) and **Theodore**, about whose cells there arose the monasteries of Füssen and Kempten. Until quite recently these two missionaries had been confounded with two companions of Gallus, Maginold and Theodore, who lived fully a century earlier (STEICHELE, *Das Bistum Augsburg*, IV (1883), 338-89). In the district of the higher Rhine the monastery of **Säckingen** is undoubtedly an ancient foundation, but of its origin little is known, for Balther's *Vita S. Fridolini* is open to grave suspicion of being based on Peter Damian's *Homilia de Translatione S. Hilarii*, or on the source of the latter work, whilst, moreover, Fridolin, according to the account in question, is sent to found a monastery, not on the Rhine, but in the island of Gallinaria near Sardinia. Cp. *J. f. Schweiz. Gesch.* XVIII (1893), 134-52; *Kath. Schweiz. Blätter*, 1896, pp. 410-37.

II. Among the Alemanni's eastern neighbours, the **Bavarians**,<sup>1</sup> who had settled in an already partly evangelised district

<sup>1</sup> *Gesch. Bayerns* by RIEZLER, I (to 1180), 1878; W. SCHREIBER, 2 vol. 1889-91; A. HUBER, *Gesch. d. Einführung u. Verbreitung d. Christent. in Südostdeutschland*, 4 vol. 1874-75; RATZINGER, *Forschungen z. Bayrischen Gesch.* 1898, pp. 401-45; *N.A.* 1903, pp. 285-321.

lying between the Lech, the Inn, and Italy, and comprising to the north some territory beyond the Danube, we find individual conversions at a comparatively early date. Garibald and his daughter Theodelinde, the Lombard queen, witness to the fact that Christianity had found its way into the reigning family by the latter half of the sixth century. Among the more noteworthy missionaries were Eustasius, abbot of Luxeuil at the beginning of the seventh century; the founder of the monastery of St. Peter's at Salzburg, Ruprecht, bishop of Worms, a contemporary of the Frankish king Childebert III (695-711)—not of Childebert II (575-96), as the Salzburg tradition has it, still less of Childebert I (511-58), as some recent scholars have maintained; the chorepiscopus Emmeram of Poitiers, who established the monastery named after him at Ratisbon († 715); and Corbinian, the founder of the church at Freising († 725). Ultimately, at the request of the duke Odilo, St. Boniface (739) divided the country between four episcopal sees—those of Ratisbon, Passau, Freising, and Salzburg.

III. At about the same time the neighbouring **Thuringians**,<sup>1</sup> who inhabited eastern Franconia, were brought to the knowledge of the Gospel. In 685 **Kilian**, an Irish or Scotch missionary, came with the presbyter Colonat (Coloman) and the deacon Totnan (or Totman) to Würzburg, and the duke Gosbert having accepted the Christian tenets, the whole people followed his example and forsook their gods. But the missionaries soon after, probably in 689, met a violent death, and great disturbances ensuing, a new mission was required to complete the work of conversion. This was undertaken by Boniface, who, in 742, consecrated St. Burkhardt as first bishop of Würzburg.

IV. It was the Anglo-Saxon **Willibrord**<sup>2</sup> who first established Christianity on a secure footing among the **Frisians**, who occupied a stretch of land between the Ems and Ostend. Like his predecessors, St. Amandus (630-50), Eligius, bishop of Noyon (c. 650), and the banished bishop Wilfrid (or Wilfrith) of York (678), he had to face many difficulties. Contending

<sup>1</sup> STAMMINGER, *Franconia sancta*, I, 1881; EMMERICH, *Der hl. Kilian*, 1896; N.A. 1902, pp. 232-34.

<sup>2</sup> A. THIJM, *Der hl. Willebrord*, 1863; MOLL-ZUPPKE, *Vorreform. KG. d. Niederlande*, 1895.

as they were with the Franks for their own national existence, the Frisians had a political reason for standing aloof from the religion of their enemies, whilst their then king, Radbod, was a firm adherent to the old beliefs. As, however, Willibrord was, with a few interruptions, able to labour at their conversion for over forty years (690-739), his success was very considerable. The Frankish portion of the country was won over almost entirely to Christianity. The headquarters of his mission was Utrecht, which, as soon as he had been consecrated bishop at Rome (695), was assigned to him as his episcopal city. Willibrord having gone to his reward, St. Boniface, who had already worked in this mission under Willibrord's direction (719-22), again made his appearance among the Frisians. The very next year his life and work was brought to a sudden end by his martyrdom at the hands of the enemies of the Faith (754), but his death served the cause of Christianity, for it brought about the destruction of whatever there remained of heathenism in the region.

## § 80

### St. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans<sup>1</sup>

The greatest merit in the conversion of the Germans belongs by right to a man whose name has already several times been mentioned, the Anglo-Saxon Wynfreth, born (c. 680) at Crediton in the county of Devonshire, and better known by his other name of Boniface, by which indeed during his missionary career, or at least subsequently to receiving his mission from Pope Gregory II in 719, he is usually designated. Not only did he help to spread the Gospel ever more widely, he also strove to purify it wherever he found it already in existence but disfigured by foreign importations. Lastly, by wise administrative measures, he succeeded in putting

<sup>1</sup> Boniface's letters and *Vitae* (those by Willibald, c. 780, and Othlon in the eleventh century) will be found in JAFFÉ's *Monumenta Moguntina*, 1866 (*Bibl. rerum German.* III); his letters are in the *MG. Epist.* III, 1892. The *Vitae* have been edited by W. LEVISON, 1905; that of Willibald by NÜRNBERGER, 1895. There are later biographies by SEITERS, 1845; PFAHLER, 1880; BUSS-SCHERER, 1880; FISCHER, 1881; G. KURTH, 4th ed. 1903 (in French); and by J. M. WILLIAMSON, 1904. Cp. HAHN, *Bonifaz u. Lul. Ihre angelsächs. Korrespondenzen*; EB. *Luis Leben*, 1883; Z. f. KG. XXV (1904), 197-232.

Christianity in a position to preserve for the future the Faith in all its purity.

Success attended his efforts among the Ober-Hessians (722) when, after working for three years among the Frisians, he turned his attention to the province which had been specially assigned to him by the earthly head of the Church. In Amöneburg (*Amanaburch*) he effected the conversion of many, among them Deditik and Dierolf, the village chieftains, who, though baptised Christians, as Willibald remarks in his *Life*, remained attached to idolatrous practices. On his return from his second journey to Rome, where he had been consecrated bishop (722-23), his success was even more conspicuous. He now began to preach in Nieder-Hessen and in Thuringia, and here he overthrew the sacred oak of Thor or Thunar, out of the wood of which he erected a church in honour of St. Peter. In Thuringia he thwarted the opposition of the pagan priests and founded the monastery of Ohrdruf. But with the increase in the size of his mission the need was felt for more missionaries, who, at his call, came in troops of men and women from his own country. Other disciples chosen from among the German natives enabled him to establish yet other monasteries, first that of Fritzlar (with Wigbert as abbot), that of Tauberbischofsheim (under Lioba as abbess), and those of Kitzingen and Ochsenfurth ruled by the abbess Thecla; later on, with the help of the Bavarian Sturm, a monastery was founded at Fulda (744), and with that of Wunnibald and his sister Walpurgis another was erected at Heidenheim near Eichstätt.

Boniface's administrative capacities came into action more especially after his third visit to Rome (737-38). On his way back he set in order the Church of Bavaria. Soon after he established, for the benefit of the Thuringians and Hessians, the bishoprics of Buraburg, Erfurt, and Würzburg (741), and not long after, that of Eichstätt, of which only the latter two were destined to survive. The first bishop of Eichstätt was Willibald, Wunnibald's brother. Nor did Boniface forget the other German and Frankish nations, the political changes then occurring among the latter contributing much to favour his work. Carlman and Pipin the Short, sons of Charles Martel († 741), were more sympathetic to Boniface's attempts

at reform than had been their warlike father, and a number of Councils were summoned by means of which Boniface introduced most salutary measures. Clerics were bidden to observe the Church's canons in their manner of life, pagan practices were prohibited, and a system of metropolitans was established. In Neustria archbishops were nominated to the sees of Rheims, Sens, and Rouen (743), whilst a general Council of the Franks, held in 745, determined that Cologne should be the metropolitan see of Austrasia, and Boniface its first occupant. This decision does not, however, seem to have been carried into effect, for Boniface eventually took up his abode at Mainz, which was then vacant through the deposition of the former bishop, Gewilib.

Having by many years of ceaseless work established order in Germany, Boniface felt a call to resume his labours where they had begun. Desirous of devoting the closing days of his life to the conversion of the Frisians, he resigned the see of Mainz in favour of his disciple Lullus, and, accompanied by a large party of fellow-workers, descended the course of the Rhine. His toil was not in vain, and many thousands presented themselves for baptism, but a year later his work was brought to a sudden close. On June 5, 754 (755), instead of the company of neophytes who had been expected for confirmation, there appeared on the scene a band of well-armed pagans, at whose hands Boniface, together with his fifty-two associates, met their death near where stands the modern town of Dockum. Boniface has been rightly styled the Apostle of Germany. Of recent years an attempt has indeed been made to rob him of this title on account of his connection with Rome; such attempts can only rest on a failure to perceive that by means of Rome's support alone was his work rendered possible.

The Councils conducted by Boniface, besides the General Council of 745 already mentioned—which, by the way, also took measures against the Frank Adelbert and a certain Scot named Clemens, two heretics of the period—were the following: The *Concilium Germanicum*, held in 742 in a place which is now not possible to identify; the *Concilium Listinense* of 743 (not of 745; cp. *Th. Qu.* 1879; *Hist. J.* 1901-2), held at Listinæ (*Lestines*), a royal villa in Hainaut—the baptismal formula decided on in this Council has given it a certain importance, the catechumen being

called upon to renounce not only Satan, but the old gods, Thor, Wotan, and Saxnote. Lastly, there was the Council of Soissons in 744, and the Frankish General Council of 747. For the year of Boniface's death, see M. TANGL, in the *Z. d. Vereins f. hess. Gesch.* vol. 37 (1903), pp. 223-50.

## § 81

### The Saxons<sup>1</sup>

The Saxons, whose settlements stretched across northern Germany from the Elbe and Saale to the neighbourhood of the Rhine, and, at the south and west, touched the domains of the Franks, became early acquainted with Christianity through contact with the latter. As, however, their relations with the Franks were usually of a hostile nature, Christianity made but small headway among them. Missions which were sent to them at the beginning of the eighth century remained fruitless, two Anglo-Saxon missionaries, Ewald the Black and Ewald the White, receiving the martyr's crown. Only with difficulty did the Briton Livinus escape a like fate, and so matters stood until **Charles the Great** determined to compel the Saxon nation to accept at once his yoke and that of the Gospel. Both objects appeared to him to be necessary in the interests of his own country, for, so long as the Saxons retained their independence, they were a standing menace to the Frankish Empire, whilst, short of their conversion, there was little hope of their remaining his subjects for long.

From the beginning, success attended Charles's enterprise. His first expedition (772) resulted in the capture of the stronghold of Eresburg, and the destruction of the Saxon Irminsul, a pillar held sacred by the natives. But no sooner had the victor left the country than the Saxons rose again, continuing this policy for a number of years. The most remarkable upheaval was that of 782, when, disregarding the treaties, the Saxons put to death every Frankish warrior or priest on whom they could lay hands. Charles punished this act of treachery by beheading 4,500 Saxons at Verden on the

<sup>1</sup> HAUCK, *KG. D.* II, 360-412; STRUNCK, *Westfalia sancta*, ed. GIEFERS, 1855; H. BÖTTGER, *Einführung des Christentums in Sachsen von 775-86*, 1859.

Aller. His severity was the cause of a renewal of hostilities, which issued in the indecisive battle of Detmold (783), and in a second battle, this time on the Hase (783), which brought about the destruction of the Saxon power. Whatever embers of insubordination smouldered in the nation were finally stamped out in 804. The conversion of the Saxons was effected simultaneously with the conquest of their country, priests accompanying the military on each of their expeditions. A large number of neophytes were baptised at the first parliament held at Paderborn in 777, and at the second, held in 785, Christianity was imposed under pain of death. Then, and then only, did the chiefs of the nation, Widukind and Albion, agree to receive baptism. Bishoprics were established for the Westphalians at Münster and Osnabrück, for the Engrians at Minden, Paderborn, Bremen, and Verden, and at Halberstadt and Hildesheim for the Eastphalians.<sup>1</sup>

The number of those executed at Verden has lately been called in question. Cp. *Deutsche Z. f. Gesch.* 1889, I, 73-95; DIECK, *Progr. von Verden*, 1894; *Z. des hist. Vereins für Niedersachsen*, 1894, pp. 367-86. On the other side, see HAUCK, II, 348; *Hist. Z.* 78 (1896), 18-38.

## § 82

### The Scandinavian Races<sup>2</sup>

I. Through the conquest of Saxony, Christianity found a way opened to the nations of the north. Charles the Great extended his sovereignty over the country lying between the Eider and the mouth of the Elbe, then known as Transalbingia, and his plan of evangelising this district, and even the regions lying beyond, was realised shortly after his death. **Denmark**<sup>3</sup> was the first to enter the fold. King Harald, who, for dynastic reasons, had been frequently compelled to seek the help of the Franks, was baptised at Ingelheim in 826, and returned home in company with Ansgar,<sup>4</sup> a monk of the monastery of Corbie,

<sup>1</sup> H. BÖTTGER, *Diözesan- und Gaugrenzen Norddeutschlands*, 4 vol. 1875-76.

<sup>2</sup> K. MAURER, *Bekehrung d. norwegischen Stammes*, 2 vol. 1855-56; GFRÖRER, *Gregor VII u. sein Zeitalter*, II-III, 1859.

<sup>3</sup> JENSEN-MICHELSSEN, *Schleswig-Holsteinische KG.* 4 vol. 1873-79.

<sup>4</sup> Bg. by TAPPEHORN, 1863; DREWES, 1864.

who prosecuted his missionary labours so well, even after the banishment of his protector, that he came to be styled the Apostle of the country.

Certain Swedish envoys at the imperial court having spoken of the inclination of the Swedes to hear the Gospel, Ansgar, nothing loath, pushed yet farther north (829), and worked with such success that, soon after, Lewis the Pious was able to establish at Hamburg an archbishopric of the north (831), one of Ansgar's companions, Gauzbert, becoming bishop of Sweden. The new Churches had, however, soon to pass through an ordeal. Hamburg was destroyed by the Normans in 845, and Gauzbert was expelled from Sweden. But no sooner had the bishopric of Bremen been merged into that of Hamburg, than Ansgar resumed his missionary labours in both countries. His example was followed by his successors in the see of Bremen, especially by his biographer Rimbart (865-88). A century later, under archbishop Adaldag (937-88), yet further conquests were achieved by the Gospel. Bishoprics were established in Jutland at Schleswig, Ripen, and Aarhus. Harald Blue-Tooth, the king, was baptised about the year 960, and though the old religion put forth a last effort under his son Sven (988-1014), Christianity soon after became supreme, Sven himself came to view it with more favour when his life was drawing to its close, whilst his son, Canute the Great, was even more kindly disposed to it; by the conquest of England, moreover, the pagans in his kingdom had been reduced to a minority. On Denmark becoming detached from the Province of Hamburg-Bremen, the bishop of Lund was proclaimed metropolitan of the Danes (1103). On account of its transient connection with England, Denmark adopted the English custom of an annual offering of Peter's Pence, as likewise did Sweden and Norway.

II. In Sweden the progress of Christianity, even subsequently to the baptism of King Olaf (c. 1002), was less rapid than in Denmark. A bishopric was nevertheless established soon after at Skara in West Gothland, and slowly but surely paganism gave way before its adversary. In 1162 Upsala was made into an archbishopric.

III. The conversion of Norway began with the accession of Hakon the Good, who had been brought up in England

(938-61). As the nation remained firmly rooted in heathenism, the efforts of the king met with no great success, though Christianity had come to stay. Under Olaf Tryggvasen (995-1000) paganism was wiped out in the lowlands, and the king was able to turn his attention to the Norwegian settlements in the Faroe, Orkney, and Shetland Islands, in the Hebrides, Iceland, and Greenland. Olaf Haraldsen (1014-30), surnamed the Fat, or the Saint, finally secured the conversion of the highlands, Thronthjem becoming the metropolitan city.

IV. Among the piratical **Northmen** (or **Normans**) who were converted in the course of their raids, the first place must be given to Rollo. After having, for thirty-six years, been the terror of France, he, in 912, assumed the name of Robert and became a Christian, in return for which he received from Charles the Simple the hand of his daughter Gisela and that portion of the kingdom which then became known as Normandy. Many of his subjects followed their leader's example, and were baptised, and Rollo soon turned into a thriving country the region he had once so sorely harassed.

V. Several missionaries proceeded to **Iceland** towards the end of the tenth century, and the expulsion which one of them, Dankbrand, drew upon himself by his want of tact (999) helped indirectly the cause of Christianity. To allay the mortification of Olaf Tryggvasen at the poor success of his missionaries, two natives of the country offered in 1000 to undertake a new mission, and worked so well that Christianity soon became the religion of the State. The concessions which it was judged advisable to make to paganism regarding the exposal of children, the eating of horse-flesh, and secret sacrifices to the gods, were ultimately withdrawn by Olaf the Saint.

VI. Christianity, in the same year (1000), also made its way into **Greenland**, in the extreme north-west. Here, however, it was destined soon to disappear, most of the Norman population dying, probably of the plague, in the fourteenth century, and the rest being exterminated by the **Skrællings** or **Eskimos**. *Rquh.* 1902, I, 538-82.

## § 83

### The Slavs and Hungarians

The Franks were instrumental in carrying the Gospel, not only to the people of the north, but also to the Slavs. The

Greeks also helping in the work of conversion, the greater portion of the Slavonic race forsook their idols in the course of this period.

I. The **Croats**,<sup>1</sup> who had settled in Dalmatia (c. 640), were mostly baptised thirty years later, under their prince Porga, by priests sent from Rome. The remainder were converted at the beginning of the ninth century.

II. The **Carantanians** (or Carinthians),<sup>2</sup> who, between 612 and 630, had invaded Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria (or Steiermark), there, more especially at Salzburg, came into contact with the Bavarians, from whom they accepted Christianity in the course of the following century.

III. As soon as the **Moravians**,<sup>3</sup> whose possessions then stretched as far as the Ballaton Lake in Hungary, had been forced to pay tribute to the Franks (803), missionaries were sent them from Passau and Salzburg. Their conversion was soon effected. At the invitation of the prince Rastislav, the Greek missionaries, Cyril and Methodius, aided in the work of evangelisation (863). Of these, the former, the inventor of the Slavonic alphabet, or Glagolitz, was only a short time engaged on the mission, for he died at Rome, whither he had been summoned. Methodius, on the other hand, lived to return, and worked as archbishop of Moravia and Pannonia for nearly twenty years († 885). His success was very great, and must be partly explained by his having adopted the vernacular in the celebration of the Liturgy. Dissensions among the sons of Swatopluk († 894), and the inroads of the Hungarians (c. 906), caused Moravia to disappear for a time from history. On its reappearance a century later it was, what it still remains, a mere province of Bohemia.

IV. Christianity found its way to the **Bohemians** <sup>4</sup> as soon as a portion of that nation was compelled to acknowledge the overlordship of the Franks (805). Fourteen Bohemian chieftains, together with their tribes, were baptised at Ratisbon in 845, and when, some thirty years later, their duke Borziwoi followed their example, the bulk of the nation was already Christian. The troubles which broke out after the death of this duke's sons—Ludmilla his wife being murdered at the instigation of her daughter-in-law Drahomira (927), and his grandson Wenzel dying at the hand of his own

<sup>1</sup> HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, II, 604 ff.

<sup>2</sup> RETTBERG, *KG. D. II*, 556 ff.

<sup>3</sup> DUDIK, *Mährens allg. Gesch.* 12 vol. 1860-88; GINZEL, *Die Slavenapostel Cyril u. Method.* 1867; LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège*, I, 1895; L. K. GÖTZ, *Gesch. d. Slavenapostel Konstantinus (Cyrillus) u. Methodius*, 1896.

<sup>4</sup> PALACKY, *Gesch. v. B.* 5 vol. 1844-67; FRIND, *Gesch. Böhmens*, I, 1864; HAUCK, *KG. D. III*, 186-202; H. G. VOIGT, *Adalbert v. Prag*, 1898; *Mitteil. d. V. f. Gesch. d. Deutschen in Böhmen*, 1900, pp. 1-10; *Hist. J.* 1900, pp. 757-75 (on the foundation of the bishopric of Prague).

brother (935)—hindered for a time the good work. But as soon as Boleslav I felt his power secure, he too did something to help on the cause, though it was only under his son Boleslav II that the Church was definitively established, and a bishopric erected at Prague (975).

V. It was through Bohemia that Christianity reached the **Poles**. In 965 their duke Miecislav married Dubravka the daughter of Boleslav I, who, in the following year, persuaded her husband to renounce paganism. A number of his subjects were baptised with him, and, a generation later, the country was wholly Christian. A bishopric was first established in Posen, and soon after, Gnesen, where Adelbert (+ 997), the second bishop of Prague, lay buried, was erected into the archiepiscopal see (1000). Here, too, the custom of paying Peter's Pence prevailed.

VI. The numerous tribes of **Wends**,<sup>3</sup> living between the Elbe and Oder, after having been partially subdued by Charles the Great, were finally, by the Saxon emperors, made to acknowledge the German supremacy; with this the conversion of the people began. Under Henry I, Adalward bishop of Verden preached the Gospel to the Abodrites. Otto the Great took up the matter with yet greater energy. One bishopric for the Redarians was established at Havelberg (946?), another for the Hevellians and Lusatians in Brandenburg (948), and yet another for the Abodrites and Wagrians at Oldenburg or Stargard (later on, c. 1160, transferred to Lübeck). The plan of making Magdeburg into an archbishopric, which had been mooted in 955, was realised by the Councils of Ravenna in 967-68. At the same time it was decided to create new sees at Merseburg, Zeitz (afterwards transferred to Naumburg), and Meissen. In spite of all that was done paganism stood strong, and Henry II was compelled to recognise it so far as the tribe of the Leuticians were concerned. Gottschalk, a prince who in 1047 succeeded in effecting the union of the Wend tribes, and brought over a large portion of them to Christianity, was, in 1066, overthrown by the pagan faction, and his fall was the ruin of the native Church.

VII. The **Servians**, who in the reign of Heraclius had settled to the south-east of the Croats, were compelled by the same emperor to receive baptism. Their conversion had, however, so little depth that no sooner were they out of the power of the Eastern Empire (827) than they relapsed into paganism. On being re-incorporated in the Empire in 868, they returned to the profession of Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

VIII. The **Khazars**, who dwelt in the region between the Chersonesus and the Caspian, were converted by missionaries from

<sup>1</sup> RÖPELL-CARO, *Gesch. Polens*, 4 vol. 1840-86.

<sup>2</sup> L. GIESEBRECHT, *Wendische Geschichten*, 3 vol. 1843; HAUCK, III; NOTTROT, *Aus der Wendenmission*, 1897.

<sup>3</sup> HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, II, 604.

the Greek Empire. The apostle of the Slavs, Constantine or Cyril, worked for a time among them (c. 858).

IX. At about the same time, the **Bulgarians**<sup>1</sup> changed their religion. Prince Bogoris, who took the name of Michael at his baptism, was, in 864, persuaded by his sister to become a Christian, and compelled his people to do likewise. Here the Gospel was first preached by Greek priests, and though, in 866, Latin missionaries came at the invitation of the prince—it is to this period that the famous *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum*, written by P. Nicholas I, belongs—the Bulgarians in 869 returned to the Eastern Church, to which they afterwards continued faithful, in spite of the action of Basil the Macedonian in making over the country to P. John VIII (cp. § 94). In 1019 the Bulgarians lost their independence, and became a Greek province.

X. Soon after the foundation of their State, by the Scandinavian Ruric, of the Variag tribe called Russ (862), the **Russians**<sup>2</sup> became acquainted with Christianity. But until the baptism of the Grand Princess Olga in 955, and of her grandson Vladimir in 987 (her son Swätoslav remained a pagan to the end), progress was slow. Vladimir, however, soon made Christianity obligatory on his subjects; idols were everywhere destroyed, the Russians were baptised troop-wise in the rivers, and Kief became the metropolis of the country.

XI. The **Avars**, who had fixed their settlements in Pannonia after the departure of the Lombards, became Christians as a result of their defeat at the hands of Charles the Great. But the Avars disappeared from history in the ninth century, and their country was occupied by the pagan **Hungarians**.<sup>3</sup> The new-comers were a terror to their Christian neighbours by reason of their raids, till their power was broken by Otto the Great at the battle of the Lechfeld in 955. The time had now come for their conversion. Soon after the beginning of the reign of the duke Geysa (972-97) we find the Swabian monk Wolfgang, and missionaries sent by Pilgrim bishop of Passau, preaching in the country. The ruler himself eventually sought baptism, his son, King Stephen the Saint (997-1038), doing much to second the spread of the Gospel. He founded several bishoprics and monasteries, Gran becoming the metropolis. At his death, which was followed by a period of unrest, the pagans again became supreme, and caused much bloodshed among the Faithful, but Andrew I (1046-61), as soon as he felt his position sufficiently secure, issued a law forbidding

<sup>1</sup> JIRECEK, *Gesch. der Bulgaren*, 1875; LAPÔTRE, *l. c.* I, 47-90.

<sup>2</sup> STRAHL, *Gesch. d. russ. K.* 1830; PHILARET, *Gesch. d. K. Russlands*; German by BLUMENTHAL, 1872; GOLUBINSKIJ, *Gesch. d. russ. K.* I, 1881-82; PELESZ, *Gesch. d. Union d. ruthen. K. mit Rom*, 2 vol. 1878-80; *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, 1901, pp. 223-34; L. K. GÖTZ, *Kirchenrechtl. u. kulturgesch. Denkmäler Altrusslands*, 1905.

<sup>3</sup> FESSLFR, *Gesch. von Ungarn*, 2nd ed. by E. KLEIN, I, 1867. BOD, *Hist. Hung. eccl.* 1890.

under penalty of death all pagan practices, and when this measure caused a revolt, the rebels were crushed by the strong hand of Bela I (1061-63) and paganism was at an end.

### § 84

#### The Mohammedans in Spain and Sicily <sup>1</sup>

During this period the Mohammedans carried fire and sword into the heart of Europe. In 711, by their victory over the Visigothic king Roderic, at Xeres de la Frontera—when the sons of the dethroned king Witiza joined their country's foes—the whole of Spain with the exception of the mountainous north-west fell into their hands. Even then they were not satisfied, and, passing the Pyrenees, they seized on Narbonne, Carcassonne, and Nimes. Their onward march was checked by the victory gained over them near Poitiers by Charles Martel in 732, and soon after they were forced to recross the Pyrenees, even a portion of Spain being wrested from their grasp. Alfonso I established and extended the kingdom of the Asturias, and Charles the Great effected the conquest of the 'Spanish Mark' in north-eastern Spain (778-812). The time was not yet when the Christians could do more, the Moors being then at the height of their power. When the Ommiades of Damascus had been overthrown by the Abbasides (752), Abderrahman I, one of the Ommiades, fled to Spain, and founded the Caliphate of Cordova. A period of great prosperity in the arts and sciences ensued as soon as the Saracens were firmly established in the country. This was especially the case under Abderrahman III (912-61), Hakem II (961-76), and under the Grand Vizier Al Mansor who, for a long while, under Hisham II, held the reins of government.

In the ninth century the Saracens took possession of Sicily, occupying Palermo in 831, and making the island the base of their expeditions against Italy. They even established themselves for a time in Lower Italy (at the mouth of the Garigliano, 880-916), and on the southern coast of France (at Fraxinetum in Provence, 889-975).

As elsewhere, so also in Spain, the Moorish domination led to wholesale apostasy. Nominal religious toleration was indeed extended to the former owners of the country (soon to be known as Mozarabians), but, owing to the promises held out to those who should embrace the Islamic tenets, many were led to forsake Christianity, those who remained steadfast having many hardships to endure. A long and violent persecution broke out in 850. To tell the truth, the Christians had brought it on themselves, many

<sup>1</sup> LEMBKE-SCHÄFER-SCHIRRMACHER, *Gesch. v. Sp.* 7 vol. 1830-1902; GAMS, *KG. v. Sp.* II; DOZY, *Hist. des Musulmans d'Espagne*, 4 vol. 1861; BAUDISSION, *Eulogius u. Alvar*, 1873.

of them having publicly outraged the Prophet, a crime which was punishable by death. Some of them even persisted in seeking after martyrdom, and this in spite of the Council of Cordova, which, in 852, had issued a decree forbidding anyone to confess the Faith unbidden before a secular judge. In this false zeal they were encouraged by Eulogius of Cordova (afterwards archbishop of Toledo) and his friend Alvarus. The religious excitement was not quelled till Eulogius himself died at the hands of the Moors in 859.

Finis

## CHAPTER II

### THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE<sup>1</sup>

#### § 85

#### The Beginning of the Papal States and the Re-establishment of the Empire of the West—The Popes of the Eighth Century<sup>2</sup>

WITH the fall of the kingdom of the East Goths, Rome reverted to the old Empire. But it was now no longer the capital, nor even the residential city, of the imperial agent for Italy. Though the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula had, to begin with, hailed with delight their reincorporation in the Roman Empire, their feelings soon changed. The fiscal extortions practised by the Byzantine emperors excited discontent, nor did the Italians take at all kindly the imperial measures

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Pontificalis* (cp. § 78, IV); *Pontif. Rom. Vitae*, ed. WATTERICH, 2 vol. 1862 (from John VIII to Celestine III). *Regesta Pontif. Rom.* ed. JAFFÉ, 1851; ed. 2a cur. LOEWENFELD, KALTENBRUNNER, EWALD, 1885–88. *Regesta Imperii*, ed. BÖHMER; re-ed. MÜHLBACHER and FICKER, 1899 ff.; DAMBERGER, *Synchron. Gesch. d. Kirche u. Welt im MA.* 15 vol. 1850–60; NIEHUES, *Kaisert. u. Papstt. im MA.* I–II, 1877–87; REUMONT, *Gesch. d. St. Rom.* 3 vol. 1867–70; HEFELE, *CG.* III–IV. GREGOROVIVS, *Gesch. d. St. Rom. in MA.* 8 vol. 4th ed. 1886–96; 5th ed. 1903 ff. (Engl. Trans. *Hist. of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, 1894); J. LANGEN, *Gesch. d. röm. K.* I–IV (to Innocent III), 1881–93. GIESEBRECHT, *Gesch. d. d. Kaiserzeit*, 6 vol. 5th ed. 1885 ff. (to Frederick I, vol. 6 ed. by SIMSON, 1895); DUCHESNE, *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical* (754–1073), 2nd ed. 1904 (Engl. Trans. *The Beginnings of the Temporal Power*, 1908); W. BARRY, *The Papal Monarchy from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII* (590–1303), 1902.

<sup>2</sup> CENNI, *Monum. dominationis pontificiae*, 1766; reprinted in *P.L.* 98. THEINER, *Codex diplom. dom. temp. S. Sedis*, 1881 ff.; *Jahrbücher d. d. Gesch.*: HAHN-OELSNER, *Pippin*, 1863–71; ABEL-SIMSON, *Karl d. Gr.* 1<sup>2</sup>, 1888; II, 1883. J. FICKER, *Forschungen z. Reichs- und Rechtsgesch. Italiens*, 4 vol. 1869–74; FABRE, *De patrimoniis Rom. eccl. usque ad aetatem Carolinorum*, 1892; G. SCHNÜRER, *Entstehung d. Kirchenstaates*, 1894; LINDNER, *Die sog. Schenkungen Pippins, Karls d. Gr. u. Ottos I.*, 1896; MARTENS, *Beleuchtung d. neuesten Kontroversen d. röm. Frage unter Pippin u. Karl d. Gr.* 1897; HUBERT, *Étude sur la formation des États de l'Église* (726–57), 1899; W. GUNDLACH, *Entstehung d. Kirchenstaates*, 1899; J. A. KETTERER, *Karl d. Gr. u. die Kirche*, 1898; WELLS, *The Age of Charlemagne*, 1898; SCHNÜRER-ULIVI, *Das Fragmentum Fantuzzianum*, 1906 (*Freib. hist. Studien* II).

directed against image-worship; nor, again, did the Empire afford adequate protection, and when the Lombards, in the eighth century, prepared for further conquests, it did nothing for the defence of its Roman subjects. Under these circumstances it is no marvel that the Byzantine rule soon came to an end in Italy; to a large extent its heritage passed into the hands of the bishops of Rome.

The Popes had already long enjoyed a position of high political influence, a position which they owed partly to their pastoral office, partly to the extensive properties—constituting Peter's Patrimony—which had come into their hands as gifts or capitulations. Gregory II and Gregory III, in the quarrels which ensued when the emperor Leo III took the side of the image-breakers, and, again, on the Lombard invasion, stand forth as the recognised heads of Rome and of the surrounding territories, viz. the Campagna, the Maritima, and suburban Tuscany. Pope Zachary (741-52) practically proclaimed himself the ruler of the Roman dukedom, by concluding peace on its behalf with the Lombard king Liutprand (712-44). It was under this same pontificate that a beginning was made of certain relations, thanks to which the Church's civil sovereignty was to be both enlarged and strengthened. After Carlman had forsaken public life, to atone for the excesses he had committed at Cannstatt against the rebel Alemanni (746), **Pipin the Short**, mayor of the palace, was left with the whole power of the Frankish kingdom in his hands. The time seemed now come to put an end to the long-standing abuse by which one man bore the name of king whilst another governed the people—an abuse which had its danger, in that every rebel could claim to be acting on the king's behalf. Pipin accordingly dismissed the incapable Merovingian Childeric III, and assumed the crown, after having first obtained Pope Zachary's consent (752). The new king soon found an opportunity of showing his gratitude for the support given him by Rome. The Lombard throne, which had been vacated by the peaceful Rachis, who had retired to a monk's cell at Monte Cassino, was now occupied by Aistulf (749-56), a man who shared fully the love of adventure and conquest natural to his race. Having captured Ravenna, he led an army on Rome (752). As the Byzantine emperor refused to intervene, the Pope was compelled to appeal

to the Franks. Pipin responded to the call, and in two expeditions (754 and 756) crushed the Lombards, and bestowed on the Roman See that portion of the Exarchate which they had occupied, *i.e.* Ravenna itself, twenty-one other towns, and all the territories belonging thereto—in other words, the whole district from Comacchio southwards to Jesi and Gubbio, or as the stretch of land came to be called afterwards, the Exarchate and the Pentapolis. The town of Narni, which had been seized by the duke of Spoleto, was also restored to its former owner. These events happened under **Stephen II** (752–57), reckoned by some as Stephen III. After the death of Zachary, a successor was elected in the person of a different Stephen, who, however, died before he could be consecrated, and who was accordingly refused a place in the old lists of popes.

The dissensions which shortly after tore asunder the Lombard kingdom also contributed to the aggrandisement of the States of the Church. On the death of Aistulf, Rachis was of a mind to reascend the throne; to frustrate this design and to secure himself allies, Desiderius (757–74) bribed the Romans with a promise of the portion of the Exarchate of Ravenna which still remained under Lombard rule. This promise was, indeed, only partially fulfilled, possibly because just then a change occurred in the occupant of the papal throne, but it was to furnish the Romans with a claim against the Lombards for further grants of land.

It is true that for some time the popes were scarcely in a position to enforce this claim. On the death of Paul I (757–67) there was great trouble in Rome itself. Toto, duke of Nepi, obtained by violence the election of his brother, a layman named Constantine. After thirteen months the intruder was ousted with the help of the Lombards, whose selection of a monk named Philip was, however, equally vitiated by violence. Only with the advent of Stephen III (768–72) did the papal election revert to its normal course. The Council of the Lateran in 769 adopted a measure to obviate the recurrence of such disorders, and decreed that in future the laity should have no right of electing the Pope, but merely of acclaiming him when elected. Even yet no steps could be taken against the Lombards, especially as Pipin, the protector of the Holy See, had just died, and his sons were engaged in the customary

family quarrels. Matters seemed to be coming to a yet worse pass when **Charles the Great** espoused Desiderata, the daughter of Desiderius (770). But the wind soon changed. Charles returned Desiderata to her father (771); Carlman departed this life, and was followed the next year by Stephen III. **Adrian I** (772-95), his successor, by labouring to counteract the influence which Desiderius had obtained in Rome, provoked the Lombard king to invade that portion of the Exarchate still under Roman rule. At the Pope's appeal a Frankish army now appeared in Italy (773). Pavia, the Lombard capital, fell in 774, and Lombardy was annexed by the Franks. Pipin's donation was secured to the Pope, and the promised towns of Imola, Bologna, and Ferrara were added to it. According to the *Vita Hadriani* in the *Liber Pontificalis* (c. 41-43)—the only document giving details of the transaction—the donation comprised other countries also, and there are some who believe that this was actually the case. It is, however, more probable that only certain extra-territorial townships, certain revenues, &c., which had formerly belonged to the Pope, and had been purloined by the Lombards, are really meant. At any rate, this is all that was restored by Charles. The carrying out of the promises occupied a considerable time, as the claims had to be made good in each instance, and, as Adrian was inclined to make the most of his rights, we find him several times complaining of unfair treatment. Charles was, however, able, on his visit to Rome in 781, to come to an understanding with the Pope.

By the annexation of Lombardy, Charles was now in possession of a large tract of Italy, and was accordingly anxious to secure greater influence at Rome. His constant use of the title *Patricius Romanorum*, which had been bestowed both on his father and himself by Stephen II (754), betrays his desire, which was to be fulfilled under Adrian's successor, **Leo III** (795-816). Soon after his election the latter offered Charles, on behalf of the Roman people, the oath of fealty and obedience. The need of a protector, not long after, forced the Pope to confer yet another privilege on the king of the Franks. During the procession on St. Mark's Day in 799, an attack was made on Leo by the kinsmen of his predecessor, the Pope being severely mauled. In consequence of this he crossed the Alps,

and proceeded to Paderborn to solicit help. Charles reached Rome in the following year, and in reward for his intervention was crowned Roman Emperor on Christmas Day, 800.

Charles's coronation was a great event in history, his sovereignty over Rome being thereby solemnly acknowledged. According to the settlement afterwards made by Lothar I in his constitution of 824, the emperor was sovereign lawgiver, whilst the Pope, as ruler of the country, had charge of the executive. The emperor also secured a right of intervening in the papal election, similar to that formerly possessed by Constantinople. This power, at first dormant, was afterwards usually exercised through an imperial ratification of the electors' choice. According to the oath (which some, on insufficient grounds, have called into question) taken by the Romans subsequently to the election of Eugene II, the Pope-elect was not to be consecrated before having sworn fealty to the emperor in the presence of one of his ambassadors. Corresponding to this right of the emperor's there was the obligation on the Pope's side to crown the emperor. It is true that Charles's immediate successors, Lewis the Pious (813) and Lothar (817), received the crown in the first instance from the hand of their father; but they were afterwards formally crowned by the Pope, and throughout the Middle Ages it continued to be implicitly believed that the imperial crown could be granted only by the Pope. Pope and emperor, one being the head of the Christian Church and the other the chief of Christian princes, stood united by the closest bonds, the Papacy and the Empire forming in a sense the hinges on which the whole history of the Middle Ages turns.

According to the so-called **Donation of Constantine**, Constantine the Great, in thanksgiving for his baptism and cure from leprosy, bestowed on Pope Silvester the city of Rome and all the provinces of Italy and of the western regions (*omnes Italiae seu occidentarum regionum provincias*). This spurious document, which is found in its complete form for the first time in the pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, was, till well into the fifteenth century, almost universally regarded as genuine. It was doubtless fabricated at Rome, probably in the latter half of the eighth century. Cp. DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln*, pp. 61-106; *Hist. J.* 1883; and the studies of BRUNNER and ZEUMER, 1888; MARTENS, 1889; E. MAYER (*Schenkungen Konstantins u. Pippins*), 1904.

The sources have nothing to say of the wherefore of the

restoration of the Empire of the West. Eginhard (*Vit. Kar. M.* 28) merely reports the saying of Charles, that, had he known beforehand of the Pope's intention, he would not have entered the church on the memorable Christmas Day. Many attempts have been made to supplement by research the little that we know of the concatenation of events. In the later Middle Ages the prevalent view was that the Empire had been withdrawn from the Greeks in favour of the Franks, the image-breaking zeal of the Byzantine emperors being alleged as justifying the measure adopted by the Holy See. Cp. W. OHR, *Kaiserkrönung Karls d. Gr.* 1904.

### § 86

#### The Popes of the Carolingian Period<sup>1</sup>

Leo III continued throughout his life on the most friendly terms with the great Frankish emperor. In 804 he again crossed the Alps to visit him, and the reality of the protection afforded by the sovereign became evident on Charles's death, which was immediately followed by a rebellion against Leo. Stephen IV (816-17) continued the same policy with regard to Lewis the Pious (814-40). He, too, journeyed to the north, and crowned the emperor at Rheims. Paschal I (817-24), who crowned Lothar I as co-emperor (823), and who, like Leo III, had to withstand great trouble at home, received from Lewis the *Privilegium* dated 817, which is the earliest trustworthy witness to the temporal power of the Popes. The elevation of Eugene II (824-27) led to a quarrel concerning the manner of election, and was the occasion which called forth the Constitution of Lothar, to which allusion has been already made.

Valentine, who was Pope for one month only, was followed by Gregory IV (827-44). It was during the latter pontificate that the unhappy dissensions between Lewis and his sons broke out, and the Pope, true to his position as Christ's regent, sought to act as peacemaker. His efforts were, however, in vain, partly because he was suspected of being prejudiced in favour of Lothar. After their father's death, the sons proceeded to quarrel among themselves, until their haggling was brought to an end by the treaty of Verdun (843), which partitioned the Empire among them.

Gregory's demise was followed by a double election, Sergius II (844-47) succeeding, however, in gaining the day over his adversary John. In the meanwhile the Saracens were ravaging the neighbourhood of Rome, not sparing even the tombs of the Apostles

<sup>1</sup> *J. d. d. Gesch.* : SIMSON, *Ludwig d. Fr.* 2 vol. 1874-76 ; E. DÜMMLER, *Gesch. d. ostfränkischen Reiches*, 2 ed. 3 vol. 1887-88 ; M. HEIMBUCHER, *Papstwahlten unter den Karolingern*, 1889 ; H. DOPFFEL, *Kaisertum u. Papstwechsel unter d. Karolingern*, 1889 ; LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque Carolingienne*, I : *Le pape Jean VIII*, 1895.

(846). To prevent a renewal of this act of desecration the next Pope, Leo IV (847-55), surrounded the Vatican with a wall, thereby creating the *Urbs Leonina* or Transtiberine quarter (Trastevere). The same Pope also lived to see the Saracens routed at the sea-fight near Ostia (849). After another dispute as to the succession (the anti-Pope in this case being Anastasius the Librarian, cp. § 107), Leo was followed by Benedict III (855-58), whose pontificate was quite uneventful. According to an idle tale, he had been preceded in the Chair of Peter by Joan, a girl from Mainz, who, after playing the pontiff for two and a half years, brought forth a child during a procession, thus disclosing her sex and the imposition she had practised. This story is first heard of in the thirteenth century, but it spread rapidly and found universal credence until the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

Benedict was succeeded by Nicholas I (858-67),<sup>2</sup> a man deeply conscious of the responsibilities of his position, unbending in his defence of orthodoxy and of the Roman primacy, and unquestionably the greatest Pope between Gregory I and Gregory VII. Three events lend especial interest to his pontificate. In the first instance he had to withstand John, the tyrannical and unruly archbishop of Ravenna. Next, the Eastern Church was thrown into confusion by the action of Photius, which had for its consequence a bitter conflict between East and West (§ 94). Lastly, the Christian marriage law had to be upheld against Lothar II of Lorraine.<sup>3</sup> The latter was desirous of dismissing his wife Theutberga that he might marry his concubine Waldrada, and to obtain his object, accused his wife of having misconducted herself with her brother Hukbert, a crime which, according to Frankish law, rendered a marriage invalid. With the connivance of his bishops, especially of Günther of Cologne and Thietgaud of Treves, it was comparatively easy to control the business. A Council held at Aachen in 860, in spite of a prearranged reference to the Judgment of God turning out favourably to the queen, decided against her, and (862) allowed the king to contract a new marriage. Lothar indeed gave way on the Pope threatening to ban him if he did not again receive Theutberga (865); but even then the matter was not at an end. The next Pope, Adrian II (867-72), absolved Waldrada from the excommunication she had incurred, after having received assurances of her innocence, and admitted Lothar to communion at Monte Cassino. As the king continued, however, to cherish the design of having Waldrada as his consort, the quarrel would probably have begun anew had not death prevented him from accomplishing his plan. Lothar died at Piacenza (869), on his way

<sup>1</sup> DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln*, pp. 1-45; *KL. VI*, 1519-24; E. RHOIDES, *P. Johanna*; trans. from the Greek by P. FRIEDRICH, 1904.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by H. LÄMMER, 1857; J. RICHTERICH, 1903.

<sup>3</sup> SDRÁLEK, *Hinkmars v. Reims kanonist. Gutachten über die Ehescheidung des Königs Lothar II*, 1881; SCHRÖRS, *Hinkmar v. R.* 1884, pp. 175 ff.

home from Rome, and his kingdom was seized by his uncles Lewis the German and Charles the Bald, in spite of Adrian's intervention on behalf of the emperor Lewis II (855-75); the treaty of Mersen (870) carried yet further the division between the two halves, German and French, of the old Empire of the Franks, already decided on at Verdun (843).

To John VIII (872-82) it fell to crown two emperors. At Christmas 875 he bestowed the Empire on Charles II, nicknamed the Bald. His hope that the emperor would help him out of the Italian trouble was not destined to be fulfilled. Charles may have been a braver man than his name implies, but he was able to do very little, being carried off by death before he had occupied the throne two years. The Pope's choice also gave great offence to Charles's brother, Lewis the German (†876), who, being the eldest surviving son of Lewis the Pious, had reckoned his succession secure. Hence the disturbances proceeded apace. In Italy the Saracens continued their incursions, and at Rome a conspiracy was hatched under the leadership of Formosus, bishop of Porto (876). The conspirators were, indeed, compelled to flee from the city, but its gates were again opened to them when they returned, accompanied by Lambert duke of Spoleto and Adelbert margrave of Tuscany, who had espoused their cause (878). It was now the turn of John VIII to flee, and as he could not find help in France, he finally crowned Charles III, commonly known as the Fat (881-87), the youngest son of Lewis the German. This emperor, who united under his rule the whole Carolingian Empire, proved even more incapable than his predecessor, and was eventually dethroned by Arnulf, duke of Carinthia, a natural son of Charles's brother Carlman.

The change in the supreme civil power did not produce any change for the better at Rome, where in the meantime Marinus I (882-84), Adrian III, and Stephen V (885-91) had successively been elected to the papacy. In Italy Berengar margrave of Friuli, and Guido duke of Spoleto, were fighting for the upper hand. Success attending the efforts of the latter, Stephen V raised him to the imperial throne (891), and his successor Formosus (891-96) did the same for Guido's son Lambert (892). But, as the Spoletan dynasty did not promise well, the Pope soon summoned to Rome the German king Arnulf, and anointed him emperor (896). The new emperor spent, however, only a fortnight in the Eternal City, nor was he able to make his power felt in the Italian peninsula, so that his visit ultimately produced more harm than good. The shortness of the following pontificates, and the small heed paid to the papal enactments, show the sad state of anarchy then prevailing at Rome.

Formosus died soon after Arnulf's departure. His successor, Boniface VI, was Pope only for two weeks. Stephen VI (896-97), a puppet of the Spoletans, was induced to desecrate the remains of

Formosus, and to declare that his pontificate having been contrary to law, all his ordinations were null and void. Canon XV of the Council of Nicæa, alleged as a justification of this barbarous action, had so far (save in the case of Marinus I) been strictly observed at Rome, though everywhere else in the West it was almost a dead letter. Stephen's harshness cost him his life, and he was followed by Romanus, who, after reigning not quite four months, was in his turn followed by Theodore II, who restored to office all the clergy who had been ordained by Formosus. His pontificate lasted twenty days, and a tumultuous election resulted in the choice of Sergius. On the refusal of the emperor Lambert to recognise the election, and at his demand, a new Pope was found in the person of John IX (898-900), a man well fitted for his post, who for the second time annulled the decision of Stephen VI, and also strove with all his might to prevent the crimes then so frequent. He summoned a Council (898) to debate on the means of preserving order in the papal election, and, in conjunction with it, he issued a decree (c. 10, afterwards to be associated with the name of a certain Pope Stephen 1) that the consecration of the new Pope should take place only in the presence of the imperial envoys. His pontificate being so brief, he was not able to effect very much, especially as, on the death of Lambert, the political horizon was again darkened. Whilst Berengar was fighting for the mastery in Italy, Benedict IV (900-903) placed the imperial crown on the head of Lewis of Provence (901), a son of Count Boso, who shortly before (879) had severed Provence and southern Burgundy from the rest of France, and founded the new kingdom of Lower Burgundy or Arelate. The new emperor, Lewis III, was, however, no match against Berengar in Italy. The experience of the next two Popes was equally unfortunate. Leo V, after reigning thirty days, was ejected by Pope Christopher, who, in his turn, had soon to vacate the See.

### § 87

#### The Tenth Century—the Ottonians and Crescentians 2

Sergius III (904-11) had for several years been scheming to obtain the Papacy, but only on his second election (904) did he succeed in retaining it. His cause was championed by the powerful party of noblemen headed by the senator Theophylactus, or, rather, by his ambitious wife Theodora and his daughters Marozia

<sup>1</sup> FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 460-78.

<sup>2</sup> *J. d. d. Gesch.*: G. WAITZ, *Heinrich I*, 3rd ed. 1885; DÜMMLER, *Otto I*, 1876; GIESEBRECHT, *Otto II*, 1840; WILMANS, *Otto III*, 1840; K. UHLIRZ, *Otto II u. III* (973-83), 1902; *Congrès IV des Cath.* V, 158-67 (for the practice of changing names); *MIGÉ.* XXIII (1902), 50-126 (*Alberich II u. d. Kirchenstaat*).

and Theodora the younger, a party which, during the next few decades, was to wield an overwhelming and disastrous influence over the history of Rome, that is if we may trust the information of Liutprand, bishop of Cremona, whose *Antapodosis* and history of Otto the Great constitute the main source of the history of the time. His account cannot, however, be wholly devoid of foundation, whatever we may think of his predilection for scandalous tales, and though certain of his statements are palpably false.

After the short and uneventful pontificates of Anastasius III (911-13) and Lando, John, archbishop of Ravenna, became Pope under the title of John X (914-28). According to Liutprand he owed his elevation to Theodora. He was a good ruler. In 916 he crowned Berengar emperor, and organised a league against the Saracens, who were defeated on the Garigliano (916). His home government was also energetic, but he was finally overthrown by Guido of Tuscany, Marozia's second husband. The next Popes were Leo VI (928-29) and Stephen VII (929-31).

On the latter's death, Marozia appointed her own son, John XI (931-36), Pope, that she might rule through him. Her ambition was, however, not at an end, and on again becoming a widow she married Hugh, king of Provence and Italy, apparently in the hope of receiving the title of empress. Her plan was foiled by her own action, and she lost for ever her influence at Rome. Her second son Alberic, on the very day of the marriage, headed a revolt and assumed the title of *Senator et princeps omnium Romanorum*, thus seizing the whole civil power in the Roman States. Pope John was consequently obliged to confine himself to a purely spiritual rule. The position of affairs remained the same under the next four pontiffs, Leo VII (936-39), Stephen VIII, Marinus II (942-46), and Agapetus II. The fifth, however, Octavian, the eighteen-year-old son of Alberic, again united the two rules. On his father's death in 954 he succeeded to his position, and, on a vacancy occurring the following year in the Papacy, he seized upon that office also, and now changed his name to John XII. This latter innovation was not imitated by his immediate successors, but, with the next century, it became a general rule for the Pope to change his name on election.

In the meantime a strong hand had made itself felt in Upper Italy, and was soon to perform a like office at Rome itself. At the death of Hugh's son, king Lothar (950), Berengar, margrave of Ivrea, seized the crown of Italy, and to strengthen his shaky throne sought to marry his son Adelbert to Lothar's widow. On Adelheid's refusal, she was mishandled by Berengar and compelled to call for the help of the German king. Otto I (936-73) crossed the Alps, and took her as his wife (951). In the following year he restored Italy as a fief to Berengar and Adelbert, withholding only the dukedom of Friuli. On his second expedition to Italy (961) he entirely withdrew their authority. The motive

of this second expedition was furnished by John XII. A worldly prince rather than a bishop, he was bent on enlarging the Papal States, or, at least, on restoring to them the territories of which they had been deprived during the time of trouble. His designs were to be fulfilled otherwise than he had expected. Berengar, against whom principally they were directed—seeing that Hugh had merged the Exarchate in the kingdom of Italy—threatened an advance on Rome. At the urgent request of the Pope, Otto made his appearance, and was rewarded by receiving, at the feast of Candlemas (962), the imperial crown. Eleven days later he granted a charter confirming and enlarging the donations of Pipin and Charles. This charter, though no longer extant in the original, is still preserved in a contemporary duplicate in the Vatican archives.<sup>1</sup>

The understanding between Pope and emperor was not to last long. No sooner had Otto taken his departure than John joined hands with his enemies. The emperor, on receiving news of John's duplicity and of the shamelessness of his life, hurried back to Rome, and assembled a Council at St. Peter's which deposed the youthful pontiff on the charge of murder, perjury, sacrilege, and unchastity, and chose as his successor Leo VIII (963-65). The words which serve as a preface to the judgment, 'An unheard-of ulcer must needs be extirpated by unheard-of means,' sufficiently indicate the wish of the Council; the proceedings were not legal according to the accepted notions of canon law, but seemed called for by the circumstances. But the charges having been brought against John by people who were notoriously unfriendly, many refused to bow to the sentence of the Council, and the emperor had to intervene a second time to secure respect for its decision.

As soon as Otto was at a safe distance, John returned to Rome (964) and summoned another Council to meet at St. Peter's. The Fathers present were mostly the same who had taken part in the previous Council, but the conclusions at which they now arrived were diametrically opposed to those they had previously issued; the former Council was now declared null and void, and Leo was proclaimed a usurper. John died shortly after this, and Benedict V was elected by the Romans. To this action Otto took grievous exception, all the more so since the Romans had sworn only the previous year to elect no Pope for the future without first seeking his will. Hence he turned his steps to Rome yet a third time, and there reinstated Leo. It is said that, on this occasion, at a Council held at the Lateran, the Pope bestowed on Otto and his heirs the right to nominate their own successors, and of appointing bishops to all the sees of Christendom, including that of Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Th. SICKEL. *Das Privilegium Ottos I für die röm. K. v. J. 962, 1883; Forsch. z. d. G. 1884, pp. 567-81; N.A. (1900), 409-24.*

The Bull<sup>1</sup> which exists in a longer and a shorter recension is a forgery dating from the time of the investiture quarrel.

By Otto's coronation the imperial throne had been filled after a protracted vacancy. The Roman factions were, however, too strong not to continue their unholy work. John XIII (965-72) gave such offence to the nobles by the severity with which he upheld his temporal power that in the very year of his election he was carried off a prisoner and had to spend eleven months in a dungeon. The end of his pontificate was more peaceable, the emperor cruelly punishing the rebels, and then remaining for the next six years at Rome or in Italy (966-72). Trouble began anew with the advent of Benedict VI (972-74), and persisted, with a few intervals, till the end of the century. At the head of the opposition party we now find the family of the Crescentians, a family which emerges into history in the life of John XIII, a certain Crescentius, *a caballo marmoreo*, having agitated for his deliverance. In the next decades this family seems to have had almost entire control of Rome. Scarcely was the emperor dead when a revolution headed by Crescentius de Theodora (*i.e.* Theodora's son) broke out. The Pope was thrown into prison, and soon after put to death, and Franco, a deacon, became Pope under the name of Boniface VII. Otto II (973-83) soon emended the situation, the creature of the Crescentians fleeing to Constantinople at Otto's approach. The pontificate of Benedict VII (974-83) was peaceable, but on the death of Otto II passions were again let loose at Rome. John XIV (983-84), a former bishop of Pavia, who succeeded Benedict, was starved to death in the Castle of St. Angelo, and Boniface VII ascended a second time the throne of St. Peter, and, after a reign of eleven months, perished in a tumult.

Under John XV (985-96) the civil power at Rome seems to have passed into the hands of Crescentius Numentanus, who reigned as Patrician. He made, however, no attempt against the imperial overlord, nor did any difficulty arise when the dowager-empress Theophano demanded imperial honours during her stay at the Eternal City (989-90). The Pope made the best of the situation, until it became unbearable (995) and recourse had to be had to Otto III (983-1002). At John's death the Romans even left the emperor free to provide him a successor, the result being that there followed one another in the Papacy the first German and the first Frenchman to attain the highest ecclesiastical honour, the former being the emperor's cousin and chaplain, Bruno, and the second Gerbert, Bruno's tutor. Both of them were worthy men, but their pontificates were too short to produce much good. Gregory V for a time had to face a schism, Crescentius Numentanus,

<sup>1</sup> C. 23 Dist. LXIII; FLOSS, *Die Papstwahl unter den Ottonen*, 1858; *Leonis VIII privilegium de investituris*; cp. *Forsch. z. d. Gesch.* 1875, p. 618 ff.; HEFELE, IV, 620-26.

after the emperor's departure, having again usurped the government and set up an anti-Pope in the person of John, bishop of Piacenza, commonly known as John XVI (997-98). This revolt cost Crescentius his life. Silvester II (999-1003)<sup>1</sup> was mainly remarkable for his extensive learning. His exceptional knowledge gained him, even during his lifetime, and still more in the later Middle Ages, the reputation of being a sorcerer. He was followed by John XVII, John XVIII (1003-09), and Peter, bishop of Albano, who took the name of Sergius IV (1009-12). During the whole of this time the temporal power was in the hands of John Crescentius.

At an early date an imaginary Donus II was associated with Benedict VI (972-74), either as his predecessor or his successor. Another error led to a John XVI being included immediately after John XV. The list of Popes was thereby unduly lengthened. On the other hand, the names of Leo VIII and Boniface VII are wanting in many modern lists, whilst other Popes follow each other in a different order. The list in St. Paul's Basilica at Rome mentions four Popes whose names will not be found in the list given at the end of the present work. On the other hand, the *Gerarchia cattolica*, as revised in 1904, omits two names contained in our list (cp. *KL. IX*, 1424-42).

## § 88

### The Eleventh Century—Tusculan and German Popes<sup>2</sup>

With the downfall of the Crescentians a new party came into power at Rome. On the death of Sergius IV, whilst the former were engaged in securing the succession of a certain Gregory, Alberic, count of Tusculum, a descendant of Theophylactus and Theodora, broke into the city, took control of the proceedings, and succeeded in placing successively on the papal throne three members of his family, two of them being his brothers and the other his son, all of whom had heretofore been laymen. His first election resulted in the choice of Theophylactus, who assumed the name of Benedict VIII (1012-24). As there were thus two claimants, Gregory and Benedict agreed to refer their case to the German king. Henry II (1002-24) gave judgment in Benedict's favour, who accordingly bestowed on him and his consort Kunigunda the imperial crown (1014). Though a worldly man and chiefly solicitous for the political welfare of the Papacy, Benedict did not altogether neglect his spiritual duties. Not only did he successfully engage the Saracens, who at the beginning of the century had settled on the coast of Sardinia, whence they were threatening Tuscany, but he also strove

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by C. F. HOCK, 1837. K. WERNER, 1873; 2nd ed. 1881. K. SCHULTHESS, 1891; LUX, 1898.

<sup>2</sup> *J. d. d. G.*: HIRSCH-BRESSLAU, *Heinrich II*, 3 vol. 1862-75; BRESSLAU, *Konrad II*, 2 vol. 1879-84; STEINDORFF, *Heinrich III*, 2 vol. 1874-81; P. G. WAPPLER, *Papst Benedikt VIII*, 1897; GIOVAGNOLI, *Benedetto IX*, 1900; H. GÜNTHER, *K. Heinrich II*, 1904.

for the better observance of the Church's canons. He was succeeded by his brother Romanus, as John XIX (1024-33), who crowned Conrad II (1027), the third of the line being their nephew Theophylactus, or Benedict IX. Though only twelve years of age, he excelled in the viciousness of his life even John XII, who, like him, had been the son of an Alberic and had been promoted to the Papacy when not yet of canonical age. His evil life produced a general revolt in 1044, but the new Pope, Silvester III, was compelled to evacuate the See after having occupied it only seven weeks. In the following spring Benedict was, however, induced to resign the tiara in favour of the archpriest, John Gratian, now to be known as Gregory VI. The new pontiff was a man of sterling worth, and, though he obtained his promotion by payment, this may be excused on the score that corruption then prevailed universally. But his election did not remove the difficulties, and it was soon necessary to supplant him. This was done in 1046 with the help of Henry III (1039-56): Silvester and Gregory were deposed by a Council held at Sutri; the same was done for Benedict by a Council held at Rome, and Henry's nominee, Suidger, bishop of Bamberg, was acclaimed Pope.

Clement II (1046-47),<sup>1</sup> as the new Pope styled himself, reigned for ten months, but his pontificate marked the beginning of a new era in the Papacy. He it was who began war in earnest against the twin evils of simony and clerical concubinage, then prevalent throughout wide sections of the clergy, and his work was energetically taken up by his successors. The four next Popes, being all of them nominees of the emperor, were likewise Germans. Damasus II, in private life Boppo, a former bishop of Brixen, died very shortly after his election, and as Benedict IX caused some disturbance by an attempt to regain the Papacy—he scarcely even succeeded in taking possession of his See. On the other hand, Bruno, bishop of Toul, elected as Leo IX (1048-54),<sup>2</sup> enjoyed a rather longer pontificate. In his reforming zeal he journeyed from place to place everywhere convening Councils. One of his greatest supports was Hildebrand, whom he had, on his accession, ordained sub-deacon and set over the monastery of St. Paul, and who soon became the very embodiment of the movement of reform. The most important event of the pontificate was the beginning of the struggle between East and West brought about by the machinations of Michael Cerularius (cp. § 95). Leo acquired Benevento—over which the emperor renounced his rights in exchange for those of the Pope over Bamberg and Fulda (1051)—thereby involved himself in hostilities with the Normans, and died soon after his defeat at their hands at Civitate (1053). There followed him in the Papacy

<sup>1</sup> C. HÖFLER, *Die deutschen Päpste*, 1839; C. WILL, *Die Anfänge der Restauration der K. im 11 Jahrh.* 1859-64.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by HUNKLER, 1856; DELARC, 1876; BRUCKER (*L'Alsace et l'Église temps du Pape S. Léon IX*), 2 vol. 1889.

Gebhard, bishop of Eichstätt, elected as Victor II, and Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine, abbot of Monte Cassino, who chose to be called Stephen IX (1057-58). Of these, the former owed his election to Henry—who shortly afterwards breathed his last in the Pope's hands, recommending to him his six-year-old son and his empire—whilst the latter was elected canonically, though recognition of the choice was obtained from the German court. His zeal for reform was evinced by his appointment of Peter Damian, abbot of Fonte Avellana, to be cardinal bishop of Ostia.

On Stephen's death the Tusculan faction again came into evidence, and succeeded in tumultuously electing John Mincius, bishop of Velletri, known as Benedict X (1058-59). This action was all the more shameless in that it constituted an act of disobedience against the orders issued by Stephen just before his death, to await the return of Hildebrand from the imperial court before proceeding to the election of a successor. A new election accordingly took place, and the tiara was offered at Siena to Gebhard bishop of Florence, who took the name of Nicholas II (1058-61). The introduction of some order into the papal election now seemed the most pressing need, the problem being to devise a means by which it might be freed from the influence of the Roman nobility, and also from that of the emperor, who had latterly enjoyed complete control over it. The somewhat irregular election of Nicholas II also required to be approved. These matters were settled at the Lateran Council of 1059. According to the decree then issued, the right of election was to belong to the cardinals (cardinal bishops alone having the right of proposing the names; this item of the decree was never of any effect), whilst the remainder of the clergy, and the laity, were to have merely the right of acclaiming the cardinals' choice. To the emperor a right of confirmation or recognition was conceded, but this honorary privilege was withdrawn as soon as the Papacy became estranged from the Empire. The election was in future to take place in Rome, and the elect was to be a member of the Roman clergy. But if a worthy candidate could not be found in the Roman Church, or if, for one reason or another, a free election could not take place in the city, then the election might take place elsewhere, and a candidate might be chosen from a foreign diocese. Lastly, if by war or other circumstance it should be impossible to solemnly enthrone the new Pope in St. Peter's Chair, the elect was nevertheless to exercise full apostolic authority. The decree caused great dissatisfaction beyond the Alps, in consequence of which Nicholas sought for support among the Normans established in Lower Italy. In consideration of a tax and a promise to defend the Roman Church against all her enemies, he pawned to Duke Robert Guiscard, by the treaty of Melfi (1059), Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, and then, feeling his position secure, reissued at the Lateran Council of 1060 the decrees concerning papal elections. The result was a

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.

breach between Rome and the imperial court. The decrees of the Pope were, in Germany (in the summer of 1060), declared to be null and void, only to be reiterated by Rome at the Lateran Council of 1061.

On the death of the Pope the situation became distinctly dangerous. The imperial party at Rome dispatched an embassy to Germany to request the appointment of a new Pope, but Hildebrand was too quick for them, and secured the election of Anselm, bishop of Lucca, as Alexander II (1061-73). In Germany this election did not win approval, and, at a Council held at Basel, Henry IV nominated the bishop of Parma, Cadalous, or Honorius II. Germany, however, soon lost interest in her favourite. In the early part of 1062 Anno, archbishop of Cologne, kidnapped the young king from his mother Agnes and assumed the government. A change was immediately apparent. Alexander's election was confirmed by an envoy, and on Cadalous making a fresh attempt to obtain possession of Rome, a Council was assembled at Mantua (1064) and gave judgment against him. The worst of the schism was now over, though, as Cadalous continued to pose as Pope and had supporters in Upper Italy, his cause only came to an end with his death (1071-72).

We find the decree concerning **papal election** (1059) in c. 1, Dist. XXIII. Outside of the text given in the *Corpus iuris canonici* there is another, the decree, according to Cardinal Deusdedit, having been corrupted either by Wibert of Ravenna or by one of his party, during the quarrel between Gregory VII and Henry IV. The existence of the two versions, the so-called papal and the imperial recensions, gave rise to many difficulties, nor was there ever any agreement as to the exact purport of the decree. Cp. SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, *Die Neuordnung der Papstwahl durch Nikolaus II*, 1879; GRAUERT, in *Hist. J.* 1880, pp. 501-602; MARTENS, *Die Besetzung des päpstl. Stuhles unter Heinrich III u. Heinrich IV*, 1887; *Hist. J.* 1892, pp. 186-91; MIE. 1906, pp. 11-53, where an attempt is made to show that both recensions have been corrupted by the clerical party.

## CHAPTER III

### EARLY MEDIÆVAL HERESIES AND CONTROVERSIES <sup>1</sup>

#### § 89

#### The Paulicians and Bogomiles <sup>2</sup>

I. THOUGH its origin dates further back, the later history of the Paulicians <sup>3</sup> belongs to the period now under consideration. According to outside information the sect was a Manichæan one, and had its origin in the teaching of a certain woman named Kallinike and her two sons, Paul and John, the name of Paulicians either being derived from that of the former of the two men, or being a compound from those of both. On the other hand, the Paulicians who styled themselves simply Christians, or the Catholic Church, and designated the Catholics as Romans, preferred to trace their parentage to a certain Constantine, a native of Mananalis near Samosata, who, in the reign of Constantine Pogonatus (668–85), established a Church of his own at Cibossa in Armenia. Paul the Apostle they held in great veneration, and, to mark this, the leaders of the sect and their Churches adopted names connected with the history of St. Paul, Constantine being known as Silvanus, his first Church as Macedonia, &c. They several times separated into smaller sects, the most remarkable split of this kind occurring at the beginning of the ninth century, when Baanes and Sergius († 835) founded the factions of the Baanites and Sergiotes.

Steps were taken from time to time against the sect by the Byzantine emperors. At first only the leaders were persecuted,

<sup>1</sup> HEFELE, *CG.* vol. III–IV; J. BACH, *Dogmengesch. d. MA.* 2 vol. 1873–75.

<sup>2</sup> DÖLLINGER, *Sektengesch. d. MA.* 1890, I, 1–51.

<sup>3</sup> KARAPET, *Ter-Mkrtschian, Die Paulicianer*, 1893; *SB. Münch.* 1896, p. 67–111; CONYBEARE, *The Key of Truth*, 1898.

but under Leo the Armenian and Theodora, in the ninth century, orders were issued to execute all who remained obdurate to persuasion. This severity, however, only excited bitterness. A number of the Paulicians fled to the Saracens, and afterwards revenged themselves by acts of brigandage against the Empire. Others continued to profess their error, heedless of the persecution. The emperor Zimisces (969-76) transported many of them to Philippopolis in Thracia, there to act as frontier guards.

II. The **Bogomiles** make their first appearance in the tenth century. They represent a fusion of Gnostic and Massalian elements, and probably owed their existence to the fact that the Euchites or Massalians who migrated to Thracia there adopted Gnostic doctrines. At the beginning of the twelfth century their increase caused some anxiety at Constantinople, and the emperor Alexius Comnenus ordered their leader, the physician Basil, to be burnt and his followers to be imprisoned. In spite of these measures the sect continued.

According to their teaching God has two sons. The first-born, Satanael, was appointed by the Father ruler over all things. But Satanael's head was turned by his promotion, he proclaimed war on God, and was, in consequence, banished from heaven together with all his angelic associates. He thereupon created a new heaven and formed the earth. Having shaped man, he was not, however, able to animate him, and, at his request, the Father consented to give him a spark of life from the Pleroma, on condition that man should belong to both. The bargain was not fairly kept by Satanael, who preferred to lord it alone over man. Hence, in the year 5500, God gave issue to the Logos as son. The latter, who is sometimes called the archangel Michael, assumed the appearance of a man, vanquished Satanael, or Satan, as he is henceforth called, and took from him his former place at the right hand of the Father. Finally, before reverting to the substance of God, the Logos begot the Holy Ghost to carry on his work. The Holy Ghost dwells in the true believers (*viz.* in the Bogomiles), and gives them the power of entering heaven forthwith on the dissolution of the body. Ultimately the Holy Ghost also will be reabsorbed in the Father. As for other men, they are inhabited by the demons, who dominate the lower world. Candidates were admitted into the sect by a spiritual baptism; prayer, more especially the Lord's Prayer, took the place of the Eucharist; the Old Testament was rejected with the exception of the Psalms and the Prophets; marriage and the use of flesh-meat were forbidden; worship given to images was reckoned idolatry, and the churches of the Catholics

were looked upon as dwelling-places of the evil spirits. In spite of this, the Bogomiles had no scruples about taking part in Catholic worship, and justified themselves by appealing to *Matt.* xxiii. 3: 'All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do,' to which text their version added the word 'outwardly.' According to the main Greek source of information concerning them, the *Panoplia* of Euthymius Zigabenus (*P.G.* CXXX), their name comes from their frequent use of the Slavonic words *Bog milui* ('God, have mercy'); according to recent Slavonic research (cp. JIRECEK, *Gesch. der Bulgaren*, 1875, pp. 174-84), it came rather from a certain priest Bogomil (corresponding to the Greek Theophilus, cp. *Echos d'Orient*, 1909, p. 258), who introduced the sect into Bulgaria during the reign of the czar Peter (927-68).

## § 90

### The Image-breakers and the Seventh General Council<sup>1</sup>

As soon as Paganism was extirpated the possible dangers of image worship to weakly Christians were at an end, and, even in the previous period, the practice had taken deep root in the Eastern Church. It continued, however, to arouse misgivings in certain quarters, and as soon as some of the emperors entered the lists against the images the smouldering fire of opposition burst into a blaze. The war was opened by **Leo III, the Isaurian**, who, in 726, in the tenth year of his reign, unexpectedly issued an edict condemning images as incompatible with Holy Scripture. To this action he may have been moved either by the superstitions to which image worship had possibly given rise in certain localities, or by some other motive. Individual bishops, Constantine of Nacolia in Phrygia, Thomas of Claudiopolis, and Theodosius of Ephesus, gave the emperor their support. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, was, however, against the edict, whilst the learned John of Damascus eagerly took up the cause of the images. The bulk of the people was also on the latter side, and the edict was the occasion of many riots. But Leo was

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by J. MARX, 1839; K. SCHWARZLOSE, 1890; L. BRÉHIER, 1904; PARGOIRE, *L'Église Byzantine de 527 à 841*, 1904; A. LOMBEARD, *Constantin V*, 1902. On the letters of Gregory II, see HEFELE, III, 393-404; DUCHESNE, *Liber Pont.* I, 413; *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.* X (1890), 44-60; *N.A.* XXI (1896), 83-120 (*Libri Carolini*); *Byz. Z.* V (1896), 257-301 (Leo III).

not the man to be thus balked. Cosmas, a pretender to the throne put up in Greece, was overthrown, and in 730 Germanus had to vacate his see in favour of a more pliant patriarch, Anastasius. With the encouragement of this new head of the Eastern Church there is little doubt that many other bishops now embraced the cause of the Iconoclasts. The same year another edict appeared, this time ordering the destruction of all images.

In the West the emperor encountered more serious opposition. Gregory II (715-31) warned him to desist, though the two epistles dealing with the matter, and which have come down to us under Gregory's patronage, are probably spurious. Gregory III (731-41), soon after his election, threatened to excommunicate all who should insult or break images. Even the elements fought against Leo, the fleet which he had fitted out (732) to reduce Italy being shipwrecked.

No alteration occurred on the emperor's death. Artabasdus, his son-in-law, and the people's favourite, who usurped the crown, revoked indeed the edicts of Leo, but as soon as he had been overthrown (743), Leo's son, **Constantine V Copronymus** (741-75), continued the work begun by his father. The image breakers now sought a conciliar sanction, and the Council of Constantinople (754), which styled itself the Seventh General Council, actually proclaimed that the worship of images was a work of the devil and a new kind of idolatry. The destruction of the images now began in earnest; what could be removed was taken from the churches, whilst the mural paintings were whitewashed, or replaced by pastoral scenes. Few had the courage to oppose the tyrant; the monks alone stood firm, and were in consequence subjected to a cruel persecution, which began in 761. The best-known martyr of the cause was the abbot Stephen (†767).

The rest of Christendom did not keep silence whilst such deeds were being perpetrated. The eastern patriarchs outside the Empire gave their approval to the images, and the Council of the Lateran (769) anathematised the Constantinopolitan Council of 754. Even so the situation was but slightly improved. The emperor **Leo IV** (775-80) indeed showed himself less severe than his predecessor, and allowed the monks who had been driven away to return to their homes, but his

father's law remained in force, and a denunciation sufficed to set it in motion.

Under the following ruler, however, a different policy was to prevail. The empress-mother **Irene**, on assuming the regency on behalf of her young son Constantine VI, immediately made known her approval of image worship. To restore more effectually peace to the Church she resolved to summon a General Council, being strongly urged thereto by Tarasius, the patriarch of Constantinople. The Council—after a first attempt to hold it at Constantinople had been frustrated by the soldiery, who were in sympathy with the image breakers (786)—actually came to meet in 787 at **Nicæa** (Second Council of Nicæa), and decided in favour of the traditional reverence for images. This reverence was defined, as it had been previously, as *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*, *i.e.* veneration, in contradistinction to the *ἀληθινὴ λατρεία*, or true adoration which is given to God alone, and it was justified on the ground that the honour shown to the representation was reflected on the prototype. The judgment of this Council was obeyed in the Eastern Empire during the next decade, the two following emperors, Nicephorus (802–11) and Michael I Rhangabe (811–13), being friendly to the practice involved.

Pope Adrian I strove to secure recognition of the Council in the West also, but, partly owing to faulty translations of the acts, encountered the outspoken opposition of the Franks. Charles the Great, in one of his own works, the formerly much debated *Libri Carolini*, submitted to severe strictures the acts of the Council and the whole attitude of the Greeks. In this work both the Seventh General Council and the Council of 754 are reproached with having perverted the teaching of the Fathers, one by declaring images to be idols, and the other by allowing adoration and reverence to be given to things which are intended merely for the decoration of the churches, and as memorials of former events; according to the Church's tradition, such respect must be shown only to the saints and their relics, to the Holy Cross, to Holy Scripture, and to the sacred vessels. The Council of Frankfort (794, c. 2) likewise rejected the Second Nicene Council, and forbade anything in the way of either adoration (*προσκύνησις*) or *servitus* (corresponding with the Græco-Latin 'dulia') to be bestowed on

images. The action of the Council was, of course, due to a misapprehension, the Nicene Council having clearly declared that true adoration or 'latria' was to be given to God alone. An extract from Charles's work or, more probably, a synopsis of it, comprising eighty-five chapters, was sent to Rome. The trace of this misunderstanding soon vanished, though there is extant a treatise in which Adrian took up the defence of the Seventh General Council (*P.L.* XCVIII).

The Franks were not alone in opposing the Council, for its decision was soon called into question in the East also. Fancying that image worship was the cause of his predecessor's ill success in the wars against the infidel, **Leo the Armenian**, in 815, again raised the standard of the image breakers. The persecution which thereupon ensued, and in the course of which the abbot Theodore Studita<sup>1</sup> was the acknowledged champion of the images, continued for nearly thirty years, being renewed by the emperors Michael II the Stammerer (820-29) and Theophilus (829-42). But as soon as Theodora, the latter's wife, became regent during the minority of her son Michael III, she imitated the example of Irene, and restored the images to their former place. The iconoclast patriarch John had to make room for Methodius, and the feast of 'Orthodoxy' (First Sunday in Lent) was instituted to commemorate the restoration of the images.

The renewal of the conflict in the East led to new discussions in the West. As Michael II notified both Paschal I and Lewis the Pious of his measures, it came about that the latter summoned a Council to meet at Paris (825) to discuss the matter. The Franks persisted in their previous attitude, and Agobard, bishop of Lyons, set down their opinion in a written work (*P.L.* CIV). One only, Claudius of Turin, ventured to go further, and reject altogether the practice of using images in churches; he was assailed by Jonas, bishop of Orleans (*De cultu imag. adv. Claud. Taurin. apolog. P.L.* CVI), and by Dungal, a monk of St. Denis (*Respon. c. pervers. Claud. Taur. episc. sententias, P.L.* CV). Mg. on Claudius by COMBA, 1895; *SB. Berlin*, 1895, pp. 425-43; on Agobard, in the *Z. f. w. Th.* 1898, pp. 526-88.

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by G. A. SCHNEIDER, 1900; A. GARDNER, 1905; MARIN, 1906.

## § 91

**Controversies concerning the Filioque and Adoptionism<sup>1</sup>**

The *Filioque*, after having been early embodied in the Creed of the Spanish Church (§ 49), came to the knowledge of the Franks in the course of the eighth century. At the Council of Friuli in 796 it was defended by Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia. Charles the Great ordered the Creed to be sung with this addition in the court chapel, and it was likewise adopted by the monks of the Mount of Olives at Jerusalem, though in the latter locality, where it found itself side by side with the untouched Niceno-Constantinopolitan version, it excited remark and led the Greeks to accuse the Latins of heresy. At the request of the monks the matter was handled in the West, and Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, at Charles's command wrote a defence of it in the work *De Spiritu Sancto*. The Council of Aachen in 809 also declared for the *Filioque*. In consideration for the feelings of the Greeks, Pope Leo III endeavoured to prevent the incorporation of the word in the Creed, and, though he agreed with the doctrine expressed by the word, he advised the Franks to abstain from innovations. He also erected in St. Peter's at Rome two large silver tablets on which the Creed was engraved without the *Filioque*. The Franks, however, refused to hearken to him, and, in the event, the Roman Church herself conformed to the Frankish custom, probably adopting the *Filioque* very shortly after the discussion just spoken of, for at a later date we hear no more of any disagreement concerning the matter within the Western Church.

About the year 780, a certain Migetius in the neighbourhood of Sevilla, having explained the Trinity after a Sabellian fashion, as a threefold manifestation—of God the Father in David, of God the Son in Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost in Paul—was opposed by Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, who maintained that the Logos is in truth a Divine Person distinct from the Father, but that Christ in His human nature could only be called the Son of God by adoption. The view of Elipandus came to be known as the error of Adoptionism. Felix, bishop of Urgelis in the Spanish mark, immediately ranged himself on the same side. On the other

<sup>1</sup> E. H. LIMBORGH, *Alcuinus als bestrijder van het Adoptianismus*, 1901.

hand Beatus, abbot of Libana, and Etherius, bishop of Osma, took up the cudgels against this new form of Nestorianism. As some of the disputants belonged to his Empire, Charles the Great claimed the right to have the matter referred to himself, and at his command several Councils (Ratisbon, 792; Frankfort, 794), and certain individual scholars such as Alcuin busied themselves with it. At the Council of Aachen in 799 Felix abjured his error, and as most of his followers now imitated his example, the worst of the controversy was at an end. With the death of Elipandus, Adoptionism disappears from history.

## § 92

### Gottschalk and the Predestinarian Controversy<sup>1</sup>

Predestination, which already in the previous period had set minds at variance, was again to be the subject of more discussion. The occasion for the new controversy was furnished by Gottschalk, son of the Saxon count Berno, and an oblate of the monastery of Fulda, but who—at a date later than 829, and in consequence of a quarrel with his abbot, Rhabanus Maurus, as to the engagements incurred by the reception of the tonsure—was transferred to the monastery of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons. Adopting the strict Augustinian views, and holding that Predestination is the eternal and unchanging decree of God, he came to believe that God's will for man's salvation is merely particular, and was wont to speak of a twofold predestination, the one to Death and the other to Life, though he denied that there is any predetermination to evil or sin, and based the predestination to Death on the Divine foreknowledge of man's sin. It is scarcely just to speak of this as heresy, but as, on the one hand, he failed to make sufficiently clear the distinction between the two forms of predestination, whilst, on the other, he laboured through thick and thin to impose his view on the common people who were still less capable of understanding it aright, it is no matter for wonder if his proceedings excited suspicion. Rhabanus Maurus, now archbishop of Mainz, immediately denounced as unbearable the assertion that there was such a thing as a predestination to Death, and condemnation was pronounced on Gottschalk by the Council of Mainz in 848, and by that of Quiercy in 849, the latter ordering him to be kept in custody at the monastery of Hautvilliers.

So far Gottschalk had encountered only foes, but now men just as devout and learned were to espouse his cause. The manner in which Predestination to Death was attacked by Hinkmar of Rheims

<sup>1</sup> MAUGUIN, *Veterum auctorum, qui IX saec. de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt, opera et fragmenta*, 2 vol. 1640; *Z. f. KG.* X (1890), 258-309 (Hinkmar's work, *Ad reclusos*); XVIII (The Life and Doctrine of Gottsch.); SCHÖRRS, *Hinkmar*, 1884; *Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig.* X (1905), 47-69.

in his recently discovered work *Ad reclusos et simplices*, elicited an answer from Ratramnus, a monk of Corbie. When questioned by Hinkmar, others such as Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, Prudentius, Wenilo, and Remigius, bishops of Troyes, Sens, and Lyons respectively, also declared themselves for the twofold predestination, opining that God willed only certain to be saved, and that the Redemption was not universal. Both sides soon secured conciliar sanction, Hinkmar formulating his thesis at the Council of Quiercy (853), and that of his adversaries being approved by the Councils of Valence (855) and Langres (859). The controversy increased in bitterness as it spread more widely, and at the French national Council of Savonnières near Toul (859) there even seemed a danger of the two views occasioning a schism. At the suggestion of Remigius of Lyons the discussion was, however, postponed till the next assembly, and finally at the Council of Touse (860), after much debate, the matter was settled and peace restored by mutual compromise. The question of predestination was left unsolved, though the view of the metropolitan of Rheims secured the majority of votes, whilst in the synodal letter which he indited it is distinctly stated that God wills the salvation of all men, and that the Redemption was universal.

### § 93

#### The Eucharistic Controversy<sup>1</sup>

I. Our Lord's promise that He would give His flesh to eat and His blood to drink, had, so far, been taken by the Christians with simple faith. In the ninth century the mystery was made the matter of learned inquiry. Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie, composed a work, *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (831), which, when he had become abbot of his monastery, he again published (944), dedicating it to Charles the Bald. His main thesis is that in the Eucharist, though indeed under the figure of bread and wine, there is in truth the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the actual body born of Mary which suffered and rose again, *non alia plane caro, quam quae nata est de Maria et passa in cruce et resurrexit de sepulcro* (c. 1). In this he voiced the Church's own feelings, though he aroused opposition by insisting too strongly on the identity of the historic and Eucharistic Christ whilst laying insufficient stress on the distinction of appearances, besides making use of novel expressions, which, taken in connection with the miracles adduced, were calculated to promote the grossly carnal assumption of the Capharnaites of old. Rhabanus Maurus, in a

<sup>1</sup> Mg. on Paschasius R. by HAUSHERR, 1862; J. ERNST, 1896; J. SCHNITZER, *Berengar von Tours*, 1890; A. NÄGLE, *Ratramnus u. die Eucharistie*, 1903; *Rev. de l'hist. de Relig.* 1903 (Berengar).

letter to Egil, abbot of Prüm, urged strongly that the actual and Eucharistic body of Christ are one only *naturaliter*, or in essence, and not *specialiter*, or in appearance. Ratramnus too, who had been requested by Charles the Bald to give his opinion, urged the same distinction yet more forcibly in his work *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, so much so, indeed, that some moderns even came to think that he believed Christ to be present in the Eucharist merely spiritually. According to all seeming, the inference is, however, unjustified. The case may be otherwise with the philosopher Scotus Eriugena, who, according to the testimony of Hinkmar of Rheims, spoke of the Eucharist as a mere memorial, *memoria veri corporis et sanguinis Christi*. The statement must, however, have been made not in a special work on the mystery, but in a passage of some other work. Others again, as is apparent from Radbert's letter to Frudigar, and also from his commentary on St. Matthew, saw in the Eucharist, instead of *vera caro et verus sanguis*, merely *quaedam virtus carnis et sanguinis*. On the other hand, failing to perceive what is phenomenal in the Sacrament, some went so far as to allow it to be believed that the Eucharist was liable to the consequences of digestion like other food. In the eleventh century this opinion came to be designated as Stercoranism.

II. The same mystery continued to afford matter for controversy. In the tenth century moderate views prevailed, but in the eleventh a reaction took place in favour of the grosser theory. Excess in one direction soon led to excess in the other. Berengar of Tours took the view of Scotus Eriugena, as opposed to that of Radbert, and, against the advice of his friends, especially of Adelman of Liège, went so far as to blame his adversaries' opinion, embodying his critique in a letter to Lanfranc, abbot of Bec. The controversy which had been, so far, courteously conducted, now developed into a violent conflict. Berengar's views were condemned by Councils held in Rome and Vercelli (1050), the Council of Paris (1051) threatened both him and his associates with death, though another Council at Tours (1054), meeting under the presidency of Hildebrand, declared itself satisfied with Berengar's admission, that after the consecration the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. Finally, the Lateran Council of 1059 required his subscription of the formula: *verum corpus Domini sensualiter, non solum in sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri*. This formula, in spite of its crudity, Berengar consented to sign under compulsion. Ten years later, however, he ventured to assail this Council, and also Cardinal Humbert, who had drafted the formula, and when Lanfranc replied by the work *De corpore et sanguine Domini adv. Bereng.* he rejoined by publishing his *De sacra coena* (a work discovered by Lessing in 1770, and made public by VISCHER in 1834), the quarrel lasting altogether some thirty years.

## § 94

Photius—Legality of Fourth Marriages—Eighth General Council, 869–70<sup>1</sup>

I. Scarcely had the question of the images been settled than new troubles began to brew in the Eastern Church. On the death of Methodius, patriarch of Constantinople, the monk **Ignatius**, a son of the emperor Michael Rhangabe, was chosen to succeed him (846). He was a man of great virtue and piety, but his position was one of great difficulty, as he had to withstand unruly bishops and monks, and, what was far worse, a court party noted for its viciousness and intrigues. After having fruitlessly endeavoured to dissuade Bardas, the empress Theodora's brother—who was regent of the Empire since the previous year, when Michael III, the Drunkard, had assumed the crown—from his sinful intercourse with his step-daughter, Ignatius was obliged to deny him Communion at the Epiphany (857). His courage cost him his situation. A few months later Bardas advised the emperor to transfer his mother and sisters to a convent, that he might be no longer disturbed by their reproaches, and to Ignatius was assigned the duty of imposing on them the veil. As the patriarch refused, he was charged with being an accomplice of the monk Gebon—who, giving himself out as one of Theodora's sons by a previous marriage, was then engaged in stirring up rebellion—and was, in consequence, relegated to the island of Terebinthus. To facilitate the appointment of a successor, every effort was also made to induce the patriarch to resign his see in due form.

Although Ignatius obstinately refused to hand in the required resignation, an election took place, and resulted in the choice of **Photius** (857), the greatest scholar of the century (§ 106). The new patriarch did not succeed in bringing all over to his side. Several bishops refused to deal with him, the lead being taken by Metrophanes of Smyrna, and, though they gradually abandoned their attitude of opposition on receiving assurances from Photius that he looked on his predecessor as guiltless and would tolerate no proceedings

<sup>1</sup> HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius, Patriarch v. Konstantinopel*, 3 vol. 1867–69.

against him, they again broke off relations as soon as Photius withdrew his former promises and declared Ignatius deposed. Metrophanes and his friends assembled in Council at the Church of St. Irene and anathematised the unfaithful occupant of the see, whilst the latter, nothing daunted, held his own Council in the Church of the Apostles and there excommunicated and deposed his gainsayers.

The expulsion of Ignatius not only led to a split within the Eastern Church, it also affected the relations between East and West. Rome was all the less disposed to acknowledge Photius, seeing that many things besides—which the Greeks had apparently not adverted to—militated against his election. The laws of the Church were not to be set aside so lightly. Photius having been a layman at the time of his nomination, his election was contrary to Canon 10 of Sardica. He had, moreover, received consecration at the hand of a bishop—Gregory Asbesta of Syracusa—who had been deposed by Ignatius, and though this bishop had appealed to Rome against the judgment, he had no right to undertake a consecration, as his appeal had not yet been heard. The papal legates who were sent to the East at the invitation of the emperor—who, when informing the Pope of the election of Photius, spoke also of new troubles occasioned by the image breakers (859)—were won over by Photius, and, though they were papal plenipotentiaries, actually ratified the deposal of Ignatius at the great Council held at Constantinople in 861. On the other hand, the Pope himself, **Nicholas I**, gave judgment against the intruder, pronouncing the deposition of Photius and all his abettors, who, did they persist in retaining their sees, were to be permanently excommunicated (863). The decree was, however, not heeded, and on the Pope summoning both factions for a new trial at Rome (865) he received from Michael III an ungracious refusal. The next year oil was thrown on the flame by the Bulgarians transferring their obedience from Constantinople to Rome, and to Photius the time seemed come to proclaim open war. In an epistle full of most bitter complaints against the discipline and beliefs of the Western Church, against the Saturday fast, the permission for the use of milk and cheese in the first week of Lent, against clerical celibacy, the non-recognition of Confirmation as

administered by the Greeks (*i.e.* by simple priests), and against the *Filioque*, the patriarchs of the East were summoned to assemble at a Council to be held in Constantinople. The Council met in 867, and pronounced the deposition of Nicholas.

II. Photius may now have fancied that he had vanquished all his opponents. His victory was, however, of short duration, for that same year **Basil the Macedonian**, who had replaced Bardas as regent a year previously, usurped the throne of Michael III and the civil revolution was speedily followed by a change of ecclesiastical policy. A few days after his coronation the emperor banished Photius to a monastery and restored **Ignatius** to his former dignity, leaving Rome to settle the outstanding difficulties. Adrian II, who had succeeded Nicholas that same year at the Roman Council of 869, issued a decree which placed the Constantinopolitan Council of 867 on the same footing as the Robber-Council of Ephesus, ordered its acts to be burnt, Photius, the new Dioscorus, to be excommunicated, and the rest of his associates to be deposed, and, in the event of their proving contumacious, to be also expelled from the Church. Legates were sent to the East to secure the carrying out of the sentence, and the Eighth General Council, which met at **Constantinople** (869-70), performed everything according to their injunctions. But peace was far from having thereby been restored to the Byzantine Church. Photius and his followers refused to submit, with the result that matters remained where they were before, with this difference, however, that the parties had now exchanged positions. To make matters worse, the Council, in an after-session, succeeded in embroiling itself with Rome by hearkening to the petition of the Bulgarians, and deciding that they should again be affiliated to the Church of Constantinople. Against this decree the papal legates protested, and, later on, John VIII called on Ignatius to restore the province under pain of excommunication and deposition.

By the time this summons had arrived at Constantinople, a new alteration had occurred, **Photius** being again in possession of the patriarchate. For some time past the emperor had treated him with growing consideration, and had entrusted to him the education of his sons, and as soon as Ignatius had

departed this life (877) Photius was appointed to succeed him, the emperor hoping thereby to restore peace within his realm. This appointment traversed the decision of the Eighth General Council, though, now that the rightful occupant of the see was dead, it was no longer open to the same objections, and, as a matter of fact, Photius was now acknowledged very generally, even in the West. John VIII accordingly judged it politic to take into account the change of circumstances, and promised Photius his support on condition that the latter should crave pardon in public synod for his former conduct, renounce his claims on Bulgaria, and be reconciled with the followers of Ignatius. Legates bearing these instructions proceeded to Constantinople, and the Council met in 879-80. It was decided to refer the Bulgarian question to the emperor, and as for the rest, Photius's submission did not meet the Pope's expectations. He persisted in asserting that his first election was regular, and that he had been wrongfully removed. The synod accordingly assumed an attitude totally opposed to that of the Eighth General Council, of which the decrees from this time ceased to be reckoned as binding in the East. In its supplementary sessions (VI and VII) it ventured even to censure the *Filioque*, in that it renewed the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed and condemned any addition which might be made to it. Hence the attempt of John VIII to secure reparation from Photius issued in complete failure. The next Pope, Marinus I, again excommunicated Photius, who retorted by stating anew his grievances against the Western Church. His power was, however, soon to cease. Leo IV, the Wise (886-912), shortly after his accession relegated him to a monastery, and Stephen, the emperor's brother, was appointed patriarch in his room.

III. Scarcely had an end been made of the dissensions between the parties of Photius and Ignatius, than Leo himself, by contracting a fourth marriage (906), occasioned a new quarrel. As his action was contrary to the discipline of the Eastern Church, and to the civil law of the Byzantine Empire, the patriarch Nicholas Mysticus pronounced his excommunication, the result being the fall of the patriarch, who was replaced by Euthymius. A part of the clergy and people remained attached to the deposed patriarch, just as, soon afterwards, when Nicholas was restored to his see (911), a faction continued to favour Euthymius. The schism thus

called forth on the question of **Tetragamy** continued till after the middle of the tenth century, when the patriarch Polyeuctus restored the name of Euthymius to its place in the diptychs.

### § 95

#### The Greek Schism<sup>1</sup>

It was Photius who laid the foundation of the schism between East and West, by unduly insisting during his conflict with Rome on the differences existing between the two Churches. All that was now needed to consummate a rupture was a new outbreak of the spirit of narrow-mindedness and intolerance ready to denounce the peculiarities of the Roman Church as departures from the purity of Apostolic tradition. This came about towards the end of the tenth century, under the patriarchs Sisinnius and Sergius, after a period during which comparatively friendly relations had been maintained with Rome. Under Eustathius (1019-25) a peace was indeed patched up with Rome, though his efforts to make the patriarch of Constantinople an œcumenical bishop with power over the Churches of the East equivalent to that exercised by the bishop of Rome throughout Christendom were freely and severely criticised in other parts of the West. **Michael Cerularius**, who followed him after an interval, was very differently disposed to Rome. In 1053, by his doing, the Latin Churches at Constantinople were suddenly closed, the monasteries were ordered to conform to the Greek rite, and on their refusal their inmates were dubbed Azymites and declared excommunicate. Nicephorus the Sacellar, in carrying out his instructions, went so far as to trample on the hosts of the Latins, simply because they were made of unleavened bread. Simultaneously Leo, bishop of Achrida in Bulgaria, attacked the Latins in writing. In a circular letter addressed to John, bishop of Trani in Apulia, he describes them as half Hebrew and half pagan, inasmuch

<sup>1</sup> *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et lat. saec. XI composita extant*, ed. C. WILL, 1861; HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, III, 710 ff.; PAWLOFF, *Krit. Versuche zur Gesch. der ältesten griechisch-russischen Polemik gegen die Lateiner*, St. Petersburg, 1878; HALFMANN, *Kard. Humbert*, 1882; DUCHESNE, *Autonomies ecclésiastiques* (Engl. Tr. *Churches separated from Rome*, Lon. 1907); BRÉHIER, *Le schisme oriental du XIe siècle*, 1899; F. X. SEPPELT, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz in the Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen*, ed. by SDRALEK, II, 1904.

as they observe the law of unleavened bread and of the Sabbath, partake without scruple of things strangled, and from which the blood has not been withdrawn, and omit the *alleluia* in Lent. Nicetas, a monk of the monastery of the Studium, for his part raised the question of clerical celibacy and other points on which the practice of the two Churches diverged.

This hail of objections was more than the Latins could patiently endure, and Cardinal Humbert, of Silva Candida, undertook to answer them, which he did with considerable spirit and some learning. His defence was indeed good, but the attack which he ventured on the Greek positions was less well advised. Thus he assailed priestly marriage as the Nicolaite 'heresy,' accused the Greeks of having expunged the *Filioque* from the Creed, and of being infected with Macedonianism, &c. With such feelings animating either side it was no easy task to arrive at an understanding. Leo IX sent, indeed, his legates to Constantinople, but on account of the hindrances put in their way by Michael Cerularius they could not obtain a hearing. The legates accordingly, in the summer of 1054, excommunicated him, together with Leo of Achrida, Nicephorus, and all their adherents. They doubtless had a hope that their adversary would either relent or fall. Their hope was never to be realised, though the emperor Constantine Monomachus, who had been all along on the side of peace, did his best to promote an understanding. The patriarch was obdurate, and by stirring up the people to embrace his cause, he succeeded finally in gaining the day. A Council which he assembled reissued with approval the manifesto of Photius to the bishops of the West, and laid the whole Latin Church under an anathema. Peter, patriarch of Antioch, besought Michael to contrive a reconciliation, but his request was not heeded, and as it was part of Peter's plan that the Latins should abandon all practices objected to by the East, his mediation was foredoomed to fail. The breach once made was never mended, and the example of Constantinople was soon followed by the other Eastern Churches. Even the fall of Michael (1059) brought no change. Wholly taken up with their supposed Orthodoxy, the Greeks seem to have lost all desire of re-entering into communion with the Latins.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

#### § 96

#### Archdeacons, Deans, Lay Patronage, Testes Synodales, and Canons

I. AMONG the Franks and in the other newly converted countries the dioceses were enormously larger than those of the older Roman Empire. The bishops accordingly stood in need of assistants, and for a time made use of chorepiscopi. On these there fell the duty of visiting the parishes and fulfilling whatever obligations this entailed, such as instructing the clergy, restoring discipline, &c. About the middle of the ninth century, as we can see from the Council of Paris in 849 and from the writings of Pseudo-Isidore, public opinion began to turn against these minor bishops, and soon after they quit the scene of history, the extra-episcopal functions which they had performed being now undertaken by archdeacons,<sup>2</sup> sometimes also styled chorepiscopi, an institution not entirely new, having originated at a somewhat earlier date in France and thence passed to Germany, but which now assumed greater importance than heretofore. The documents which refer this institution to Heddo, bishop of Strasburg (774), are spurious.<sup>3</sup> Archdeaconries, of which the limits were usually those of the civil districts termed 'gaus,' were soon subdivided into circuits, of which the head was sometimes an archpriest, sometimes a dean.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> RETTBERG, *KG. Deutschlands*, II, 582-668; LÖNING, *Gesch. d. d. Kirchenrechts*, II; A. WERMINGHOFF, *Gesch. d. Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im MA. I*, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> A. SCHRÖDER, *Entwicklung des Archid. bis zum 11 Jahrh.* 1890.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. RETTBERG, II, 60; WAITZ, *Deutsche Verf.-Gesch.* 2nd ed. III, 431 ff.

<sup>4</sup> SÄGMÜLLER, *Die Entwicklung des Archipresbyterats u. Dekanats bis zum Ende des Karolingerreichs*, 1898.

II. According to Germanic law the churches erected by landed proprietors on their property fell under their ownership; this was the case throughout the Empire of the Franks.<sup>1</sup> The founder could dispose of them at will, and appoint or dismiss the incumbents as he pleased. On the death of an incumbent the donors claimed the right in course of time of appropriating either the whole or a portion of his heritage (later on known as *ius spoli*), and, so long as the post was vacant, of receiving the surplus revenue which remained after the payment of the *locum tenens*. Similar treatment was experienced by the churches which were pledged or enfeoffed to secular noblemen (§ 98). The Church strove in numerous Councils to ameliorate the position of the clergy attached to such parishes, and succeeded in making their appointment or dismissal to depend on the consent of the bishop, thereby transforming the pretensions of the laity into a mere right of **Patronage**. In the subsequent period, after the outbreak of the quarrel about investiture, this right also was curtailed.

III. It had been the custom even previously for the bishop to perform an annual visitation of his diocese; this custom now became the rule.<sup>2</sup> Charles the Great also directed that, for the bishop's support and protection, and, if necessary, to report any remissness, he should be accompanied on his journeys by the count of the 'gau.' In the ninth century commoners also were invited to assist the bishop, and in each parish men of good repute, as a rule seven in number, were to be chosen, on whom it devolved to bring to the bishop's notice the evils existing in their district. These men were styled synodal witnesses (*testes synodales*), and the institution went by the name of synod.<sup>3</sup>

IV. In the eighth century clerics again began to dwell in common—in other words, what is now known as the *Vita canonica* was re-established<sup>4</sup> (cp. § 60). A special rule, based on that of St. Benedict, was drawn up (c. 760) for the clergy of his city by Chrodegang, bishop of Metz. The canonical mode of

<sup>1</sup> U. STUTZ, *Gesch. des. k. Benefizialwesens*, I, 1895; *art. Kirchenrecht* in HOLTZENDORFF-KOHLER, *Enzyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft*, II, pp. 829-31.

<sup>2</sup> Capitularies issued in 742, 769, 813; C. of Arles, 813.

<sup>3</sup> Z. f. KR, 1864, pp. 1-45; 1865, pp. 1-42.

<sup>4</sup> THOMASSIN, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* P. I, lib. III, c. 7; HEFELE, IV, 9-24; *Chrodegangi regula can.* ed. W. SCHMITZ, 1889; II. SCHÄFER, *Pfarrkirche u. Stift im deutschen MA.* 1903.

life soon began to be observed not only at the bishops' houses, but also in the presbyteries of the larger parishes, and in consequence of this we find two kinds of canons, those of the cathedrals<sup>1</sup> and those of the collegiate churches, as they came to be called. The Council of Aachen (817) laid down new prescriptions,<sup>2</sup> some of which are embodied in the longer recension of Chrodegang's rule, which also includes yet other regulations. So excellent a means of infusing new intellectual and moral life into the clergy was soon adopted widely, yet the institution was destined to be short-lived. The common life of the canons may have proved impracticable owing to inequality of fortune, each canon, unlike a monk, being permitted to retain his private property, and the difficulties of independent community life were probably increased by the political upheavals which followed. The dissolution of the chapters seems to have begun at Cologne when Günther, the archbishop, issued directions to the canons of the cathedral and other foundations of the city, permitting them to resume the administration of the properties destined for their sustenance. A like right was soon after granted to other chapters, and gradually the canons ceased to dwell in common, or to share their income. In most places the institution had reached its end before the beginning of the eleventh century.

## § 97

### Legal Status of the Clergy—Princely Nominations to Church Offices

I. For a time the clergy of the West continued to be amenable to secular law, though they were afterwards released from this disability. The alteration was justified by the Germanic legal principle that each one may live according to his law, and by the claim so repeatedly urged by Pseudo-Isidore, that a clergyman may be judged only by his peers; even so, the adoption of the system was a matter of ages, and the *Privilegium fori*, or privilege of clergy, was not

<sup>1</sup> German, *Dom*; Italian, *duomo*; from [*ecclesia in*] *domo* (sc. *episcopii*).

<sup>2</sup> HARDUIN, IV, 1055-1147; HEFELE, IV, 9-13.

universally or fully acknowledged till subsequently to the period now under review.

II. This privilege was one in which all the clergy shared, but among the Franks the higher clergy were granted certain political privileges over and above.<sup>1</sup> There we find the bishops, from the middle of the seventh century onwards, acting in the capacity of counsellors to the king, just like secular noblemen; they owed this privilege equally to their position in the Church, and to the immense landed possessions which in the course of time had come into their hands. Certain Churches and monasteries were granted immunity by the Merovingian kings, *i.e.* were freed from taxes and enforced labour, and themselves became the recipients of the taxes and tithes due from the inhabitants of the freehold. In the ninth century this immunity was granted to nearly all the monasteries and Churches, and now began to carry with it jurisdiction, or the so-called Ban. Those dwelling on such exempted estates were to hold their right from the bailiff of the bishop or abbot. Prelates also obtained at an early date the right of imposing duties and of coining money. Finally, they acquired the rank and rights of earls. This right was granted in the first instance to the bishops of Langres (887) and Toul (927). Similar promotions became frequent in Germany under Otto III, and an increase took place not only in the number of ecclesiastical lords, but also in the extent of their possessions. Prelates gradually became civil princes, and what we may call, for want of a better word, clerical States grew numerous. The development was finally brought to its term by the letters of privilege of Frederick II (April 26, 1220) and Henry VII (May 1, 1231).

III. The greater the political importance of the higher ecclesiastical posts became, the more secular princes strove to win control over them.<sup>2</sup> Election, which even in the previous period had, among the Franks, been frequently a mere formality, was now replaced by the royal nomination. Since the tenth century it had been the rule to notify the royal will by investing the candidate with the ring and staff, which insignia,

<sup>1</sup> WAITZ, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.* VII; HAUCK, *KG. Deutschlands*, III, 56-68.

<sup>2</sup> IMBART DE LA TOUR, *Les élections épisc. dans l'Église de France du IX<sup>e</sup> au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 1891.

on the death of their bearer, were regularly handed back to the prince who had bestowed them. John X speaks of the royal nomination as a *prisca consuetudo* (921). It was only occasionally that a Church received the right of electing its own bishop; Lewis the Pious gave a general permission to this effect (817), and certain other rulers allowed it to take place exceptionally. The practice of leaving the decision to the secular ruler was not without its dangers. Some princes, heedless of the Church's prescriptions, bestowed ecclesiastical dignities on their own relatives and favourites. Many of the men promoted by Charles Martel to bishoprics were laymen, some of whom refused afterwards to be consecrated. We also hear of simony, but even canonical election was not safe from it, whilst, in the majority of cases, princes exercised their privilege of nomination to the Church's good.

IV. As among the German nations military service was attached to all landed possessions, whether secular or ecclesiastical, the Churches were under the necessity of furnishing military levies. This obligation frequently led to the clergy themselves accompanying their people to the wars, and occasionally fighting side by side with them, and this in spite of the canons which forbade a cleric to carry weapons; new prohibitions which were launched against this abuse, owing to the savagery of the time and the warlike spirit of the people, remained without effect.

## § 98

### The Church's Property and Revenues—Tithes—Ecclesiastical Advocates<sup>1</sup>

I. Ecclesiastical property which in the course of time, through donations and legacies, had grown to huge proportions, was greatly curtailed at the beginning of this period in the kingdom of the Franks. With the many wars which he had to wage, Charles Martel was unable to make the revenues of the lands belonging to the State meet the demands of his soldiers.

<sup>1</sup> A. BONDROIT, *De capacitate possidendi Ecclesiae . . . aetate Merovingia*, 1900; E. PERELS, *Die kirchl. Zehnten im karol. Reiche*, 1904; G. BLONDEL, *De advocatis ecclesiasticis*, 1892.

He accordingly bestowed the incomes of the Church establishments on laymen, in some cases transferring the properties bodily into lay hands. Under his successors, however, restitution was made, and though it may not have been total, we nevertheless find, soon after, the Churches and monasteries in possession of very considerable tracts of land.<sup>1</sup>

II. A new and important source of revenue which the Church tapped in this period was the **tithes**. Their payment had indeed been made obligatory even earlier, the Council of Macon (585, c. 5) having ordered it under threat of censure. This enactment does not appear to have secured obedience, but after the practice had been insisted on by Pipin (765) and Charles the Great (779) and enforced by several synods (Frankfort, 794; Mainz, 813) it became the general rule, first of all among the Franks, and then in the rest of the Church also. To begin with, only the products of the field were tithed, but soon, as we may see from the synod of Pavia (850, c. 17), all income, from whatever source, had to pay its dime. The new revenue at first went in its entirety to the parish church, but subsequently to the tenth century we find the Councils decreeing that a part of it shall be set aside for the bishop; this part is defined by the synod of Auch in Gascony (1068) as one-fourth.

III. With all its wealth the Church was often compelled to have recourse to law, and as according to Germanic notions a cleric could not sue in court, not being allowed to carry weapons, to say nothing of the unseemliness of a clergyman taking part in proceedings in which cases were decided by battle and other means equally trustworthy, it became necessary to appoint a Church representative or *Advocatus* to attend the court. Charles the Great directed all Churches to secure for themselves an agent of this kind.<sup>2</sup> His command may have been called forth by certain Churches which were ready to forgo the somewhat dubious advantage of a legal defender, deeming that to accept such would be to put themselves in a position of inferiority, or because they more than suspected the advocates of replenishing their purses at the expense of the establishments they professed to serve. This,

<sup>1</sup> WAITZ, *D. Verf.-Gesch.* 2nd ed. III, 13 ff.; K. RIBBECK, *Die sog. divisio des fränk. Kirchengutes in ihrem Verlaufe unter Karl M. u. s. Söhnen*, 1883.

<sup>2</sup> *Capit.* 783, c. 3; 802, I, 13; C. of Mainz, 813, c. 50.

the evil side of an institution meant for the Church's good, became later on more manifest, when the advocates began to tyrannise the Church instead of affording her protection.

## § 99

### The False Decretals and Later Collections of Canons<sup>1</sup>

I. During this period the Dionysian and Spanish collections of conciliar decrees (§ 65) continued to hold their own in the West, the former being mainly known in the form in which it existed in a codex presented to Charles the Great by Adrian I (774). But about the middle of the ninth century a new work made its appearance in western Gaul; its unknown author describes himself as *Isidorus Mercator*. The first witnesses to the existence of the work are the Councils of Soissons (853) and Quiercy (857), which both make use of it; they point to its having been composed among the Franks, and the same conclusion will be arrived at if the MSS. and the sources drawn upon in the collection be taken into consideration. The Decretals in question are found in two recensions, a shorter and a longer, of which only the latter is of interest to us at present, having, at an early date, completely ousted the other. Apart from the preface and the appendices, it falls into three parts, of which the first contains the fifty Apostolic Canons acknowledged in the West, fifty-nine Decretals or Papal Bulls and Briefs dating from Clement I to Miltiades, and the charter by which Constantine's Donation was made, whilst the second gives the Canons of the ancient Councils, which here are copied from the Spanish collection; the third part contains the Papal Decretals from Silvester I to Gregory II (314-731).

As for the object of the collection, the writer himself tells us that he wished *canonum sententias colligere et uno in volumine redigere et de multis unum facere*—in other words, that his intention was merely to compose a handy reference book

<sup>1</sup> *Decretales Pseudoisid. et capitula Angilrammi*, ed. P. HINSCHIUS, 1863; R. v. SCHERER, *KR.* I, 1885-86; SÄGMÜLLER, *KR.* I, 1900 (where a careful statement of the literature connected with the subject will be found); G. LURZ, *Über die Heimat Pseudoisidors*, 1898; W. SOMMER, *Inhalt, Tendenz u. kirchenrechtl. Erfolg der ps. D.* 1903; P. FOURNIER, *Études sur les Fausses Décrétales*, in the *RHE.* 1906.

of Canon Law. His intention is, however, no excuse for his wholesale fabrications. The papal briefs of the first part of his work are, every one of them, forgeries, and the same is true of many contained in the last portion of the work; nor can the author crave forgiveness on the score that much of the material he uses is really taken from early documents. More likely his real intention was to strengthen the hand of the bishops against both the metropolitans and the secular power. To this intention corresponds his eagerness to magnify the office of the primates and to convince the reader that *causae maiores* (by which he means *causae episcopales*) can be decided only by Rome. It may also have been his desire to heal to some extent the wounds produced in the Church by the civil wars under Lewis the Pious and his sons, and to better the Church's position. His effort may have been to second those of the Councils of Paris (829, 846), Aachen (836), and Meaux (845), but whether this be the case or not, Möhler was certainly wrong in taking this as the primary object of the work.

Since the work, in the main, is devoted to justifying customs which were already in possession, it would be an overstatement to say that Pseudo-Isidore founded an entirely new system of Canon Law. But his importance must not be under-estimated. By reserving to the Holy See the decision of the *causae maiores*, which had formerly been a privilege of the provincial synods, he helped mightily to forward the cause of the Roman primacy.

The decretals were made use of at Rome first by Nicholas I, who appeals to them when quashing the decision of the bishops of Gaul, who in 864 had deposed Rothadius, bishop of Soissons (*N.A.* XXV, 1900, pp. 652-63; according to the *Hist. J.* 1904, pp. 1-33, he was acquainted with only a few passages of the Decretals, and did not find his pretension on them at all), and throughout the Middle Ages they were generally held to be genuine. It was only their binding force which was questioned at first, for instance by Hinkmar of Rheims in the case of his nephew and namesake of Laon. The first real doubts as to their credibility were expressed in the fifteenth century by Nicholas of Cusa and Juan de Torquemada, and though their strictures did not then succeed in shaking the deep-rooted general persuasion, yet in the next century, as soon as the collection had been widely circulated by means of the press (it was first printed by Merlin in his *Collectio Conciliorum*, 1523), the fraudulent nature of the composition was borne in on all

The arguments adduced by the Jesuit Torres for their authenticity against the Magdeburg Centuriators were triumphantly confuted by the Protestant theologian Blondel (*Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*, 1622).

II. The gradual accumulation of decrees and other canonical matter, and the diversity of needs, continued after the time of Pseudo-Isidore to call for the formation of new collections. The age immediately subsequent to his was exceedingly prolific in these productions. No less than thirty-six are known to have existed prior to the twelfth century. Most of these have, however, never been printed; the more important are:

1. *Libellus de synodalibus causis et disciplinis*, by Regino of Prüm († 915), a handbook for episcopal visitations. *P.L.* 132; WASSERSCHLEBEN, 1840.

2. *Collectarium* or *Decretum* by Burkhard, bishop of Worms († 1025), a collection intended for the instruction of the younger clergy. *P.L.* 140. Mg. by A. M. KÖNIG, 1905.

3. *Collectio canonum* by Cardinal Deusdedit, composed at the end of the eleventh century; ed. MARTINUCCI, 1869. V. Wolf v. Glanvell, 1905.

4. *Panormia* by Ivo, bishop of Chartres († 1116) *P.L.* 161.

## CHAPTER V

### WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, AND MORALS

#### § 100

#### Liturgy, Communion, Preaching, and Chant

I. WHEREAS in antiquity considerable divergencies had been tolerated in the Liturgy,<sup>1</sup> with the advent of the Middle Ages a certain oneness of ceremonial was secured. In the orthodox East the Liturgy of Constantinople gradually became supreme, whilst in the West the Roman rite spread farther and farther. The Council of Cloveshove (747, c. 13) prescribed its use in the whole of England, whilst through the action of Pipin and Charles the Great it soon prevailed over the whole Frankish Empire, save at Lyons, where the old Gallican Liturgy remained in force, though even here certain details were adopted from the Roman rite. Alexander II and Gregory VII succeeded in introducing it into Spain in the eleventh century, and the old Spanish, or Mozarabic, Liturgy was soon banished from all the Churches of the country, save from a few, such as Toledo. The same rite was adopted for Scotland by Queen Margarite († 1093) and for Ireland by Malachy, archbishop of Armagh, in the twelfth century. Attempts were also made by Charles the Great, Nicholas II, and others to impose the Roman usage on the Milanese, but so strong was the attachment of the people to the old Ambrosian rite, that the attempts were doomed to failure. Whilst older Liturgies were being thus displaced in most regions of the West, a new one had come into being in the middle of the ninth century among the Slavs of Moravia and Illyria; it was the work

<sup>1</sup> KRIEG, *Die liturg. Bestrebungen im karol. Zeitalter*, †888; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, IV, 3.

of Methodius (§ 83), and, owing to its language, was known as the Slavonic rite.

So far the general practice had been to celebrate the Liturgy in conjunction with, and in the presence of, the community. The clergy were accordingly wont to receive Communion with the laity from the hand of the bishop or priest who acted as celebrant, just as is still done now on Maundy Thursday. Subsequently to the seventh century a change occurred, and the public celebration began to be supplemented by the private Mass, which a priest could read with the assistance of a single server, and at which he administered Communion to himself. There were some who went so far as to dispense even with the server, but this abuse was soon forbidden as repugnant to the Liturgy, and the presence of at least one person to represent the absent community was prescribed. It was also the custom in places for one and the same priest to celebrate several Masses on the same day; some Councils (Dingolfing, 932; Mainz, 950-54) even insisted on three Masses being said during Lent and on other fast-days. It would seem that some of the clergy were not satisfied even with this limit, for the Council of Seligenstadt in 1022 (c. 5) forbids more than three Masses to be said on the same day.

II. The increase in the number of Masses was accompanied by a concomitant decrease in lay Communions.<sup>1</sup> The Church, indeed, continued to counsel frequent **Communion**, but she was content to insist on the Holy Eucharist being received two or three times annually; many communicated once only in the year.

From the eighth or ninth century it had become the custom in the West to use unleavened bread at the altar. To prevent accidents, the practice also arose of using small hosts, one being reserved for each communicant, instead of the loaves which it had been necessary to break. For a like reason the consecrated particle was now no longer placed in the hands, but on the tongue, of the communicant. In the Eastern Church it became the practice to dip the consecrated Bread in the wine, and to communicate the Faithful with a spoon.

<sup>1</sup> SIRMOND, *Disquisitio de Azymo*. *Opp.* t. V. MABILLON, *Diss. de pane euchar. azymo ac fermentato*, 1674; *Vet. Analecta*, ed. 1723, pp. 522-47. FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 298-308; *Theol.-pr. Qu.-Schr.* 1906, pp. 95-109 (rite of Communion).

This practice soon became general, though at first it was only adopted to suit the convenience of the sick and of little children ; it was even introduced into Spain, but was there forbidden by the Council of Braga, c. 675 (c. 2).

III. The **sermon**<sup>1</sup> continued to hold an important place in public worship. The obligation of preaching the Word of God was frequently insisted on, and, to help even the unlearned to fulfil this duty, sermonaries were compiled. The most popular collections were the Homilies of Bede and the Homiliarium compiled from the works of the Fathers by Paul Warnefrid at the command of Charles the Great. These works were written in Latin, but the sermons were to be delivered in the vernacular. This was enforced by several Councils (813, Mainz, c. 25 ; Rheims, c. 15), whilst others (Tours, 813, c. 17 ; Mainz, 847, c. 2) ordered the publication of official translations. In most parishes sermons seem to have been regularly delivered.

The **Roman Chant** found its way among the Franks with the Roman rite. Charles the Great obtained a number of Roman choristers, and established schools of church music at Metz and Soissons. The monastery of St. Gall also was noted for the care with which it cultivated the art of chanting. But the Gregorian, simple or plain, Chant did not hold its own, and c. 900 it was displaced by a chant in several voices, the transition being effected by a harmony in two voices. The invention and introduction of this chant is ascribed to Hukbald, a monk of St. Amand in Flanders († 930). On the invention, by Guido of Arezzo († 1050), of a method of representing notes on two, or four, horizontal lines, a great progress was achieved in musical notation. Another important invention, that of the measure, was due to Franko, a priest of Cologne, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, who suggested that the length of the sounds should be indicated by the shape (*figura*) of the notes. It is to his invention that figured or measured music, as distinct from the merely choral, owes its origin. It was also in the period under consideration that the organ came into use as an accompaniment to the chant. The earliest organs were, however, of very rude construction, and it was only at a later period that the instrument assumed large proportions. The example of the use of such instruments in the churches seems to have been set by Pipin the Short and Charles the Great, who presented the organs which they had received in gift from Byzantium to the Churches of Aachen and Compiègne.

<sup>1</sup> KÖLLNER-LINSENMEYER, *Gesch. d. Predigt in Deutschland von Karl d. Gr. bis zum Ende des 14. Jahrh.* 1886 ; WIEGAND, *Das Homiliarium Karls d. Gr.* 1897 (*Studien zur Gesch. d. Th. u. d. K.* I, 2.

## § 101

The Penitential Discipline<sup>1</sup>—Church Penalties

I. A slight mitigation took place in the penitential discipline when, after the ninth century, it ceased to be necessary to perform public penance for any save public crimes, private sins, or sins known to the priest alone, being atoned for in private. In another direction, however, the Church's discipline became more severe. The category of public crimes, for which public penance had to be performed, was notably enlarged: not only murder, manslaughter, adultery and fornication, but the abduction of a maiden or widow, usury, perjury, false witness, robbery, arson, fortune-telling, witchcraft, incest—under which was also comprised marriage within the forbidden degrees—now entered the class of public sins. Nor was the performance of the penance left any longer to the free-will of the sinner. A refusal to perform the allotted penance not only entailed ecclesiastical censure, but the sinner could be compelled by the secular arm to undertake it. The penitential works or penalties consisted principally in fastings, in banishment, in enforced pilgrimages, in scourgings, or in relegation to the cloister. By the Council of Worms (868, c. 30) penitents were, however, declared capable of contracting marriage even during the period of their penance. The time of Lent seems to have been especially devoted to the performance of penance, the imposition generally taking place on Ash Wednesday, and absolution being granted on Maundy Thursday.

To determine the quality and quantity of the penance, and more especially to direct private penitents, books called **Penitentials** were now put in circulation. Of these the most famous is that which bears the name and is based on the regulations of Theodore of Canterbury. The number and diversity of these works led to confusion, and even to a certain laxity, which in the beginning of the ninth century caused

<sup>1</sup> MORINUS, *Comment. hist. de disciplina in administr. S. Poenitentiae*, 1651; WASSERSCHLEBEN, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländ. K.* 1857; H. J. SCHMITZ, *Bussbücher u. Bussdisziplin*, 1883; *Bussbücher u. Bussverfahren*, 1898; *KL.* II, 1573 ff. KOBER, *Der Kirchenbann*, 1863; *Das Interdikt*, in the *A. f. k. KR.* vol. 21, 22. HINSCHIUS, *Kirchenrecht*, V, 19-32.

a violent outbreak of opposition. They were already too firmly established to be got rid of so easily, but we nevertheless find the Councils and Popes of the succeeding age reverting to the ancient discipline. As great stress seems to have been laid just then on the Greek canons, it is no matter of surprise to find that the ancient eastern practice of stations became for a time the rule in the West.

The practice of redeeming penance, which had originated in the previous period, now led to an alteration of far-reaching consequences in the penitential discipline. Among the penalties into which due penance might be commuted was that of almsgiving, and it had also, even earlier, been a custom among penitents to seek the aid of others in performing the penance imposed: thence it was an easy step to the practice of buying-off a penance at the price of money. Subsequent to the eighth century the Penitentials contain tariffs showing the sums which, should he be unable to fast, the penitent must devote to pious works. So far as public penance is concerned, such buying-off cannot be traced farther back than the ninth century, and the Council of Tribur (895, c. 56), which first allows it, does so only in certain special cases, and requires a solid motive, besides insisting on the performance of a part of the penance. It was evidently not the intention of the Council to detract from the severity or the reality of the penitential practice; it merely aimed at accommodating as far as possible the Church's discipline to the case of the penitent: yet its decision opened out a way by which the Church's laws might be evaded, besides conducing to the crime of sacerdotal avarice. In 1048 the Council of Rouen (c. 18) was obliged to forbid the clergy to increase or diminish through such motives the penances they imposed on their flock.

II. Little by little the penitential discipline was losing its old severity, but in the meantime the Church's power of punishing was steadily increasing. Excommunication gradually came to mean exclusion from all intercourse with Christians, and as, even in this meaning, it was occasionally insufficient to produce obedience, an aggravation of the penalty was devised in the form of the **Interdict**, by which permission was withdrawn for the holding of public services in a determined region, whether great or small. This punishment may be said

to reach farther back, as individual bishops, to ensure submission, or on other grounds, had occasionally directed the closing of local churches. But as a recognised means of punishment it makes its appearance only in the tenth century. At first the interdict was accompanied by excommunication, and was directed against all who should unlawfully seize a church or diocese, but in the following century it came to be used alone. As in the beginning it was pronounced either by a bishop or by a Council, it also allowed of considerable diversity: in some places it involved the entire cessation of Divine worship, whereas in others not only might Baptism and the last Sacraments be administered, but Divine worship might also take place privately, *i.e.* with closed doors. The latter, indeed, soon became the general rule, till little by little the interdict was robbed of much of its ancient terror.

## § 102

### Feast-days and Fasts <sup>1</sup>

I. The calendar was during this period enriched by many new feasts. In the first instance each Apostle and Evangelist was assigned a special celebration. This would seem, indeed, to have been the case even from the very beginning of the period, seeing that the practice is mentioned in Chrodegang's rule (c. 30). In the tenth century the feasts of Easter and Whitsun assumed less importance, in this sense, that their octaves were no longer regarded in the light of one prolonged feast, only the earlier days within the octave continuing to be reckoned as festivals. But the decrease in importance is apparent only, as some restriction in the number of days was necessary to give the event a character of special solemnity. Other feasts which then came to be generally kept were those of the Holy Innocents, of All-Hallows, and of St. Martin. We must also mention the patronal feasts of the Churches, to keep which was a universal custom, though the feast was, of course, observed on different days in different localities. Other feasts such as those of the Finding of the Cross or Holyrood, of St. Lawrence, and of St. Michael, were very widely kept. The feast of All-Souls, though

<sup>1</sup> FUNK, *A. u. U.* I, 266-78 (Lenten fast).

it never obtained the status of a holiday of obligation, was a popular festival even from its first establishment. It was first introduced into the monastery and congregation of Cluny by Abbot Odilo (998), and soon spread over the whole Western Church.

II. The number of fast-days increased with that of the feasts. Lent, which, so far, had contained only thirty-six days, was prolonged to forty days, its beginning being put back to the Wednesday previous to the first Sunday *in Quadragesima*, or Ash Wednesday, as it came to be called from the custom of placing ashes on the heads of the Faithful—a custom which had been made obligatory on the whole Church by Urban II at the Council of Benevento (1091). The forty days' fast, which had become the rule at Rome in the seventh century, was soon adopted together with the Roman rite throughout the whole of the West, except at Milan. At about the same time the Sundays *in Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima*, and *Quinquagesima* make their appearance, and serve the purpose of a kind of preparation for Lent. In the Eastern Church an eighth week was added to the original seven, though this week was one merely of abstinence from flesh-meat. With this one exception, during the whole of Lent, even on Sundays and Saturdays (the latter day not being under ordinary circumstances a fast-day in the East), meat, eggs, and cheese were forbidden, only one meal a day was allowed, and the fast was not to be broken before the hour of None; all rejoicing, hunting, weddings, intercourse between man and wife, and the holding of courts of justice were prohibited. Towards the end of the period it became the custom during Lent to conceal the decorations of the high altar behind a curtain, symbolical of the mortification of the season, and therefore known as the 'hunger-veil.' The three periodical three-day fasts observed at Rome (§ 69) now came to be generally kept elsewhere, and a fourth was added and placed in the spring, though, as it fell in Lent, it made but little difference; these so-called Ember Days,<sup>1</sup> on account of their occurring four times in the year, came to be styled *Ieiunium Quatuor Temporum*. The practice soon arose of conferring ordination on these days.

<sup>1</sup> Ember=(T) *empor (um)*, a corruption possibly connected with [*Sept-*] *ember*.

An increase also took place in the number of fasting vigils, nearly all the feasts obtaining the dignity of a vigil; especially was this the case with the feasts of Apostles. Fasting was also enforced on the three Rogation Days. Certain Councils enjoined the keeping of a fast of a fortnight or three weeks in preparation for Christmas and for the Feast of St. John the Baptist; in this instance, however, custom varied.<sup>1</sup> Every Friday in the year was reckoned a day of abstinence, except when it coincided with a great feast,<sup>2</sup> and from the eleventh century the same rule held widely for the Saturday also.<sup>3</sup>

Among the Greeks the Sunday previous to the eighth week before Easter is called *Κυριακή τῆς ἀπόκρεω* (or 'Sunday of Abstinence'); the following Sunday, which marks the beginning of the real fast, is termed *Κυριακή τῆς τυροφάγου* (or 'Sunday of Cheese-eating'). The two previous Sundays are called after the Gospel read on them, the tenth being *Κυριακή τοῦ τελώνου καὶ τοῦ φαρισαίου* (or 'Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee'), and the ninth *Κυριακή τοῦ ἀσώτου* (or 'Sunday of the Prodigal'), and both these weeks form, like the period which in the Latin Church begins with Septuagesima, a kind of remote preparation for Easter. The whole period of the ten weeks received later on the name of *Τριῶδιον*; the period from Easter to the Octave of Whitsun was called *Πεντηκοστάριον*, and the rest of the ecclesiastical year, *Ὀκτώηχος*.

## § 103

### Saint and Relic Worship<sup>4</sup>

Whereas the veneration of images was opposed in both East and West, that of the saints was everywhere popular. New feasts were established in their honour; their tombs were the object of many visits, this being especially the case with the tombs of the Apostles at Rome, and those of St. James of Compostella and St. Martin of Tours, to which pilgrimages were almost as frequent as to the holy places at Jerusalem. Their remains, or even fragments of them, were everywhere in great demand, and though at first their relics were religiously preserved in the churches, it soon became customary to carry them about in procession, to

<sup>1</sup> *Nicol. I Resp. ad consulta Bulg.* c. 4, 9, 44-48; Statutes of the Councils of Erfurt, 932; Dingolfing, 932; c. 2, Seligenstadt, 1022, c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Nicol. I Resp.* c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, V, 2, 165 ff.

<sup>4</sup> BEISSEL, *Verehrung der Heiligen u. Reliquien in Deutschland*, 1890-92; *Mélanges G. B. de Rossi*, 1892, pp. 73-95 (*Suppl. aux Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist. de l'École française de Rome*, t. XII).

bear them in battle, and to dispose of them in exchange for alms destined for the building of churches. As a protest against spoliation of church property, or to lend force to an ecclesiastical decree, they were occasionally taken down from their normal place on the altar and laid on the floor among thorns and thistles.

Culture being at the time at a very low ebb, it is no wonder if the practice issued in abuse. The Council of Châlons (813, c. 45), for instance, recalls St. Jerome's severe strictures against pilgrimages (§ 70, III). The unenlightened zeal of the people also led them to ascribe sanctity too easily to those they had revered; this tendency was rebuked by the Council of Frankfort (794, c. 42) and forbidden by a capitulary of Charles the Great (805, c. 17). Not unfrequently an exaggerated value was set on relics, and in consequence many were tempted to obtain them by unlawful means; whilst others, in their avarice, actually brought spurious relics into circulation. It is against this latter practice that the decree of the Second Council of Lyons (1247, c. 17) is directed, which speaks of the 'debasement' of images and relics.

The capitulary of Charles the Great, of which we spoke above, forbids the worship of any new saint save by the bishop's leave. Hence the decision of the question as to whether a person was to be reckoned as a saint belonged to the bishop in whose diocese that person had lived. If it was intended to give a saint public worship beyond the limits of the diocese, then the canonisation of the saint was required to take place before an assembly of several bishops, all the bishops of the province being usually convoked for the occasion. Cases of holy men who had passed their lives in far-off lands might also be left to the judgment of a Roman Council; the first instance in point is the canonisation of Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg, by the Lateran Council of 993.

## § 104

### Monasticism

In consequence of the wealth of some of the monasteries, and of the wholesale bestowal of abbacies on laymen by Charles Martel, monasticism in the eighth century fell into a state of considerable decay. At the beginning of the ninth century, in consequence of the labours of Benedict, abbot of Aniane,<sup>1</sup> and of the reforming Council of Aachen in 817, which promulgated new statutes, great improvements were effected, but in the political turmoils which ensued, order and discipline

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by NICOLAI, 1865; *Z. f. KG*, XV, 244-60 (Benedict's Rules); W. PÜCKERT, *Aniane u. Gellone*, 1899.

were soon as bad as ever. The abbeys again came into lay hands, and if credence can be given to the complaints of the Council of Troslé in the diocese of Soissons (909), the cloisters were filled with women and children, soldiers and hounds, whilst the monks tramped the country or else surrendered themselves to a life of pleasure. But at this same time, by the establishment of the monastery of **Cluny** in Burgundy (910), duke William of Aquitania and abbot Berno laid the foundation of a congregation, which became the starting-point of a widespread reform of monasticism, the good spirit which ruled that cloister under Berno being maintained by a succession of worthy abbots, Odo (924-41), Aymard, Majolus, and Odilo (994-1048), till Cluny grew to be the model of all other monasteries. The actual Cluniac reform had already been adopted in nearly 2,000 monasteries by the beginning of the twelfth century.<sup>1</sup>

Early in the eleventh century two Benedictine congregations were started in Italy: that of the **Camaldolese**, which originated (c. 1018) in the hermitage at Camaldoli, near Arezzo, and at the monastery in the Val de Castro, and of which the parent was St. Romwald, a scion of the house of the Honesti of Ravenna; and the congregation of the **Vallombrosians**, styled after the monastery of Vallombrosa, and first established by John Gualbert in the neighbourhood of his native city, Florence (1038).

Lastly, the monastery of Hirsau, in Swabia, as soon as it had been reorganised on the model of Cluny by William the Blessed (1071),<sup>2</sup> also contributed greatly to the better observance of the religious life, though this monastery never became the mother house of a separate congregation. Whereas Cluny, at least from the time of Odilo, retained a sort of sovereignty over all the houses which adopted its reform, this was never the case with Hirsau.

Whereas the monks of antiquity had nearly all of them been laymen, in the mediæval monasteries priests were plentiful. The latter devoted themselves to the church services, to the education of youth, and to study, whilst the manual labour

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by LORRAIN (1858); PIGNOT (909-1157), 2 vol. 1868; O. RINGHOLZ (*Odilo*, 1885); E. SACKUR (*Die Cl. in ihr. kirchl. . . . Wirksamkeit*), 2 vol. 1892-94.

<sup>2</sup> KERKER, *Wilhelm d. Sel.* 1863; *Württemberg. KG.* 1893, pp. 108-27; *Festschrift z. Jub. d. d. Campo santo in Rom.* 1897, pp. 115-29.

was left to the lay monks, known as *fratres conversi*, *barbati*, or *laici*. This division of monks into two distinct classes, whenever it may have begun,<sup>1</sup> was achieved by the end of our period, and soon became general.

A privilege which the monasteries obtained was their **Exemption**.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Chalcedon (c. 4) had placed every religious house under the bishop of the diocese in which it was situate, and this enactment was ratified by later Councils, such as that of Aachen in 802 (c. 15). Now, however, many monasteries were exempted from the bishops' jurisdiction and transferred to the immediate jurisdiction of Rome. There are cases of this privilege even in the seventh century, an instance being that of Bobbio in 628, but it became frequent only after it had been conferred on Cluny in 949, all the affiliated monasteries sharing in the privilege of the mother house. In the course of time it also became customary to interpret as an exemption any brief by which Rome assumed the protection of a monastery. Exemption was usually granted in return for a tax payable annually to the Holy See.

## § 105

### Religion and Morals<sup>3</sup>

I. The conversion of the Germanic tribes, having been effected so rapidly, consisted in little more than a mere change of belief; once converted, it was necessary to bring them to lead a Christian life. Nor was it at all easy to uproot certain pagan habits of mind, and many superstitious notions and practices, such as the use of amulets, remained as relics of their former paganism. Some of these practices clothed themselves in

<sup>1</sup> Cp. HOFFMANN as in § 127, B. II.

<sup>2</sup> A. BLUMENSTOCK, *Der päpstliche Schutz*, 1890; K. F. WEISS, *Die kirchl. Exemtionen der Klöster bis zur gregorianisch-cluniacensischen Zeit*, 1893; P. FABRE, *Étude sur le Liber censuum de l'Église romaine*, 1892; A. f. k. KR. 1906 (*Klöst. Exemption in der abendländ. K.*).

<sup>3</sup> RETTBERG, *KG. D. II*, 113-18; SCHINDLER, *Der Aberglaube des M.A.* 1858; FEHR, *Staat u. Kirche im fränk. Reiche*, 1869; OBERLE, *Überreste german. Heidentums im Christentum*, 1883; C. MEYER, *Der Aberglaube des M.A. u. der nächstfolg. Jahrh.* 1884; DRESNER, *Kultur- u. Sittengesch. der ital. Geisl. im 10 u. 11 Jahrh.* 1890; DAHN, *Studien zur Gesch. der germanischen Gottesurteile*, 1857; PATETTA, *Le Ordalie*, 1890; LEA, *Superstition and Force*, 4th ed. 1892.

a Christian garb: such was the *Sortes Sanctorum* (sc. *Biblicorum*), which consisted in foretelling the future, or in discerning the will of God by opening a Bible haphazard and reading the first sentence which caught the eye; another custom which assumed a Christian character was that of the Ordeals. The former practice was indeed discountenanced, but the latter, consisting in trial by fire, by water, by the Cross or Sacrament, by combat, &c., agreed too well with the childlike faith of the times to be affected by the occasional protests which it called forth. These ordeals fell into disuse only subsequently to their condemnation by Innocent III, who denounced them as a temptation of God, and forbade the bestowal of the priestly blessing on the objects used in such trials.

II. Robbery and revenge, cruelty, rudeness, and the grossest sensuality continued to prevail among the convert Germans, whilst blood-feuds and duels led to the commission of frequent acts of violence. As these evils, in the absence of any secular power able to secure respect for the law, could not be entirely obviated, the Church made it her business to find means to restrain them within due bounds. It was due to her efforts that, soon after 1040, for the first time a *Treuga Dei*, or **Truce of God**,<sup>1</sup> was proclaimed by Councils assembling in France. According to a synodal decree issued in 1042, under penalty of severe censure no private act of revenge was to be perpetrated in Normandy, between Advent and the Octave of the Epiphany, between the beginning of Lent and the Octave of Easter, between the Rogation Days and the Octave of Whitsun, or finally, at any time between Wednesday evening and Monday morning. The actual times differed, however, according to the locality. The Church also strove, by the imposition of penance and by preaching, to diminish cases of violence, and here again her action was not in vain. Nor must we forget that the history of the period contains many a bright page, that we find in it shining examples of true repentance, of childlike piety, of self-sacrifice and charity. It is not without reason that the Church has been called the tutor of the Germanic nations.

III. As to the clergy in particular, its state was by no means

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by KLU HON, 1857; FEHR, 1861; SEMICHON, 1869; C. F. KÜSTER, 1902.

the same everywhere during this period. As might be expected, its condition under the reign of the warlike Charles Martel was less satisfactory than under his grandson Charles the Great, who was so concerned that the life of the clergy should be in keeping with their office; similar differences are noticeable later. Again, whilst in some countries, for instance in Germany under the Saxon and early Salian emperors, a good spirit animated the clergy, in others the Church appears in a much more unfavourable light. Thus Peter Damian in his *Liber Gomorrhianus*, though not without manifest exaggeration, depicts the state of the clergy in very dark colours. The law of celibacy proved especially irksome among the uneducated nations of German descent. In Spain, for instance, it was formally abrogated early in the eighth century by King Witiza. Elsewhere, indeed, it came to be insisted on more severely than ever, especially in the ninth century, but there can be no doubt that, in spite of all this, multitudes of priests were living in the married state. The Lombards in particular considered it as one of the liberties of the Ambrosian Church. With the crime of priestly incontinency, or Nicolaite heresy, as it was called from the end of our period (*Apoc.* ii. 6, 15), was associated the other priestly crime of simony.

These evils encountered many determined adversaries, but they were perhaps most effectually opposed by the institution of the canonical life. In England they were assailed by **Dunstan**, archbishop of Canterbury († 988), and in the middle of the eleventh century the Roman See also began to have recourse to severe measures to secure the observance of the Church's laws. At about this time there was formed at Milan a party known as the Pataria, pledged to reintroduce the observance of the canons. This party was led by the clerics Anselm, Arialdus, and Landulf, and later on by the latter's brother, the knight Herlembald. Their efforts were seconded by a number of bishops, such as Conrad of Constance († 934), Bruno of Cologne († 965), Ulrich of Augsburg († 973), Wolfgang of Ratisbon († 994), Willigis of Mainz († 1011), Bernward († 1022), and Godehard († 1075) of Hildesheim, and Anno II of Cologne († 1075).

## CHAPTER VI

### LITERATURE AND EDUCATION <sup>1</sup>

#### § 106

#### Greek Literature

OWING to the attack made on images during this period, the interest of theologians was naturally directed to their defence. Three men are more particularly noted for their efforts in this connection. Of these the first is **John Damascene** († 749),<sup>2</sup> for a time counsellor to the caliph of Damascus, and afterwards monk at the lavra of Mar Sabas near Jerusalem; the second is Nicephorus, at first Secretary of State, then a monk, and finally patriarch of Constantinople (806-15); the third is Theodore Studita, abbot of the Studium monastery († 826). John Damascene is also known on account of other works: he compiled the *Sacra Parallela*, a kind of Florilegium; his greatest work is, however, that which bears the title *Fons Scientiae*. It comprises, besides an elementary treatise on philosophy and a history of heresy, an exposal of Christian doctrine, which, coming after the controversies of the previous period, the results of which it embodies, became the first, and also the most influential, handbook of the Eastern theologians. It is on the strength of this work that John of Damascus is included among the Greek doctors, whose list ends with his name.

<sup>1</sup> K. KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzant. Literatur* (527-1453), 1891; 2nd ed. 1897. F. A. SPECHT, *Gesch. des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland v. d. alt. Zeiten bis z. Mitte des 13 Jahrh.* 1885; DENK, *Gesch. des gallo-fränkischen Unterrichts- u. Bildungswesens*, 1892; H. HURTER, *Nomenclator liter.* I, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. LEQUIEN, 2 fol. 1712; P.G. 94-96. Mg. by LANGEN, 1879; LUPTON, 1884; K. HOLL (the *Sacra parallela*) 1897; Διοβουιλότης, 1903, AINSLEE, 3rd ed. 1903; V. ERMONT, 1904; *Echos d'Orient*, 1906, pp. 28-30 (for the year of his death).

The most noteworthy personage in the subsequent age was **Photius**, patriarch of Constantinople († 891),<sup>1</sup> renowned for his profound scholarship. He wrote, besides some polemical tracts and numerous letters, his great *Bibliotheca*, a work of immense importance for the history of Greek literature, in which over 280 books of every description, both sacred and profane, heathen and Christian, are dealt with. He is also the author of *Amphilochia*, a collection of explanations, theological, exegetical, dogmatical, and even philosophical, given in answer to questions asked by Amphilochius, metropolitan of Cyzicus, and constituting Photius's most important contribution to theology. On the other hand, his authorship of another work which bears his name, the *Nomocanon*, an ordered collection of the canons and of the civil laws affecting the Church, which is considered an authority by the Easterns, has lately been called into question. The next in importance among the Greek writers is **Simeon Metaphrastes**,<sup>2</sup> who lived in the latter half of the tenth century. He wrote the lives of many saints and martyrs, but his accounts contain too much of the marvellous to be of any great historical worth, though they enjoyed great popularity in the Middle Ages. Trenching on the next period we find Theophylactus, bishop of Achrida in Bulgaria, and Euthymius Zigabenus, a monk of Constantinople, both of whom were exegetists, though the latter also earned the reputation of a theologian and polemic through his *Panoplia*,<sup>3</sup> which was, later on, embodied with additions in the *Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei* of Nicetas Acominatus († 1206).

## § 107

### Latin Literature <sup>4</sup>

It would be unreasonable to expect much from the Germanic nations so soon after their conversion to Christianity. It was

<sup>1</sup> P.G. 101-4; HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, vol. III, 1869. 'Λόγοι και 'Ομιλίαι, ed. S. ARISTARCHES, 1901.

<sup>2</sup> P.G. 114-16; EHRHARD, *Die Legendensammlung des S. M.* in the *Festschrift z. Jub. d. d. Campo santo in Rom*, 1897; *R. Qu.* 1897, pp. 67-205.

<sup>3</sup> See *Echos d'Orient*, Sept. 1909, p. 257 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lat. Philologie des MA.* ed. L. I RAUBE, 1906 ff. A. EBERT, *Allg. Gesch. der Lit. im MA.* 3 vol. 1874-87; P, 1889. A. HAUCK, *KG. Deutschlands*, I-III (cp. § 79).

first of all necessary to cultivate their mental powers, and amidst the constant wars of the time this was no easy task. In this respect, too, the Church was their tutor. Instruction was imparted on the Græco-Roman system, beginning with the seven liberal arts, which were taught in two divisions, the lower, that of the Trivium, designed to teach correctness of speech, and consisting of Grammar, Rhetoric, and Dialectics, and the higher, or Quadrivium, being devoted to the four mathematical sciences of Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Music. The reading of MSS. was taught under Grammar. Theological instruction comprised the interpretation of Scripture, and the elements of knowledge necessary for the due performance of priestly work.

The good results of these educationary measures first became apparent in **England**,<sup>1</sup> where Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury († 690), a monk from Tarsus, and the Roman abbot Adrian, who accompanied him to his new home, had taken in hand the intellectual formation of the Anglo-Saxons. Early in the eighth century there flourished Aldhelm, the father of Anglo-Latin poetry, and **Venerable Bede** († 735), who, as his works show, had at his command the whole learning of his time, and who laid the foundation of English history with his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*; another well-known scholar of slightly later date was Alcuin of York. Education came indeed to a standstill in the ninth century while the raids and conquests of the Danes were in progress, though matters again improved a little under Alfred the Great (871-900), the founder of the English kingdom.

Efforts in a like direction began to be made among the **Franks** under the reign of Charles the Great. That prince, who was as much interested in the arts and sciences as in good government, not only summoned to his court the best scholars of the time, such as Alcuin, the Lombard Paul Warnefrid or Paulus Diaconus, the grammarian Peter of Pisa, and the poet Theodulf who afterwards became bishop of Orleans, besides bestowing special attention on the Palatine School which he had established at his court, but he also issued orders (789) to all the monasteries and cathedrals to erect schools, and

<sup>1</sup> K. WERNER, *Beda d. Ehrw. u. s. Zeit*, 1875; *Alcuin u. s. Jahrh.* 1876; GASKOIN, *Alcuin*, 1904; WEIS, *Alfred d. Gr.* 1852.

even urged parish priests to train pupils. The result of all these measures was eminently satisfactory, and though the learning of those times, owing to its entire dependence on the works of the Fathers, was lacking in the merit of originality, yet on the whole, and considering the circumstances, it was highly creditable.

The names of others who were in any way prominent for learning have already been mentioned when recording the controversies of the period. Such were Claudius of Turin, Agobard of Lyons, Jonas of Orleans, Dungal of St. Denis (§ 90), Paulinus of Aquileia (§ 91), Gottschalk, Rhabanus Maurus (*Kath.* 1902, II; J. HABLITZEL, in *Bibl. Studien*, XI, 3, 1906), Hinkmar of Rheims, Servatus Lupus, Prudentius of Troyes, Remigius of Lyons (§ 92), Paschasius Radbertus, Ratramnus, Scotus Eriugena, Berengar, Lanfranc (§ 93), Humbert of Silva Candida (§ 95). Others of whom we have not yet spoken are the following: Amalarius of Metz, author of *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (*P.L.* 105); Eginhard († c. 848), abbot of Seligenstadt and biographer of Charles the Great (*MG. SS.* 2); Walafrid Strabo of Reichenau († 849), who wrote the *Glossa ordinaria*, the *Liber de exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiae* (ed. KNÖPFLER, 1890), and other works; Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt († 853), a Church historian and exegetist; Æneas, bishop of Paris († 870), author of a *Liber adv. decem obiectiones Graecorum*; the Librarian Anastasius of Rome († c. 879), noted for his translations from the Greek, among which is that of the acts of the Seventh and Eighth General Councils; Notker Balbulus of St. Gall († 912), a Church poet who composed many hymns and sequences (his authorship of the *Media vita in morte sumus* is doubtful). The literary language then used was almost exclusively Latin, though a few works were even then written in the vernacular, for instance, the *Heliand* (= Heiland = Saviour), a Gospel epic composed in the time of Lewis the Pious (ed. by E. SIEVERS, 1878; Germ. Tr. by GREIN, 1869), and a version of the Gospels by the monk Otfrid of Weissenburg in Alsatia († c. 875, ed. by P. PIPER, 1878; O. ERDMANN, 1882; mg. by C. PFEIFFER, 1905), both of which are in Old German.

Towards the end of the ninth century there began a period of comparative inactivity. But though the tenth, compared with the previous or with the subsequent century, was indeed a dark age, the lamp of knowledge was not extinguished everywhere. At the abbey of St. Gall, for example, there lived during this age Ekkehard I († 973) and Ekkehard II († 990), Notker Physicus († 975), and Notker Labeo († 1022), to the latter of whom the German language owes much, as he was the first to use it for learned purposes (P. PIPER, *Die Schriften N. u. s. Schule*, 3 vol. 1882-83). At Rheims we meet the historian Flodoard and the learned Gerbert,

who later on became Pope Silvester II (mg. by SCHULTHESS, 1881; PICAVET, 1897). In Saxony there was Roswitha, the nun of Gandersheim, who not only set in metre the lives of the saints and other stories, but even cast them into dramatic form (ed. by BARACK, 1858, P. v. WINTERFELD, 1902; cp. *A. f. d. Stud. d. neueren Sprachen*, 1905, pp. 25-75). Another Saxon writer was Widukind of Corvey, whose *Res gestae Saxoniae*, though somewhat too patriotically one-sided, is interesting reading and of great value for the history of the country. Even Italy, the most backward country of the age, can show writers in the persons of Liutprand of Cremona and Atto of Vercelli († 960; mg. by J. SCHULTZ, 1886). The most important and at the same time individual writer of the century was the Netherlander Rather († 974), at one time bishop of Verona and Liège (mg. by A. VOGEL, 2 vol. 1854; H. KURTH, 2 vol. 1905).

In the eleventh century the most reputable centre of studies was the abbey school of Bec in Normandy, which owed its pre-eminence to the teaching of the abbot Lanfranc (MÖHLER, *Ges. Schr.* I, 32 ff.; PORÉE, *Hist. de l'abbaye du Bec*, 1901). Several chroniclers of note lived in the same century: Rodulfus Glaber (*Historia Francorum*, 900-1040), Hermannus Contractus at Reichenau († 1054), Adam of Bremen († c. 1068) and especially Lambert of Hersfeld, who, in the latter portion of his annals (which reach to 1077), becomes a true historian, writing both fully and ably of the events of recent years, though his bias against Henry IV to some extent spoils his work. Lastly, Peter Damian contributed so much to literature that he received the title of Doctor of the Church (mg. by KLEINERMANN, 1882).

## § 108

### Formation of the Clergy<sup>1</sup>

In spite of the traces which we find of intellectual life in the ninth century, the education of the clergy generally, and especially of the rural clergy, was deplorably deficient. In this there is of course nothing wonderful. Higher culture was a rare thing in those days, and, so far as it existed at all, it was to be found only in clerical abodes. The very difficulty of reproducing books made their circulation no easy matter. Under these circumstances it would be unreasonable to expect too much even from the clergy, especially as the situation in which most of them were placed was not of a nature to cause

<sup>1</sup> *Th. Qu.* 1868, pp. 86-118; 1875, pp. 35 ff., 57 ff. *Theol.-prakt. Quartalschrift*, 1902, pp. 260-69.

them to study. By far the greater number were quite content to know what was absolutely necessary for the due performance of their duties. This was the case not only during this one period, but during the whole of the Middle Ages.

The Council of Cloveshove<sup>1</sup> in England (747, c. 10) demands of the priest, besides the knowledge of the meaning of the Sacraments and ceremonies of the Church, that he be able to render into the vernacular the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Mass, and the rite of Baptism. The Council of Aachen (802) requires somewhat more: besides the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Mass, priests must also know by rote the whole Penitential, be able to translate the homilies of the Fathers and the rite of Baptism, and render the Liturgy according to the Roman method (HEFELE, IV, 744 f.; SPECHT, 62 f.). As about this time schools were being generally established, it is possible that the intellectual condition of the clergy was showing a slight improvement. This notwithstanding, many of the clergy were in a state of deep ignorance, though it is quite possible that the complaint of Charles the Great (*Ep.* 25, ed. JAFFÉ, p. 388), that many could not even recite the Creed or the Lord's Prayer, is not directed against the clergy (as was usually believed), but against godparents. The Council of Ravenna (1311, c. 16) merely required that parish priests and canons should be able to read and to sing; with regard to those who seek a *beneficium rurale et simplex*, it directs that it be not given them unless they can read a little (*aliqua litera*).

Of the state of the Eastern Church we know less than of that of the West. The Nicene Council of 787 (c. 2) passed a canon determining the knowledge required of a bishop, which would seem to indicate that the state of learning in the East was scarcely higher than in the West. It requires of the candidate to a bishopric that he know by heart the Book of Psalms, and that he be capable of reading and entering into the meaning of the canons, the Gospels, the Epistles of the Apostles, and the whole of Holy Scripture; that he live according to the commandments, and teach his people to do likewise.

<sup>1</sup> Now Cliffe in Kent.—Trans.

## II. THE MIDDLE AGES

### SECOND PERIOD

FROM GREGORY VII TO CELESTINE V (1073-1294)

### CHAPTER I

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE <sup>1</sup>

#### § 109

#### The Quarrel about Investiture—Ninth General Council, 1123 <sup>2</sup>

HILDEBRAND, from the day of his entrance into the service of the Roman Church, had played an important part in her government, and, on the death of Alexander II, he was left with the direction of affairs entirely in his hands. On being elected Pope, he assumed the name of **Gregory VII** (1073-85), and from his new position (in which according to all probability he had been confirmed by Henry IV) he continued to direct the reforms which his predecessors had left unfinished, namely, the war which they had begun against the evils of simony and clerical incontinency (cp. § 88).

But at the same time he also turned his attention to another matter, which had indeed been touched upon previously by Popes and Councils (Rheims, 1049, c. 1; Rome, 1059),

<sup>1</sup> For the literature, see § 85; also POTTHAST, *Regesta Pontif. Rom.* 2 vol. (1198-1304), 1874-75; HEFELE-KNÖPFLE, *CG.* vol. V-VI, 1886-90; J. LOSERTH, *Gesch. des späteren MA.* (1197-1492), 1903.

<sup>2</sup> *Registrum Greg. VII* (HARDUIN, VI *P.L.* 148; JAFFÉ, *Bibliotheca rer. Germ.* II), *MG. Libelli de lite imper. et pontif.* 3 vol. 1891-97. Mg. on Gregory VII by J. VOIGT, 2nd ed. 1848; GFRÖRER, 7 vol. 1850-61; DELARC, 3 vol. 1889-90; W. MARTENS, 2 vol. 1894; *D. Z. f. G.* XI (1894), 227-41; *N.A.* XXXI (1906), 159-79 (on the supposed Jewish descent of Gregory VII); MIRBT, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII*, 1894; *J. d. d. G.*: MEYER, *Heinrich IV u. Heinrich V*, I-V, 1890-1904; E. HÖHNE, *K. Heinrich IV nach dem Urteil seiner deutschen Zeitgenossen*, 1906; A. HAUCK, *KG. Deutschlands*, III, 3rd and 4th ed.

but which had never been pursued farther. The appointment to high position in the Church, as it had been practised in the previous period, brought the Church into a position of too great dependency on the State; it was also rendered the more intolerable by being frequently, especially of late, tainted with simony, Church offices being obtained at the price of money. Gregory accordingly, at the Lenten Council of 1075, made unlawful any conferring of an ecclesiastical dignity by a layman, and sanctioned this measure (1078-80) by further decrees, threatening censure on all its contraveners, *i.e.* on all who should dare so to confer or receive an office. But it was no easy thing to abolish at one stroke the practice of lay investiture, which, having prevailed so long, was now in possession. Rulers who had endowed the Church with crown lands had thereby acquired, as they thought, a right to have some part in the nomination of those who were to be set over these same lands, and they expected this supposed right of theirs to be taken into account. Hence the papal decree called forth a storm of opposition, more especially within the Empire.

The German crown was at this time worn by **Henry IV.** Left a mere child at his father's death, and having been brought up amid the unfavourable surroundings of a court in which the peers, spiritual and temporal, were each striving for the mastery; having been into the bargain spoilt by the kindness of Adelbert of Bremen, as soon as he arrived at the age of manhood he displayed such want of character and power of government, and even of ordinary self-control, that, as early as 1072 when he was declared of age, he was already hated and despised.

Scarcely had he been king a year than his deposition was mooted in Saxony, which had been the principal scene of his disorders. Seeing himself surrounded at home by enemies, Henry, whom Gregory was just then endeavouring to win over to his plans of reform, was inclined to lend a listening ear, and in an epistle full of humility he acknowledged the evil he had committed against the Church and promised amendment (1073). His contrition was not, however, very deep, and as soon as the Saxons had been overthrown at the battle of Hohenburg (1075), he returned to his former manner of life. He

again sought the company of the counsellors whom Alexander II had been obliged to excommunicate on account of their evil influence, and began to distribute the offices of the Church precisely as he had done before, appointing Tedald, for instance, to the archbishopric of Milan, though the see was not even vacant. Gregory indeed, even now, was willing to come to terms, but Henry was no longer disposed to meet him. On the contrary, when Gregory, beginning to despair of his conversion, had by verbal message threatened to excommunicate and depose him unless he showed signs of repentance, Henry, early in 1076, summoned Councils at Worms and Piacenza and proclaimed the deposition of the Pope, the emperor insolently notifying the decree to 'Hildebrand . . . the false monk.'

The step was a far-reaching one: war was now declared and blow followed blow. In the following Lent, Henry was excommunicated, all his subjects were released from their oath of fealty and forbidden to obey him. The measure was intended not so much to secure the king's dismissal as to compel him to second the Pope's reforms; but it did much more. Many princes forsook Henry, now that they had a pretext, and in the autumn of the same year the diet met at Tribur to discuss the election of a new king, but decided to allow Henry to continue in office, provided his excommunication was removed within a year. The king, who in the meantime had taken up his quarters at Oppenheim on the other side of the Rhine, promised obedience, or rather consented to withdraw the decree of Worms and apologise for his rudeness to the Pope. Gregory himself was invited to attend the parliament to be held at Augsburg on Candlemas Day 1077 and bring the dispute to an end. In the interval Henry, however, succeeded in making peace with the Church by performing penance at Canossa, the stronghold of Mathilda, countess of Tuscany, the powerful and zealous protectress of the Pope. The parliament which had been planned never met, for, on learning of the king's departure for Italy, the nobles refused to give Gregory a safe-conduct to Germany, and assembling at Forchheim they deposed Henry and chose as king his brother-in-law, Rudolf of Swabia (March 15, 1077).

Gregory was naturally displeased with this issue, and as it

was no easy thing to undo what had been done, he offered to arbitrate between the parties. But, though his intervention was accepted, neither side was inclined to rely on it alone, and ultimately Henry, his head turned by his victory at Flarchheim (January 1080), imperiously demanded his recognition, threatening otherwise to appoint a new Pope, a threat which he was soon to carry into effect. At the Lenten Council of 1080 Gregory bestowed the crown on Rudolf, and again banned and deposed Henry, thus finally consummating the breach. This measure only increased the violence of the storm, Henry retorting at the Council of Brixen, held in the ensuing summer, by again deposing Gregory, and by appointing him a successor in Wibert, archbishop of Ravenna. That same year Rudolf was slain in the battle on the Elster, and Henry now marched on Rome to give battle to the Pope and secure the crown of the Empire. But his hope of quickly making himself master of the city was not so easily fulfilled. The gates of Rome were closed against him, and it was not until the spring of 1084 that he succeeded in making his entry. Nor would the Pope, in spite of the entreaties of the Romans, consent to be reconciled. Henry was accordingly crowned by Wibert, who now assumed the name of **Clement III**. Gregory, whose only retreat was the castle of Sant' Angelo, seemed on the point of falling into the hands of his enemies, when there appeared on the scene the Norman duke Robert Guiscard.

Gregory was now indeed delivered from the power of his foe, but Rome was no longer a secure dwelling. Quarrels between the Normans and Romans led to the looting and burning of the city and inhuman treatment of its inhabitants, so that there soon grew up an intensely bitter feeling against him who had called such cruel strangers to his help. Gregory had, therefore, to abandon Rome to the anti-Pope and spend the remainder of his life at Monte Cassino and Salerno, finding his last resting-place in the cathedral of the latter city. His words, uttered when at the point of death (May 25, 1085), *Dilexi iustitiam et odi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio*, show that even his expulsion from the Chair of Peter had not availed to shake his persuasion of having fought for a good cause.

The schism which closed his pontificate was maintained

long after his death. The extremity to which matters had come is evident by the difficulty which was experienced in giving him a successor. It was only after a vacancy of eleven months that Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, became Pope as **Victor III**. After the latter had ended his uneventful pontificate there was again an interval of six months before the cardinal bishop of Ostia, Otto, was elected as **Urban II** (1088-99).<sup>1</sup> No great alteration in the situation occurred, and there seemed even less chance of peace being reached, when to the prohibition of lay investiture there was added another forbidding the clergy to tender homage to a layman (Council of Melfi, 1089, c. 11; Clermont, 1095, c. 17). It is true that at the beginning of this pontificate Hermann of Lützelburg (1081-88), Rudolf's successor, abdicated, and Germany was left for a while with a single king, but Rudolf's party was still to be reckoned with. Henry IV was, moreover, in no mood to abandon the struggle in spite of all his losses. His second expedition to Italy (1090) may be accounted a failure, as Mathilda, the countess of Tuscany, still remained unsubdued even after seven years of warfare. To add to the confusion, troubles were now being experienced in England. William II (1087-1100) not only insisted, as his father William the Conqueror had done before, on nominating, and receiving homage from, the bishops and abbots, but openly sold Church offices, helped himself to the Church's goods, and, after a short period of amendment, treated archbishop Anselm of Canterbury so contemptuously that the latter sought refuge at Rome (1098). The only country to accept the Church's decisions was France; here the king and other nobles consented to abandon the practice of investiture, though they continued to claim the right of giving the permit of election, of ratifying the choice, and of receiving homage for the temporalities.

The election of **Paschal II** (1099-1118) was soon followed by the death of the anti-Pope Clement III (1100), after whose demise the schism began to near its end. The first two anti-Popes elected were soon forced to acknowledge Paschal, the second (1102) having actually to do so on the day of his election, whilst the third (Silvester IV), though he held his own for six years (1105-11), did nothing to render himself specially

<sup>1</sup> L. PAULET, *Un pape français ; Urbain II*, 1903.

notorious. In England the question of investiture was at last settled.<sup>1</sup> Desirous of being just, and full of good will to the Church, Henry I (1100–35), soon after his accession, recalled home the archbishop of Canterbury. He seems, however, to have thought it quite within his right to continue the practice of his ancestors, and Anselm on his return was accordingly summoned to do homage and receive the archbishopric from the king's hands. This summons was the occasion of a new quarrel, or, to speak more correctly, was the beginning of the real investiture quarrel so far as England was concerned, as the point at issue in the time of William II had been, not so much his claim to invest, as his oppression of the Church. Anselm declined to consent, threw the onus of his refusal on the law of the Church, or, rather, on the decree of Urban II, and as the negotiations with Rome were fruitless, departed a second time into exile (1103). But the dispute soon reached its end. To escape a decree of excommunication, Henry gave up his claim to invest (1105), on the condition that all prelates should do homage, and Paschal, without accepting the condition, desisted from any further demands. At the parliament of Clarendon (1164, art. 12) it was enacted that elections should take place in the royal chapel, and by the king's leave, and that the elect should do homage and take the oath of fealty before his consecration.

It was more difficult to come to an understanding with the Empire. **Henry V** (1105–25), who had proved submissive enough to the Church so long as his crown was in dispute, became on his father's death (1106) as jealous of his rights as his sire had been, and, as Paschal was equally determined to abolish lay investiture, there seemed scarcely a chance of peace being preserved. It is true that an understanding seemed to have been reached by the treaty of Sutri (1111), agreed to by the king on his first journey to Rome. Henry then promised to drop the practice of investiture, provided Paschal would direct the prelates to return all fiefs and regalia. In reality the treaty only made matters worse, for it touched the German bishops more than the Pope, and when these were requested, before Henry's coronation, to express their approval they flatly refused. Under these circumstances Henry also declined

<sup>1</sup> H. BÖHMER, *Kirche u. Staat in England im 11 u. 12 Jahrh.* 1898.

to be held to his part of the agreement, and as the coronation was on this account postponed, he sought to obtain his end by more forceful means. Paschal was soon a prisoner in his hands, whilst in the city German and Roman engaged in fierce conflict. In his distress the Pope determined, *pro ecclesiae liberatione*, to assume a different attitude. He accordingly crowned the king, and, on condition of his allowing the elections to take place freely, gave him the privilege of conferring on all prelates the investiture, also promising to bear no malice against the king for what had happened.

Henry had thus gained his object. But the privilege which he had been granted was valueless, having been obtained by extortion. The Gregorian party assailed this so-called 'Præilegium' so violently, that Paschal was compelled indirectly to withdraw it at the Lateran Council of 1112, by re-enacting the decrees of Gregory and Urban, though, owing to the oath with which he had confirmed it, he refused to do so directly. The Council of Vienne, in the same year, openly denounced lay investiture as a heresy, and put the emperor under the ban. Having been likewise excommunicated in Germany, Henry determined to reopen negotiations, and crossed the Alps a second time (1116). An understanding was again not reached, as Paschal, mindful of the treatment he had previously experienced, contrived to evade a meeting. Under **Gelasius II**, his successor, the breach was widened. Like his predecessor, he refused to meet the emperor, and answered all his requests for a recognition of his privilege of 1111 by referring him to a General Council. In consequence of this Henry set up Burdinus of Braga, or Gregory VIII, as anti-Pope (1118), a step for which he was excommunicated by Gelasius. Soon after the election of **Calixtus II** (1119-24),<sup>1</sup> the former archbishop Guido of Vienne, and a member of the royal family of Burgundy, new efforts were made for peace, with such apparent success that the ratification at Mouzon of a new treaty had been already determined on by the Council of Rheims (1119). Owing, however, to the emperor's contrariness the negotiations fell through, and his excommunication was renewed. But it was now becoming evident that the principle of lay investiture could not be condemned in

<sup>1</sup> U. ROBERT, *Bullaire et Histoire de Calixte II*, 1891.

its entirety. The prohibition which had extended to all church buildings and church properties was now lightened, so as to involve only bishoprics and abbeys (c. 2) ; exception was made for inferior benefices, and homage was declared lawful in return for the transmission of church properties, the Council making its own a distinction which had long been current in the pamphlets of the time, viz. that between spiritualities and temporalities. The king's right of investing prelates with the temporalities of their office being no longer questioned, Henry too showed himself more amenable, and an understanding was at last reached. Peace was finally signed (1122) at Lobwisen near Lorsch, by the *Pactum Calixtinum*, or **Concordat of Worms**, as the covenant is variously called, after the Pope who concluded it and the place where it was published.<sup>1</sup> The emperor hereby promised Calixtus and his successors to desist in future from all investiture of bishops and abbots with ring and staff, and granted canonical freedom of election. In return the Pope granted to Henry, and presumably to his successors also, the right of being present at all elections to take place in Germany, and, in the case of a division of votes, to support that side which, by the metropolitan and bishops of the province, was judged to be the better, and to confer, with the sceptre, the regalia or fiefs on the newly elect before his consecration. In Italy and Burgundy the investiture was to follow within six months of the consecration.

A famous dispute was thus settled, after half a century of wrangling, by a wise spirit of compromise, and by a clearer delimitation of the rights of either side. The schism which Henry V had roused at Rome had been extinguished already a year previous, the anti-Pope being overthrown soon after Calixtus's entry into the city (1121). For the solemn ratification of the concordat and for the removal of ecclesiastical abuses a General Council was, in 1123, convoked to meet at the **Lateran**, this being the first ever held in the West.

<sup>1</sup> D. SCHÄFER, *Zur Beurteilung des Wormser Konkordats*, in *SB. Berlin*, 1905, pp. 1-95 ; *N.A.* 1906, p. 482. On the other side, A. HAUCK, *KG. Deutschlands*, III 3-4, 1047 ff. ; E. BERNHEIM, *Das W. Konkordat u. s. Vorurkunden*, 1906 ; H. RUDORFF, *Zur Erklärung des W. K.* 1906 (*Quellen u. Studien z. Verfassungsgesch. des D. Reiches*, ed. K. ZEUMER, I, 4).

## § 110

The Schism of Anacletus—Tenth General Council, 1139—The Roman Republic<sup>1</sup>

The Pope and the emperor died one soon after the other. The former was succeeded, mainly owing to the support of the family of the Frangipani, by the cardinal bishop Lambert of Ostia, who assumed the name of **Honorius II** (1124-30). It is true that an earlier scrutiny had resulted in the election of Cardinal Theobald, but, either of his own free accord or otherwise, he declined the proffered honour. The German crown came to **Lothar II** (1125-37), and the election furnished an occasion to the more zealous church party for demanding a revision of the Concordat of Worms so as to allow greater freedom to the Church in Germany. They contended that the king should renounce his right of being present at the election, of investing the elect in his temporalities prior to the consecration,—which, of course, involved the right under certain circumstances of rejecting the elect,—and finally that he should be content with the oath of fealty without the act of homage. It is hardly likely that Lothar gave the required undertaking, for, at any rate, in due course he exercised all the rights which had been granted by Calixtus II to the German kings. So far as the conferring of the regalia was concerned, the privilege was again renewed by Rome in 1133.

On the death of Honorius, the schism which had been feared at his election became a reality. Excusing themselves on the score of the intrigues carried on by the opposite party, the cardinal bishops hastened to elect Cardinal Gregory as **Innocent II** (1130-43). The remainder of the cardinals, that is to say the majority, some three hours later elected Cardinal Peter, of the family of the Pierleoni, as **Anacletus II**, and in consideration of a bribe the whole city consented to acclaim him. Innocent, who was supported by only the Frangipani and the Corsi, was compelled to quit Rome. But his flight did not spoil his cause, for, before the year was out, France, England, and Germany had declared for him, whilst

<sup>1</sup> *J. d. d. Gesch.*: W. BERNHARDI, *Lothar von Supplinburg*, 1879; *Konrad III* 1882; MÜHLBACHER, *Die streitige Papstwahl des J. 1130*, 1875.

Anacletus had to be content with the obedience of Scotland, Lower Italy, and Sicily. In the year 1133 Innocent returned to Rome escorted by Lothar. An opportunity was then afforded of settling a dispute which had arisen concerning the legacy of the countess Mathilda of Tuscany († 1115), Henry V having claimed for the Empire even that portion of her property which she had left to the Holy See; this allodial property was now conferred by the Pope on Lothar and on his son-in-law, Duke Henry the Proud of Bavaria, as a papal fief.

On his second journey to Rome (1136) the emperor pushed still further southwards, even to Bari and Salerno, with the object of establishing his own sovereignty and Innocent's authority. In this he was, however, only partially successful. After his departure, Roger of Sicily, the anti-Pope's protector, who had been won over by the promise of the title of king, again seized the whole of Lower Italy. From this time the anti-Pope took up his quarters in the Leonine city, nor did the schism come to an end even with his death (1138). It is true that his successor (Victor IV), after a reign of two months, made his submission to Innocent, but Roger persisted in his opposition. Not even the excommunication launched against him by the Tenth General Council, which met at the **Lateran** in 1139, principally with a view of putting an end to the schism, could bring him to submit. The war which was declared against him issued favourably to him, and Innocent was soon a prisoner in his hands. Only when the latter consented to remove the excommunication and acknowledge Roger as king was peace obtained.

Scarcely was the schism at an end than a new difficulty arose. Innocent having refused to allow the Romans to destroy Tivoli, they retorted by withdrawing their allegiance, and proclaimed a **Republic** (1143). The new government continued to rule after Innocent's death, his first two successors reigning too short a time to be able to bring about a reversion to the old order of things, especially as the German king Conrad III (1138-52) could not be prevailed on to cross the Alps. Celestine II died five months, Lucius II eleven months, after election, the latter from a wound received in a conflict with the rebellious Romans. Even the pontificate of **Eugene III** (1145-53), a

pupil of St. Bernard's, was troubled by disturbances at home. In spite of a compromise with the Republic having been twice arrived at, the Pope had to spend most of his time away from Rome. He finally secured a promise of help against the Romans from Conrad's successor by the treaty of Constance (1153). Eugene, however, did not live to see the promise fulfilled, nor, in fact, did his successor, Anastasius IV, who reigned for only a year and a half. The promise was, indeed, never carried out at all fully, owing to the outbreak of a new conflict between Empire and Papacy.

### § 111

#### The Schism of Barbarossa—Eleventh General Council, 1179<sup>1</sup>— Thomas Becket and Henry II of England

In the course of the last century the Papacy, which on the next election came into the possession of an Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, or **Adrian IV** (1154-59), had decidedly had the upper hand over the secular power. With **Frederick I Barbarossa** (1152-90), a nephew of Conrad III, the German throne came into the power of a man whose ideal was Charles the Great, and who, being deeply conscious of his authority and independence, was not prepared to brook any interference with his absolute supremacy. As one side was hopeful of reverting to ancient usage, whereas the other was equally determined to maintain its newly acquired rights, a conflict could not be far off. The difference between their views and interests became apparent on the king's first visit to Rome (1154-55). At his first meeting with the Pope, Frederick refused to hold the stirrup, and was a little later much displeased with a picture exhibited in Rome, in which Lothar, owing to his having received Mathilda's properties in fief from the Pope, was described as *homo papae* (i.e. as one owing homage to the Pope). Explanations were, however, forthcoming, and Frederick received the imperial crown. But a more serious conflict was now in preparation. Adrian having

<sup>1</sup> *Otton. Fris. Gesta Friderici*, ed. WILMANS, 1867; *MG. SS.* 20; RAUMER, *Gesch. d. Hohenstaufen*, 6 vol. 4th ed. 1871-72; O. J. TATCHER, *Studies conc. Adrian IV*, 1903; H. REUTER, *Gesch. Alexanders III u. d. K. s. Zeit*, 3 vol. 2nd ed. 1860-64; H. PRUTZ, *K. Friedrich I*, 3 vol. 1871-74; J. FICKER, *Rainald v. Dassel*, 1850; PETERS, *Zur Gesch. des Friedens von Venedig*, 1879.

in 1156 come to an agreement with King William of Sicily, without beforehand taking Frederick into his confidence, the latter complained that the treaty of Constance had been violated. Adrian also was vexed with the emperor on account of his delay in releasing Eskill, the archbishop of Lund, who had been captured by German knights at Dienenhofen. In the brief in which the Pope brought this matter to the emperor's notice, he spoke of the 'conferring' of the imperial crown, and of further 'beneficia' to be bestowed, which seemed to imply that the imperial crown was a fief of the Holy See. The Pope's supposed arrogance caused a violent scene at a parliament assembled at Besançon in 1157, when, to make matters worse, Roland, the papal legate, supported the very meaning which gave offence to the German nobility. According to a letter to Hillin, archbishop of Treves, which is, however, not genuine, Barbarossa was so angry as to have meditated the foundation of a national Church independent of Rome.<sup>1</sup> Calm was restored by Adrian himself giving a satisfactory explanation of his previous brief. Nevertheless, on the emperor's second visit to Italy (1158-62), the rights of the two powers again came into conflict, and the peril was increased by the death of Adrian.

The college of cardinals did not remain aloof from the quarrel. Whilst the majority were in favour of open war, and chose the chancellor Roland as **Alexander III** (1159-81), the minority who were in favour of compromise elected one of their own, Cardinal Octavian, as **Victor IV**. The rights were clearly on the side of the former, but the fact of a double election having occurred gave the emperor a pretext for interference, and he accordingly, in his character of protector of the Church, summoned a Council to meet at Pavia in 1160, and decide between the rival claimants. This Council gave judgment in favour of Victor, and deposed Alexander with an anathema. This decision was, however, followed only where the emperor's power extended, and even within the Empire it met with opposition, its principal opponent in Germany being Eberhard, archbishop of Salzburg. Outside of the Empire it was almost universally ignored, and not without reason,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. HEFELE, V, 545-59. It is probable that the letters here recorded on p. 565 f. are also spurious. Cp. *Th. Qu.* 1893, p. 524 f.

the emperor's dislike of the Pope first elected being notorious. At the Council of Toulouse in the autumn of 1160, the kings of France and England declared for Alexander, and Spain, Hungary, Ireland, and Norway soon followed suit. The result was a schism. Lewis VII, indeed, showed some indecision in 1162, but the conference between the king and emperor (which took place on the bridge over the Saône, near St. Jean de Losne, between Dijon and Dôle on the frontier of the Empire and France), though it was intended to gain him to the cause of the anti-Pope, served rather to confirm him in his obedience to Alexander, who now took up his abode in France (1162-65). In the meantime, Henry II of England, who had supported Alexander for political reasons, being now at variance with Thomas Becket, to spite him and his master attended the diet held at Würzburg in 1165, at which the emperor, the German bishops and nobility solemnly renounced all allegiance to the 'schismatic Roland,' and thence sent envoys to tender his obedience to Paschal III (1164-68), who had by this time succeeded Victor. But this stroke of Henry's was little more than a rude piece of diplomacy, seeing that the English bishops, one and all, refused to have any dealings with the schismatical Pope. Nor was the cause of the anti-Pope safe even in Italy, his headquarters. The Lombard cities, now that their liberties were endangered, had proclaimed war against Frederick and were beginning to transfer their allegiance to Alexander, so much so that the latter was able to return to Rome in the autumn of 1165. The city was, indeed, again taken by Frederick on his fourth Italian expedition in 1167; Alexander, abandoned by the Romans, had to flee, disguised as a pilgrim, to Benevento, and the emperor, together with his consort Beatrix, was again crowned at St. Peter's (August 1). But the tide of fortune soon turned. On the very day of the coronation a pestilence broke out in the imperial army, and caused such havoc that the emperor's power was broken. Even his hurried flight from the city did not save his army, the avenging angel following it on its retreat. Among those who fell victims to the malady was Rainald of Dassel, archbishop of Cologne and chancellor of the Empire, to whose advice Frederick's policy was mainly due. This misfortune put new courage into the emperor's enemies, who in the meantime had

greatly increased in numbers. The League of Verona, into which several cities of Higher Italy had entered in 1164, was now transformed into the Lombard League, and between Tortona and Asti a new stronghold was erected, called after the Pope Alexandria. Frederick was even now unwilling to admit his defeat, and on the death of Paschal he granted the requisite ratification of the election of John, abbot of Struma, or Calixtus III, the third of the anti-Popes. Soon after this Frederick was, however, compelled to resume negotiations with Alexander, and on his fifth Italian expedition (1174-78), finding himself confronted by overwhelming odds, failing in spite of all his efforts to take Alexandria, and finally suffering a disastrous defeat at Legnano (1176), the only course left him was to acknowledge Alexander III, peace being concluded at Venice in 1177.

Calixtus III made his submission in 1178, and in the following year an œcumenical Council was summoned to the **Lateran** to solemnly confirm the peace. To prevent a recurrence of what had happened in 1159 it was here enacted (c. 1, *Licet de vitanda*) that in the case where the cardinals' choice should fail to be unanimous, he should be considered Pope who obtained two-thirds majority. That same year the election of yet a fourth anti-Pope (Innocent III) again gave rise to difficulties, but as the schismatic was soon compelled (1180) to lay down his assumed dignity, Alexander lived to see the unity of the Church again fully established. He was, however, less successful in upholding the temporal power. Soon after the Council he had to turn his back on his unruly capital, and died shortly after at Civita Castellana, his victory over Barbarossa giving him the claim to be considered one of the greatest of the mediæval Popes.

As the troubles at Rome continued after the death of Alexander III, his successors also were obliged to keep away from the city. Lucius III (1181-85) stayed at Rome only a very short time. Urban III (1185-87) spent his whole pontificate in foreign lands, and the same is true of Gregory VIII, who, however, only reigned two months. Clement III (1187-91) was again able to take up his residence at Rome. There still remained some differences of opinion between the Empire and the Papacy.<sup>1</sup> According to the peace of Venice the dispute

<sup>1</sup> SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, *K. Friedrichs I letzter Streit mit der Kurie*, 1866.

concerning the properties of Countess Mathilda was to be settled by arbitration. This settlement could, however, not be arrived at, and a new difficulty soon cropped up in a double election (Rudolf and Folmar) to the archbishopric of Treves (1183), Pope and emperor taking different sides; lastly, great annoyance was caused at the Roman Curia by the marriage of the emperor's son and heir, Henry VI, to Constance, the aunt and heir-presumptive of William II of Naples and Sicily, this union causing the papal states to be surrounded on all sides by the Empire. Frederick's request that his son should be crowned emperor during his own lifetime was declined by Rome, and Urban even summoned Frederick to appear at his court and answer for his action. But as the German episcopate stood firm on their ruler's side, the Pope had at last to give way in the matter of the bishopric of Treves. His successors proved more favourably disposed to Frederick, and Clement even promised the crown to Henry, the change of policy being accounted for not only by the milder character of these two Popes, but also by the bad news brought home from Palestine.

Henry was ultimately crowned only after his father's death, the ceremony being performed by **Celestine III** (1191-98). It was followed by a new quarrel. To secure his right to the throne of Naples and Sicily, which on the death of William had been usurped by Tancred, count of Lecce, Constance's half-brother (1191), **Henry VI** (1190-97)<sup>1</sup> hurried from Rome to Lower Italy.

After the death of the new king (1194) he succeeded in obtaining possession of his consort's heritage. This action was, however, all the more distasteful to Rome in that it had been accompanied by much needless cruelty. The emperor also gave offence by keeping in prison (till 1194) Richard Lionheart, who had been apprehended on the return journey from the Holy Land by Duke Leopold of Austria. Nevertheless, by the zeal which he showed in promoting the cause of the crusades, Henry ultimately disarmed suspicion, and died at peace with the Pope, who in his turn soon followed him to the grave.

<sup>1</sup> *J. d. d. Gesch.*: TOECHE, *K. Heinrich VI*, 1867; J. CARO, *Die Beziehungen Heinrichs VI zur röm. Kurie*, 1902.

We must now retrace our steps a little. Whilst the quarrel between Alexander and the Empire was still in progress, England was distracted by a different matter.<sup>1</sup> The comparative mildness of the ecclesiastical courts, being favourable to clerical laxity, furnished Henry II (1154-89) with a pretext for restricting the *Privilegium fori*, thus bringing clerics to some extent under the secular jurisdiction, and at the parliament of Westminster in 1163 a law was passed that a representative of the king should in future sit among the ecclesiastical judges. The king, however, now went farther. What he wanted was a formal recognition of all the rights to interference in church matters which English sovereigns had claimed in the past. His wish was granted by the parliament of Clarendon (1164). The *consuetudines avitae*, which had been recognised by the bishops at the Westminster parliament, only with the saving clause *salvo ordine nostro*, were now accepted without demur and codified in sixteen articles. The primate, Thomas Becket (1162-70), consented indeed only after some hesitation, and, on the Pope condemning ten of the sixteen articles, he withdrew the consent he had given. The sovereign was so incensed at this action that Thomas found it advisable to retire to France. On returning home six years later, an angry exclamation of the king brought about the murder of the archbishop at the hands of four English knights (December 29). He died for the cause for which he had fought, and his martyrdom was not in vain, though it produced no immediate alteration in Henry's policy. At his reconciliation in 1172 the king expressly revoked only that article of Clarendon which forbade appeal to the Holy See (art. 8). The other part of his promise, viz. not to consider as binding the new customs which had been introduced against the Church during his reign, is ambiguous, and could perfectly well be understood by the king in his own favour. At any rate, his being compelled two years later, by difficulties of state, to undertake a pilgrimage to his opponent's tomb, implied a victory of the Church at his expense.

<sup>1</sup> ROBERTSON, *Becket, archb. of Cant.* 1859; *Materials for the Hist. of Thomas B.* 7 vol. 1875-86 (*Rev. Brit. med. aevi script.* LXVII). Mg. on Thomas by MORRIS, 2nd ed. 1885; L'HUILLIER, 2 vol. 1891-92; RADFORD, 1894; R. A. THOMPSON, 1889.

## § 112

**Innocent III—Twelfth General Council, 1215<sup>1</sup>**

Whilst the death of Henry VI threw the Empire into confusion and involved it in civil war, owing to the double election which followed it—one part of the princes choosing duke Philip of Swabia, and the remainder the Welf Otto of Brunswick—the Papacy was entering on the most glorious epoch of its history. Although only thirty-seven years of age at his election, **Innocent III** (1198-1216)—formerly cardinal Lothar of Segni—proved himself wholly worthy of his high position. Indeed, judging by tangible results, his pontificate must be reckoned the most memorable of all.

Convinced that the temporal independence of the Roman Church was a necessary condition of her ecclesiastical freedom, his main efforts were directed to the restoration of the papal power at Rome and throughout the papal states, of which the Exarchate and the Pentapolis, now known as the Romagna and the march of Ancona, had, since the twelfth century, been almost entirely annexed to the Empire. Innocent's aim was to regain the lost provinces, and if possible to extend the Church's temporal sway yet farther. The city prefect, who ruled in the name of the emperor, and the senator who governed in that of the Roman people, were compelled to do homage to the Pope. Innocent also obtained possession not only of the march of Ancona, but also of the duchy of Spoleto, and his right thereto being acknowledged by succeeding emperors, these territories henceforth form part of the papal states. In the meantime Innocent's attention was drawn to Lower Italy. By a brief he invested Constance and her son with the kingdom of the two Sicilies, and settled the church affairs of those regions. On the death of the empress (1198) he assumed the government on behalf of her young son Frederick II. Finally, he intervened in the German struggle, and, when all hope of compromise had passed away, declared for **Otto IV** (1201). In this instance his intervention was,

<sup>1</sup> *Innocentii III Epist. libb. XVI*; P.L. 214-17; F. HURTER, *Gesch. P. Innocenz III u. seiner Zeitgenossen*, 4 vol. 1833-42 (I, 3rd ed. 1841; II-IV, 2nd ed. 1842-44); ROHRBACHER-WERNER, vol. XVIII; LUCHAIRE, *Innocent III*, 1904. *Jahrb. d. d. Gesch.*: E. WINKELMANN, *Philipp v. Schwaben u. Otto v. Braunschweig*, 2 vol. 1873-78.

however, miscalculated, as Philip continued to hold his own in spite of his rejection, and was on the point of success when he fell by the hand of an assassin (1208). The Welf also proved himself utterly unworthy of the confidence reposed in him by the Pope. In the spring of 1209, after having been generally recognised by the German princes, he indeed repeated his promises to the Church to renounce the regalia, *i.e.* not to appropriate the revenues of a Church office during its vacancy, and also to forego the right which had been recently usurped of seizing at death all the personal estate of the prelates. But after his coronation, which took place in the autumn of the same year, he cast all his promises to the winds under the pretext that he was bound to safeguard the rights of the Empire, utterly disregarding the protests of the Pope. In 1210 he was put under the ban; the following year many of his princes discovered in his excommunication a reason for severing their connection with him; finally, in 1214, his power was broken at the battle of Bouvines, and the road to the throne was opened to the Staufeu prince Frederick II, the son of Henry VI.

Important events were also being enacted in England.<sup>1</sup> Occasion for a quarrel was afforded by a double election to the see of Canterbury (1205), and King John, nicknamed Lackland (1199-1216), having refused to acquiesce in the election of cardinal Stephen Langton, the third candidate put forward by the Pope, the country was laid under an interdict (1208). As John vented his displeasure at the measure by cruelly vexing the Churches and clergy, he was excommunicated in 1209, and finally deposed in 1212. France was directed to execute the sentence, but at the last moment, when the armies were already prepared for battle, John gave in, being no longer able to count on the support of his people (1213). At his submission he not merely allowed archbishop Stephen Langton and all the other exiles, clerical and lay, to return to England, promising them compensation for the wrong they had suffered, but, to ensure the Pope's support, he also promised by an annual tax of 1,000 marks to become a vassal and feudatory of the Holy See. By these means he was spared the humiliation

<sup>1</sup> LAPPENBERG-PAULI, *Gesch. v. England*, III (1853), 318-505. (LAPPENBERG, Engl. Trans. *History of England*, 1845.)

of an invasion. It was now the turn of the bishops and barons to protect their rights against the arbitrariness of the king, the former in particular having to defend the freedom of the episcopal elections; their united efforts dragged from the sovereign his signature to the **Magna Charta** (1215). The signing, however, led to new troubles. The Pope having condemned the charter, the king sought with his help to withdraw the promises he had made therein. The malcontents thereupon called on the help of the dauphin of France, Lewis VIII, to whom they offered the crown. Only on the death of John and the subsequent ratification of the Magna Charta by his son, Henry III, was it found possible to re-establish peace within the realm.

England was not the first country to be proclaimed feudatory to the Pope, for Peter II of Aragon had done the same for his kingdom in 1204. His object had been to induce Innocent, of whose conspicuous honesty he was not aware, to grant him a divorce. Innocent had also to maintain the sanctity of the marriage tie against Alfonso IX of Leon and Philip Augustus of France.<sup>1</sup> The latter had put away his wife, the Danish princess Ingeburga, soon after the wedding (1193) and contracted a second union with Agnes of Meran (1196). The king was excommunicated and his country placed under an interdict (1200), and he was finally forced to promise to receive again his lawful consort (1201). The promise was, however, only performed after the death of Agnes, and after the king had made attempt after attempt to have his marriage nullified (1213).

The East also occupied Innocent's attention, and his efforts here secured a result of great importance, though not indeed that which had been awaited: a Latin Empire was founded at Constantinople. Cp. § 116, IV.

A fitting end to a successful pontificate was the General Council which Innocent assembled at the Lateran in 1215. It busied itself mainly about the Albigensian heresy, the question of the Holy Land, and the restoration of church discipline.

<sup>1</sup> R. DAVIDSOHN, *Philipp II August v. Fr. u. Ingeborg*, 1888.

## § 113

The Papacy under the Last Members of the Staufen House—  
Thirteenth General Council, 1245<sup>1</sup>

Cardinal Cencio Savelli, under the name of **Honorius III** (1216-27), was appointed successor to Innocent III. It is owing to the fact that he was a man of quite unusual gentleness that the relations of Church and State were in the main peaceable so long as he reigned. He made no complaint when **Frederick II** settled on his son Henry both the Sicilian and the German crown—in spite of the promise made to Innocent III that these two crowns should never be conferred on a single ruler—and Frederick was, in due course, crowned at Rome in 1220. The Pope also consented to accept the excuses of the emperor for the constant postponement of the promised crusade, and though at the conference of San Germano (1225) he showed a disposition to have recourse to stern measures, he was called away by death before he had time to put any such plan into execution.

Of an entirely different stamp was **Gregory IX** (1227-41),<sup>2</sup> formerly cardinal Ugolino, a nephew of Innocent III, whom, in spite of his already advanced age, he greatly resembled in determination and force of character. As Frederick still delayed the carrying out of his vow, the new Pope put him under the ban, and when the emperor, assisted by a revolt of the Romans, retorted by seizing that portion of the papal states which was reckoned an imperial fief, the Pope allied himself to the Lombards and invaded Apulia. The papal forces crossed the Volturno, but were repulsed by Frederick on his return from Palestine, the success of his arms being probably accountable for Gregory's willingness to patch up a peace at San Germano in 1230.

For a few years the Church was not disturbed. The emperor

<sup>1</sup> HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *Hist. diplom. Friderici II*, 6 vol. 1852-61; HÖFLER, *K. Friedrich II*, 1844; J. CLAUSEN, *Honorius III*, 1895. *J. d. d. Gesch.*: E. WINKELMANN, *K. Friedrich*, 2 vol. 1889-97. RODENBERG, *Innocenz IV u. das Königreich Sizilien* (1245-54), 1892; E. BERGER, *St. Louis et Innocent IV*, 1893; RATZINGER, *Forsch. zur Bayrischen Gesch.* 1898, pp. 1-321; ROHRBACHER-WURM, *KG.* vol. XIX (1227-70), 1898; *Hist. Z.* 83 (1899), pp. 1-42 (*Friedrich II*).

<sup>2</sup> I. FELTEN, *Gregor IX*, 1886.

was busy establishing order at home. After having crushed the rebellion stirred up by his son Henry (1235), he declared war on his allies, the Lombards, and won the battle of Cortenuova. But the Lombards were as yet only partly subdued, and though willing to accept peace cheaply, they preferred war to the unconditional surrender demanded by Frederick; they, moreover, found an ally in the Pope. The tyrant, who of late had frequently abused his rights, not sparing even the Church, for instance by appointing by his own authority his natural son Enzo to the throne of Sardinia, though the island was a papal fief, was now again excommunicated. To a man of the emperor's stamp, such a measure at such a moment meant nothing less than a declaration of war. It is possible that Gregory wished thereby to reclaim the emperor, but he only succeeded in impelling him farther on the path on which he had entered, and the struggle which now began, and which far exceeded in violence and bitterness that which had occurred under Barbarossa, was not to end till the fall of the Staufen dynasty. Both sides brought charges against each other, the emperor being accused of having spoken of Moses, Christ, and Mohammed as the three great impostors, a charge which, though it cannot be established, agrees with what we know of Frederick's character.<sup>1</sup> Words soon made room for blows, and Frederick broke into the papal states; Gregory retorted by stirring up the Venetians to attack Apulia, and at the same time, by means of his legate Albert of Beham, archdeacon of Passau, sought to put up in Germany a pretender to the crown. A little later (1241), when the Pope was desirous of gathering together a General Council which might decide on the questions at issue, the emperor prevented the carrying out of the plan. The French bishops on their way to Rome to attend it were taken prisoners near Elba, and the war was pursued. Frederick was already outside the gates of Rome with his army, when Gregory was summoned from this world (August 22, 1241).

His death caused an interval of peace, which was further protracted owing to the seventeen-day pontificate of Celestine

<sup>1</sup> Cp. REUTER, *Gesch. der relig. Aufklärung im MA.* II, 275 ff. The work entitled *De tribus impostoribus* belongs probably to the end of the seventeenth century.

IV being followed by a vacancy of twenty months. After the election of cardinal Sinibaldo Fiesco as **Innocent IV** (1243-54) <sup>1</sup> it even seemed that a reconciliation was nigh; at any rate a treaty of peace was drawn up (1244). But the end of the war was as yet far off. Either side was suspicious of the other, and active hostilities were recommenced when Innocent, fearing a trap, answered the emperor's invitation to attend a conference by a hurried flight to Lyons, where he was to remain six years. In a diplomatic note the emperor charged the Pope with a violation of the peace, whilst the latter issued briefs to all kings, princes, and bishops summoning a General Council to meet at **Lyons** in 1245, which among other matters was to try the cause pending between Pope and emperor. The charges against the latter comprised perjury, sacrilege, suspicion of heresy, and many acts of injustice committed in the kingdom of Sicily. The decision of the Council was that the emperor should be deprived of his dignity and that obedience to him should be forbidden under penalty of the ban; Germany was to choose a new king, and the Sicilian question was to be left to the Pope's own judgment.

The decision made but little difference in the state of affairs. As was to be expected, the emperor refused to submit, and declared that the Pope by deposing him had exceeded his rights; before this, his chancellor, Thaddæus of Suessa, who had represented him at the Council, had rejected the judgment, and appealed to the future Pope and to a really Œcumenical Council. Hence the conflict proceeded, though everywhere it was deplored, especially as just then Constantinople and Palestine were both in sore need of help. Lewis IX of France repeatedly offered his mediation, but in vain, for the die was now cast. To enlist new soldiers, the war against the emperor was assimilated to the war against the infidel, and everywhere a crusade was preached against Frederick. A portion of the German electorate, in obedience to the Pope's instructions, chose as their new king the landgrave Henry Raspe of Thuringia (1246), and on his death, Count William of Holland (1247-56). Frederick on his side strained every nerve to maintain his position, his enemies suffering cruelly

<sup>1</sup> A. FOLZ, *K. Friedrich II u. P. Innocenz IV, 1244-45, 1905; Unters. z. Gesch. des 1 Konzils v. Lyon, 1905.*

at his hands. On his death at Fiorintino in Apulia (1250)—before which he had received absolution from the archbishop of Palermo—his son and heir, Conrad (1250–54), continued the war, which now became confined to Italy. Even the death of the Pope and of the two kings made no alteration. The negotiations opened by **Alexander IV** (1254–61) with Frederick's natural son Manfred, who had assumed the regentship on behalf of Conrad's youthful son Conradin, were fruitless, and the war in Italy proceeded apace. In Germany an election—being the first in which the seven prince-electors appear as a body, on which alone the choice of the king depends—resulted in a division, one party choosing Richard of Cornwall and the other Alfonso of Castile; but as the latter never went near his new kingdom, whilst the former only tarried in it a short time, the only consequence of the election was an interregnum. In the meantime Manfred was fighting with such success that in 1258 he was offered the crown by the Sicilian grandees; little by little he subdued nearly the whole of the Italian peninsula. It was only when **Urban IV** (1261–64)<sup>1</sup>, after having vainly offered the Sicilian crown to several other princes, promised it to Charles of Anjou, that Manfred met one who was more than his match. Under **Clement IV** (1265–68)<sup>2</sup> the contest was brought to its close. At Benevento (1266) Manfred lost the day, and the battle of Scurcola (1268) was equally unfortunate to the cause of his nephew, who had hurried from Germany on his uncle's death to secure possession of the Staufen crown. Conradin was taken and executed at Naples. He was the last of the Hohenstaufen family, which had indeed added to the prestige of the Empire, but which, by exceeding its rights, was in a sense responsible for its own downfall.

<sup>1</sup> K. HAMPE, *Urban IV u. Manfred* (1261–64), 1905; *Gesch. Konradins v. Hohenstaufen*, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> J. HEIDEMANN, *P. Klemens IV*, I, 1903.

## § 114

The Last Popes of the Thirteenth Century—Reunion with the Easterns—Fourteenth General Council, 1274<sup>1</sup>

By the expulsion of the Staufen princes from the two Sicilies, the Pope had rid himself of the near presence of an enemy, but by bestowing the crown on Charles of Anjou he had brought a new and even more formidable rival into the field. The Frenchman who now occupied the Neapolitan throne soon gained a party in the sacred College, whose power became visible on the death of Clement IV. In consequence of the difference of opinion between the cardinals it was nearly three years before a new head could be given to the Church in **Gregory X** (1271–76), formerly Theobald Visconti, a native of Piacenza and archdeacon of Liège.

Next to the Holy Land, it was Constantinople which gave the most concern to this Pope. The city had again fallen into the hands of the Greeks in 1261, and Michael Palæologus, its conqueror, now submitted a plan of reunion with the Holy See (1263)<sup>2</sup> which might avert a new attack from the West. The negotiations were carried on with extreme difficulty owing to the aversion of the Greeks for the Latins, which recent events had changed into positive hatred. In spite of this the Greek emperor succeeded in overcoming the opposition of the clergy, and the union was cemented at the General Council which Gregory called together directly after his consecration, and which was held at **Lyons** (*Lugdunensis II*) in 1274. The Greeks acknowledged the *Filioque*, the papal primacy, and the right of appeal to Rome. Practical effect was immediately given to the decree, and the union lasted for several years, under Gregory's successors, Innocent V, Adrian V, and John XXI (1276–77). But as it was merely a political measure it had no real life, and was bound to be dissolved as soon as a change

<sup>1</sup> H. FINKE, *Konzilienstudien z. Gesch. d. 13 Jahrh.* 1891; A. ZISTERER, *Gregor X u. Rudolf v. Habsburg*, 1891; Th. LINDNER, *Deutsche Gesch. unter den Habsburgern u. Luxemburgern* (1273–1437), 2 vol. 1890–93; WALTER, *Politik der Kurie unter Gregor X*, 1894; O. REDLICH, *Rudolf v. Habsburg*, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> *Z. f. w. Th.* 1891, pp. 325–55; W. NORDEN, *Das Papsttum u. Byzanz* (1054–1453), 1903; F. X. SEPPELT, item, 1904, in the *Kircheng. Abh.* ed. by SDRALEK, II.

occurred in the factors. **Nicholas III** (1277–80),<sup>1</sup> to the great disappointment of the emperor, put new obligations on the Greeks. They were now enjoined not only to acknowledge the *Filioque* as they had done at the Council of Lyons, but also to incorporate it in their Creed. **Martin IV** (1281–85), soon after entering on his pontificate, even put the emperor under the ban as a ‘patron of schism and heresy,’ having apparently been led to surmise that his previous advances had been made in bad faith, and no doubt being urged to the step by Charles of Anjou, who was just then fitting out an expedition against the Greeks. Michael Palæologus accordingly struck out the Pope’s name from the diptychs, and his son Andronicus on succeeding him (1282) formally re-established the schism. The patriarch John Veccus, who was favourable to reunion, was forced to yield his place to the irreconcilable Joseph, who had been deposed after the Council of Lyons. Nor was there any longer a political reason against the consummation of the breach, the Greek arms having just proved victorious at Belgrad over the Neapolitan forces.

Even before the reunion of the Greeks had been decided on, an occupant had been found in **Rudolf of Habsburg** (1273–91) for the imperial throne of the West. The Empire, however, was not again to reach its former splendour; Rudolf never received the crown; it was indeed offered to him by Gregory X, but the latter died before his intention could be carried out. Differences afterwards arising hindered its bestowal by his successors. Nicholas III demanded the cession to the Church of the Romagna, and after much wrangling the country was, with the consent of the princes, actually made over to him (1278), the papal states being thereby materially enlarged. In exchange for this, the Pope handed over to the king the Tuscan vicariate, which, during the interregnum, had been governed by Charles of Anjou; he also deprived the latter of his office of senator, which he had held for ten years; by such means the Pope doubtless hoped to restrain within due bounds the ambitions of the king of Naples. The next Pope being a Frenchman reversed his predecessor’s policy, and restored to

<sup>1</sup> A. DEMSKI, *P. Nikolaus III*, 1903; *Rudolf v. H. u. d. röm. Kaiserkrone unter Nikolaus III*, 1906; R. STERNFELD, *Kard. Johann Gaetan Orsini (P. Nikolaus III)*, 1905.

Charles the senatorial dignity; about this time, however, a large portion of the latter's realm was withdrawn from his authority. The revolution in Sicily, which began with the Sicilian Vespers at Palermo on the Monday after Easter, 1282, brought the sovereignty of the island into the hands of Peter of Aragon, to whom Conradin, when at the point of death, had bequeathed his rights over Apulia and Sicily. Pope Martin fruitlessly endeavoured, by excommunication and interdict, to bring the island again under the authority of the House of Anjou, nor were the protests of his successor, Honorius IV (1285-87),<sup>1</sup> one whit more successful. The House of Aragon retained its supremacy over the island, and a century and a half later came into possession of Naples also, *i.e.* of the other half of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

It was under **Nicholas IV** (1288-92)<sup>2</sup> that the Westerns suffered the defeats which led to the end of their rule in Palestine. His reign was followed by a vacancy of some duration. The Second Council of Lyons, to obviate such delays, had indeed ordained (c. 3 in VI *de elect.* 1, 6) that the cardinals should proceed to the election in a single hall (*unum conclave*, whence the name of Conclave by which the institution came to be known), that all individual intercourse with the outer world should be prevented, and that if the deliberations were unduly protracted, the rations of the cardinals should be progressively diminished. This decree had, however, been abrogated by John XXI and Nicholas IV, and was consequently of no avail. It was more than two years before the choice could be made, and it resulted in the election of one who was indeed a pious and even holy man, but who was manifestly unfit to occupy the papal throne; this was Peter the Hermit from the mountain of Murrone in Abruzzi, who took the name of Celestine V.<sup>3</sup> Conscious of his own incapacity, he, after five months, renounced the tiara. In the meanwhile his residence had been at Naples; the decree of Gregory X and of the Council of Lyons concerning papal elections was re-enacted during his pontificate.

<sup>1</sup> PAWLICKI, *P. Honorius IV*, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> O. SCHIFF, *Studien z. Gesch. P. Nikolaus IV*, 1897.

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by H. SCHULZ, 1894; CELIDONIO, 1896. *An. Boll.* IX, 147-200; X, 385-92; XIV (1895), 223-25. *Z. f. KG.* (1897), 363-97; 477-507.

**John XXI** (mg. by R. STAPPER, 1899), seeing that the last Pope of that name had been John XIX (1024-33), should really be John XX. He, however, assumed the number XXI, either because he believed in the existence of Pope Joan, the tale of whom had been invented in the meantime, or because John XIV (983-84) had been erroneously doubled, the statement that he spent four months in prison being made to refer to another Pope of the same name, a mistake which received credence during the thirteenth century. **Calixtus II** bears a name which is a mere conventional rendering of Callistus. **Martin IV**, who was really the second Pope of the name, is reckoned the fourth, the two Popes named Marinus being reckoned as his homonyms.

## CHAPTER II

### THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AND CONFLICT WITH THE ISLAM

#### § 115

#### Conversion of North-Eastern Europe—Missions to the East

IN the previous period Christianity had pushed forward even into Scandinavia; it was now the turn of those of the Slavs who had persisted in their paganism, for the Finns and Lettish tribes, to follow the example of their neighbours; with their entrance into the Church, the conversion of Europe was practically complete.

I. Among the **Wends** better days dawned for Christianity as soon as Gottschalk's son Henry (1105) succeeded in re-establishing his father's kingdom. It did not, however, become supreme in the country until the nation was wholly subdued by the margrave Albert the Bear and duke Henry the Lion. Hartwig, archbishop of Bremen, now intervened, and again established the bishoprics which had been destroyed, appointing St. Vicelin (1148), the best-known missionary of the time, to that of Oldenburg. At the same time steps were also taken to Germanise the country, German colonists being imported to people the districts which had been devastated by the many wars.

II. The Pomeranians received the Gospel from Otto, bishop of Bamberg,<sup>1</sup> shortly after they had been compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of duke Boleslav III of Poland (1121).

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by J. LOOSHORN, 1888; G. JURITSCH, 1889; *Z. f. KG.* X, 1-53; WIESENER, *Gesch. d. christl. K. in Pommern zur Wendenzeit*, 1889; SOMMERFELD, *Germanisierung Pommerns*, 1896.

Otto undertook on two occasions, and with great success, a missionary journey through the country (1124-28), and made a point of parading in great splendour so as to avoid the experience of the Spanish missionary Bernard, who had courted failure owing to his poverty-struck appearance. The first bishopric was instituted at Julin on the island of Wollin, but was soon after transferred to Camin (1188). Here, too, Saxon immigrants gradually Germanised the country.

III. In the thirteenth century heathenism was gradually driven out of **Prussia**,<sup>1</sup> where previous efforts at evangelisation had been of no avail, having only resulted in the death of the missionaries, as happened in the case of St. Adelbert († 997). In the year 1209 Christian, a Cistercian, entered on his missionary labours among the Prussians, and though his preaching was not remarkably successful, it nevertheless paved the way for the full conversion of the nation. As his work was constantly foiled by the pagans, he called on the help of the Teutonic knights (1226), who, allied with the Brethren of the Sword (1237), fought so well that in 1283 the whole country was in their hands and the Gospel reigned supreme. Bishoprics were erected at Kulm, Pomesanien, Ermeland (1243), and Samland (1255).

IV. Paganism was driven out of the island of **Rügen** in the year 1168, when it was annexed by King Waldemar I of Denmark, who forthwith introduced Christianity.

V. The **Livonians** received as their first missionary (1186) Meinhard, an Augustinian canon, from the monastery of Sieberg in Holstein. Christian merchants had already prepared the way for him, but, even so, the work of conversion was a slow one. The new converts repeatedly reverted to paganism, and the neighbouring tribes made frequent devastating raids. Albert of Buxhövdén was more successful: in 1200 he founded the town of Riga, where he settled down as bishop; he was also the founder of the Brethren of the Sword (1202-04), with whose help and the support of German crusaders he not only asserted his supremacy in Livonia, but also compelled the natives of Esthland and Semgallen to accept the Gospel. In the case of Curland the inhabitants accepted Christianity of their own free choice (1230). Cp. E. PAPST, *Meinhard, Livlands Apostel*, 1847-49; KALLMEYER,

<sup>1</sup> J. VOIGT, *Gesch. Preussens*, vol. I-III, 1827 ff.; WATERICH, *Gründung des Deutsch-Ordenstaates in Pr.* 1857; H. G. VOIGT, *Missionsversuch Adelberts v. Prag in Preussen*, 1901; J. PLINSKI, *Probleme hist. Kritik in der Gesch. des ersten Preussenbischofs*, in *Kircheng. Abh.* ed. by SDRLEK, I, 1902.

*Gründung deutscher Herrschaft u. christl. Glaubens in Kurland, 1859*; BUNGE, *Orden der Schwertbrüder, 1875.*

VI. The **Lithuanians** received in 1252 as their first bishop the Dominican Vitus, a year after their grand prince Mindove had been compelled by the Teutonic knights to submit to baptism. This prince, however, soon sank back into paganism, and the victory of the Gospel was delayed until, in 1386, king Jagello married queen Hedwig of Poland, received baptism, and at an assembly of the nation proclaimed Christianity the religion of the State.

VII. A way was prepared for the entry of Christianity among the **Lapps** and **Finns** by the Swedish domination (1153-1279), but it was some time before their conversion could be effected. Paganism was extirpated in Finland towards the end of the thirteenth century; into Lapland the Faith was only introduced in 1335.

VIII. In the far East the Nestorians, who had all along been noted for their missionary zeal, and who had worked even in China and India, met with one conspicuous success in the eleventh century. They converted the ruler of the Tartar tribe of the Keraites, who dwelt south of Lake Baikal, and the greater part of his people. This prince, who in his quality of vassal of the Chinese Empire bore the title of Owang Khan, became, after the destruction of his kingdom by Genghis Khan (1202), the hero (under the name of Prester John) of an extraordinary legend which found full credence in the West. Cp. G. OPPERT, *Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage u. Gesch. Abh. d. k. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1877-78*; V. BARTOL'D, *Zur Gesch. des Christentums in Mittelasien bis zur mongol. Eroberung*, German by R. STÜBE, 1901.

IX. The Mongol (or Tartar) invasions of the thirteenth century caused the Westerns to send missionaries to the East. Innocent IV dispatched Franciscans and Dominicans to effect their conversion (1245); a few years later missionaries were also sent by St. Lewis. These missions had indeed no success, but after the two famous Venetians, Poli, more especially Marco Polo, had brought home trustworthy information concerning China, John of Montecorvino, a friar minor, journeyed thither and founded what soon became a flourishing mission (1291-1330). Churches were erected at Cambalu (Peking) and other localities. Clement V appointed the missionary archbishop of Cambalu, and sent him associates of his own order to help him in his work; other Popes also interested themselves in this mission. With the overthrow of the Mongol supremacy by the Ming dynasty the work was, however, brought to a close (1368). KÜLB, *Gesch. d. Missionsreisen n. d. Mongolei während den 13 u. 14 Jahrh.* 3 vol. 1860; *Hist.-pol. Bl.* vol. 36-39, 45; *Festschrift z. Jub. d. d. Campo santo in Rom, 1897*, pp. 170-95.

X. The crusades led many to conceive a hope of converting the Mohammedans. To this end, in 1219, Francis of Assisi visited the Sultan of Egypt and sent some of his disciples to Tunis and Morocco. Several Dominicans too offered their services for this

same work. Owing, however, to the Mohammedan law which punished apostasy with the death penalty, the missionaries were compelled to restrict their attention to the Christians dwelling in the midst of the Moslems.

## § 116

### The Crusades<sup>1</sup>

From quite early times Jerusalem had been an object of pilgrimage, nor did the fact of the conquest of Palestine by the caliph Omar in 637 wean the Faithful of their love for the Holy Land. Sad as it was to Christian hearts to see the Holy Places in the hands of the infidel, yet the consideration shown by the new rulers helped to render the situation tolerable. The conqueror did, indeed, convert a few churches into mosques, and impose a tax on the profession of Christianity, but, for the rest, the Christians were left entirely free.

I. A change,<sup>2</sup> however, occurred when in the tenth century Egypt and Palestine came into the possession of the Fatimite dynasty. The Christians now began to be tyrannised to such an extent that Silvester II issued a call to Christendom to deliver the Holy Land. The oppression became even worse when Palestine was seized in 1073 by the Seljuks and in 1086 by the Turkish chieftain Orthok. The plan of snatching the Holy Land from the hand of the infidel again became a matter of practical politics, and though the appeal of Gregory VII was unsuccessful owing to his conflict with Henry IV, that of Urban II at the Councils of Piacenza and Clermont (1095) fell on more willing ears. As from one mouth the orator at Clermont was

<sup>1</sup> *Gesta Dei per Francos* (ed. J. BONGARS), 2 fol. 1611; *Recueil des historiens des Croisades; Occidentaux*, I-V, 1844-95; *Orientaux*, I-V, 1872-1906; *Arméniens*, I, 1869; *Lois*, I-II, 1841-43. C. KOHLER, *Mélanges pour servir à l'hist. de l'Orient latin et des croisades*, I, 1900; F. WILKEN, *Gesch. d. Krzze*. 7 vol. 1807-32; J. MICHAUD, *Hist. des Croisades*, 6 vol. 4th ed. 1825-29 (Engl. Trans. *Hist. of the Crusades*, 2nd ed. 1881); B. KUGLER, *Gesch. d. Kr.* 2nd ed. 1891 (*Allg. Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen*, ed. by W. ONCKEN, II, 5); R. RÖHRICHT, *Gesch. d. Kr.* 1898; E. HEYCK, *Die Krzze. u. das Hl. Land*, 1900; GOTTLOB, *Päpstl. Kreuzzugssteuern*, 1891. RÖHRICHT, *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 1893-1904; *Gesch. des Königr. Jerusalem*, 1898. SCHLÉE, *Die Päpste u. die Kreuzzüge*, 1893; DODU, *Hist. des institutions monarch. dans le royaume latin de Jérusalem*, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> SYBEL, *Gesch. des ersten Kreuzzuges*, 1841; 2nd ed. 1881 (cp. Engl. Trans. *History and Literature of the Crusades*, last ed. 1905). R. RÖHRICHT, *item*, 1901. H. HAGENMEYER, *Peter d. E.* 1879; *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, 1088-1100, 1901; *Chronologie de la première croisade*, 1902.

greeted with the cry, *Deus lo volt*, the war-cry of the crusaders, and thousands forthwith stitched the cross on their coats as a sign of their resolution. A still larger number was soon assembled by a band of preachers, among whom the best known was Peter of Amiens, whom popular legend was afterwards to make into the real instigator of the crusades, though in reality his activity only begins at this juncture. Among most of those enrolled the religious motive was doubtless the predominant, though here and there, among both poor and wealthy, the hope of booty, fortune, or promotion was also a determining factor. Urban himself did all in his power to further the undertaking; he bestowed on all the crusaders a plenary indulgence, gave them a general in the person of his legate, Adhemar, bishop of Puy, and, for the protection of their homes and relatives during their absence, proclaimed a truce of God for three years. The crusaders were mostly Frenchmen, though there were also numerous Normans from southern Italy, and natives of Lorraine. They were divided off according to their countries or provinces, and each group was under the immediate command of one of their own nobles.

The expedition was to start in the summer of 1096, and the various armies were to meet at Constantinople. Some, more eager than the rest, set out in the spring; of these one band was destroyed in Hungary and Bulgaria owing to its want of discipline, whilst the rest were cut to pieces by the Saracens in the neighbourhood of Nicæa. The main army, having on its way to Constantinople to traverse countries nearly all of them hostile, had to sustain many battles, in which thousands of lives were lost. It succeeded, however, in reaching its goal. Edessa and Antioch became Western principalities, one being bestowed on Baldwin, count of Bouillon, and the other on prince Bohemund of Tarentum. In 1099 the crusaders at last took Jerusalem, and on the refusal of count Raymond of Toulouse to accept the sovereignty of the city, **Godfrey of Bouillon**, duke of Lorraine, became the first king of Jerusalem, being succeeded the following year by his brother Baldwin of Edessa. Simultaneously Latin patriarchates were established both here and at Antioch.

The news of these events aroused new enthusiasm in the West. At the appeal of Pope Paschal II three huge armies

proceeded eastwards in 1101. It was their intention to effect the conquest of Bagdad, and thus to strike a blow at the very heart of the Saracen power. This too ambitious plan was, however, soon foiled, and the greater portion of the expedition perished in Asia Minor of hunger and the plague, and by the swords of the Turks, only a small fraction ever reaching Jerusalem. New reinforcements were nevertheless sent from Europe, and with their help the kings of Jerusalem, Baldwin I (1100-18) and his nephew, Baldwin II (1118-31), were enabled to strengthen and extend the new kingdom.

But the tide of fortune soon turned. The abdication of Baldwin II marked the beginning of the decay of the crusaders' power. His successor Fulco (1131-43), the husband of his daughter Melisenda, was indeed a strong ruler, but the difficulties of the position were daily increasing. On the one hand there stood the Greeks, who had all along claimed sovereignty over the conquered country which had once formed part of the Greek Empire; on the other, the Saracens were a constant menace, whilst the Westerns, instead of showing a united front to their common enemies, spent their time in fighting among themselves. A number of the crusaders had been drawn eastwards by motives other than the desire of defending the Holy Places, and among their children born in Palestine—the so-called Pullans—the selfish character became still more evident. This new development was all the more dangerous as the Westerns, instead of establishing one rule throughout the country, had divided it among several princes, who, most of them, were more concerned for their own advantage than for the common good. Under such circumstances it is not remarkable that the conquests were soon lost again. Within a year of Fulco's death, whilst Melisenda was acting as regent during the minority of her son Baldwin III, Edessa was reconquered by Zenki, sultan of Mosul (1144).

II. The fall of Edessa caused great commotion in the West, and made it comparatively easy for Pope Eugene III, seconded as he was by the mighty word of Bernard of Clairvaux, whom he appointed to preach the crusade, to stir up the people to undertake a new expedition, now known as the second crusade. In 1147 two armies departed for Palestine, under the command

of **Conrad III** of Germany and **Lewis VII** of France. The results were, however, not commensurate with the preparations, and the greater portion of the soldiers were slain whilst yet on the way through the treachery of the Greeks and the onslaughts of the Turks. The attack on Damascus attempted in 1148 also proved abortive, owing to the treachery of the Pullans.

The misfortunes of the crusading armies were well calculated to put heart into the Saracens. Nureddin, who succeeded his father Zenki as ruler of Aleppo and Syria (1146), soon took advantage of the Christians' position. Baldwin III (1143-62) and his brother Amalric (1162-73) held out only with difficulty. The kingdom still had force enough to hold together for another decade, whilst the crown again came into the possession of a boy (Baldwin IV, 1173-84) and then of a mere child (Baldwin V, 1184-86), the successive regentships giving rise to all manner of dissensions. But no sooner had Guy of Lusignan, the husband of Sibylla the daughter of Baldwin III, been called to the throne, than the long-expected catastrophe occurred. The crusaders were now faced by the formidable **Saladin**, who had extended his sovereignty to Egypt (1171), had conquered the sultanate of Damascus (1176) and other territories, and to add to their troubles, count Raymond of Tripoli, embittered by Guy's elevation to the kingship, actually allied himself with the enemy. The great battle at Hattin, near Tiberias, was an utter defeat for the crusaders (1187), and was followed shortly after by the capitulation of Jerusalem and of most of the other towns. Only the intervention of the West prevented the expulsion of every Latin from the land.

III. As soon as the dreadful news arrived in Europe, preparations were made throughout the continent for a third general crusade.<sup>1</sup> Three large armies, composed mainly of volunteers from Germany, France, and England, each detachment headed by its own monarch, departed for the East. This time again results did not reach expectations. The German, some 100,000 strong, set out in the spring of 1189, but mostly perished while yet in Asia Minor, those who were not slain by the Turks dying of hunger and fatigue. Even

<sup>1</sup> A. CARTELLIERI, *Philipp II August, K. v. Frankreich*, vol. II, 1906.

their leader, the emperor **Frederick Barbarossa**, met a premature death whilst trying to swim the river Calycadnus in Cilicia (1190). Of the whole host only 2,000 found their way to Acre, where Christians and Saracens had assembled for the great trial of strength. The plague which was raging here reduced their number still further, and among the others who died here was duke Frederick of Swabia (1191), who had assumed the generalship on his father's death. True enough, the French and English arrived soon after, and the town fell into the hands of the allies in the summer (1191); yet its reduction and the conquest of Cyprus, which the English had effected on the way, were the sole result of the expedition. Any further undertaking was prevented by the envy and jealousy of the kingly generals, of Guy of Jerusalem and Conrad of Montferrat, prince of Tyre, who claimed the kingdom of Palestine as his own. **Philip Augustus** returned home forthwith. Duke Leopold VI of Austria, whom the haughty king of England had grievously offended by wantonly insulting his standard, followed the example of his French colleague. **Richard Lionheart**, indeed, tarried in the Holy Land until he too, in the autumn of 1192, was called home by the insurrection of his brother John and the intrigues of the French king, but he achieved nothing of importance, his personal courage being more than matched by his impetuosity, inconstancy, and love of adventure. Before quitting Palestine he concluded a treaty with Saladin, by which the Christians were to retain possession of the coast from Jaffa to Tyre, whilst pilgrims were to be allowed free access to Jerusalem, and a truce was to be observed for three years. Beyond this nothing was obtained by the crusade, in spite of the scale on which it had been conceived. Nevertheless, as Saladin died in 1193, his kingdom falling to pieces with his death, it was found possible to preserve the *status quo* even after the truce had expired; indeed, the German army, which was dispatched to Palestine by Henry VI in the winter of 1196-97, succeeded in extending the Latin rule farther north by the reduction of Berytus (Beyrout).

IV. The fourth crusade<sup>1</sup> was due to the energy of Innocent

<sup>1</sup> W. NORDEN, *Der vierte Kreuzzug*, 1898; *N. Jahrb. f. d. klass. Altertum*, 1904, I Abt. 13, pp. 505-14.

III. Soon after ascending the pontifical throne, he proclaimed a holy war, and ordered all clerics to assign the fortieth part of their revenues to the cause. The crusading army, consisting principally of Frenchmen, was to commence the campaign in Egypt. As it happened, it never reached its destination, for the Venetians, on whose ships the expedition sailed, having at their head the blind but crafty doge Dandolo, persuaded the crusaders to disregard the papal prohibition and to attack the Christian city of Zara in Dalmatia (1202). Thence the crusaders set sail for **Constantinople**, with the object of again setting on the throne the emperor Isaac Angelus, who had been ousted by his brother, and who had sent his son Alexius to the West with a request for help. The immediate object of the crusaders was easily secured (1203), but as the Byzantines were unable to fulfil their obligations, quarrels soon broke out among the allies. To add to the confusion a new revolution occurred in Constantinople, the power falling into the hands of Alexius Ducas Murzufus. The dislike of the new emperor for the Latins compelled them to storm the city a second time (1204). This time it was not restored to the Greeks, but Baldwin of Flanders was chosen emperor, a Latin patriarchate being established simultaneously.

Innocent, though he had striven to hinder the carrying out of the plan, could not but recognise the accomplished fact. As the conquest of Constantinople had not served the cause of the Holy Land, the Pope had to make a further call. In the meantime, in both France and Germany, new bands were making ready for their departure (1212), but they comprised only **boys**, who in their misguided zeal fancied themselves called on to undertake the conquest of Palestine. Accompanied by girls and adults of both sexes, they commenced their long journey. It is scarcely necessary to add that none of them even reached Jerusalem. Those of the French children who were not engulfed in the waves of the Mediterranean were carried off into slavery; the Germans for the most part either died on the way or abandoned the senseless project; the remainder were persuaded at Brindisi to return to their homes.

This failure did not dishearten the Pope. At the Fourth Lateran Council a new crusade was decided on, and a tax equal to one-twentieth of the revenue was laid on all church

property for the next three years. The undertaking being also supported by Honorius III, warlike pilgrims, mainly from the districts of the Lower Rhine and Friesland, began again to set out in bands for the East. With them went also Andrew II, king of Hungary, and duke Leopold VII of Austria, with numerous followers (1217). When the king of Hungary, after several unsuccessful expeditions, had already started on his return journey, the crusaders at last secured the chance for which they had been waiting. Under the leadership of John of Brienne, then (since 1210) king of Jerusalem, they marched on Egypt and captured the stronghold of Damietta, the key of the country (1219). The joy which this conquest called forth among the Christians was only equalled by the dismay of the Saracens. New warriors now arriving from the West, Al-Kamil, sultan of Egypt, made an offer of the whole kingdom of Jerusalem in exchange for Damietta. The offer was, however, declined, the papal legate demanding the extermination of the enemy. The Christians accordingly continued the war, and were shortly after compelled to evacuate Damietta and Egypt (1221).

V. This terrible blow excited much grief in the West. Honorius now pressed **Frederick II** yet once again to fulfil the vow which he had taken at his first coronation at Aachen (1215), and which he had renewed when crowned emperor (1220). The vow was not, however, to be fulfilled during Honorius's lifetime. The emperor was far more concerned with home events than with the East, and at this very time he was fully occupied in putting into order the kingdom of the two Sicilies. He also refused to undertake an expedition unless other countries also sent their contingents, a condition which was prohibitive, with the lack of enthusiasm then prevailing. The crusade had accordingly to be repeatedly postponed. Finally, by the treaty of San Germano in 1225—the same year in which the emperor wedded Isabella, king John's daughter and heiress, and assumed the title of King of Jerusalem—a respite was granted till the summer of 1227, excommunication being threatened in the event of further delay. Even this was not sufficient. Towards the end of the allotted term an army began, indeed, to gather in Brindisi. The troops were, however, compelled to await their leader, and in

the meantime thousands perished from fevers brought on by the heat and circumstances of the country. Not a few returned to their homes. As for Frederick himself, he ultimately set out, only to land again three days after at Otranto on a plea of sickness. The consequence of this, seeing that no exceptions had been allowed for in the treaty, was Frederick's excommunication. Gregory IX, who in the meantime had succeeded the peace-loving Honorius, was all the more inclined to push severity to the extreme, because the emperor had of his own accord delayed the crusade, and seemed to have been only too glad to avail himself of the pretext of sickness. That the malady was, however, merely assumed (as it was urged in 1239) would be an unjust suspicion; unfortunately, in the course of the subsequent quarrel charges of this nature were frequently exchanged, and tended not a little to embitter both sides (§ 113), and to engender a situation which it is not possible to look back upon without sorrow. In 1228 Frederick started in earnest for Palestine, this time not with the Church's blessing, but with her curse. With his small fleet of forty vessels any great undertaking was, of course, out of the question, yet by dint of tact and diplomacy he persuaded the sultan of Egypt to cede Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth, together with certain other towns and hamlets lying on the Pilgrims' Way between Acre and Jerusalem, and also to set free all the captive Christians (1229). At Jerusalem only the mosque of Omar and the sacred enclosure of the Harâm esh-Sherif in which it stands were to remain in the hands of the Moslems. On his side, the emperor promised to protect the sultan from his foes, and to prevent a league of the nobles in northern Syria being concluded against him. The peace was to endure for two years and a half.

Towards the end of the term two new armies arrived in the East, a French one under king Thibaut of Navarre and duke Hugo of Burgundy (1239), and an English one under Richard of Cornwall (1240). Their success was very small, and after their departure the situation of the Christians left behind became more difficult than ever. They had entered on an alliance with the eastern Saracens against their old ally Eyub, sultan of Egypt, and the latter retaliated by calling on the help of the Turkish tribe of the Khovaresmians, and gained

a decisive battle in 1244. The Holy Places were now lost for ever, the Christian army was cut to pieces at Gaza, and the kingdom of Jerusalem was reduced to the limits secured to it by the third crusade.

VI. The news of this misfortune aroused the West to further action. The Council of Lyons in 1245 called on all to lend their help, and again laid claim to a twentieth of all ecclesiastical incomes for the space of three years. The war then proceeding between Pope and emperor indeed kept back many crusaders, yet a large army was gathered together, owing mainly to the exertions of the powerful **Lewis IX** of France.<sup>1</sup> The pilgrim army, consisting almost exclusively of Frenchmen, embarked in 1248, and a year later was in possession of Damietta, the plan being, as before, to conquer Palestine through Egypt. The remainder of the expedition was, however, unfortunate, Lewis and his army being taken prisoners (1250). In return for the restitution of Damietta and the payment of a large ransom they indeed recovered their liberty, but the crusade was a failure. One part of the army, including the king's brother, returned home as soon as its captivity was at an end, while Lewis remained in Palestine for yet three years, though, as he had been deprived of most of his forces, he was unable to accomplish anything worth mention. A relief army, at his demand, was enrolled in France, but on the murder of its leader, the 'Hungarian master,' most of the soldiers deserted, and the remainder fell victims to their own disorders. The only result of Lewis's stay was to prevent the Saracens from securing the fruits of their victory.

VII. On his withdrawal, new misfortunes awaited the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> The Mamaluke Bibars not long after (1260) extended his authority over Egypt and Syria, and after some preliminary skirmishes, crowned his achievements by the capture of Antioch (1268). By this time Lewis was already engaged in the preparation of a new crusade.<sup>3</sup> The expedition started in 1270, but was even more unfortunate than the previous one. Whilst the army was lying before

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by C. H. SCHOLTEN, 1850-58; FAURE, 1866; WALLON, 1875; LECOY DE LA MARCHE, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> MICE. XV (1894), 1-58.

<sup>3</sup> R. STERNFELD, *Ludwigs d. Hl. Kreuzzug nach Tunis 1270 u. die Politik Karls I v. Sizilien*, 1896.

Tunis, which it had been decided to capture in the first instance, a plague broke out and carried off St. Lewis himself and great numbers of the crusaders. A truce was accordingly agreed upon, and the undertaking was practically at an end, in spite of all the efforts of Gregory X—who had been elected Pope during his sojourn in the Holy Land—and in spite of the help afforded by the Council of Lyons, which in 1274 decreed the payment of a special tithe for six years. This crusade was the last. Neither the French nor any other nation were to be persuaded any more to undertake the risks of a new trial of force. The Latins left in Palestine, being now thrown on their own resources, were soon deprived even of the relics of their kingdom. Tripoli was the first to fall (1283), and was followed by Ptolemais or Acre (1291), the last bulwark of the West. Great was the dismay when the news was received in Europe; Rome again and again launched appeals for help, and a few princes, in obedience to her summons, donned the cross, but enthusiasm had been killed by failure, and the age of the crusades was over.

The crusades failed to attain their main object: the Holy Places still remained in the hand of the infidel. Yet blood and treasure had not been expended in vain. The powerful forward movement which now made itself felt in the West in almost every department of life, in commerce, art, and literature, but more especially in architecture, is attributable, without a doubt, to the enlargement of ideas due to contact with Grecian and Arabic civilisation.<sup>1</sup>

## § 117

### Conflict with the Islam in Europe<sup>2</sup>

Whereas the Saracens were successful in retaining their Asiatic conquests, they were to lose all the possessions which they had acquired in Europe. Sicily was taken from them

<sup>1</sup> J. C. HAHN, *Ursachen u. Folgen der Kreuzzüge*, 1859; KAMPSCHULTE, *Zur Gesch. d. MA.* 1864; PRUTZ, *Kulturgesch. d. Kr.* 1887; O. HENNE AM RHYN, item, 3rd ed. 1903; HIRSCH-GEREUTH, *St. z. Gesch. d. Kreuzzuges nach den Kr.* 1897.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* § 84. A. F. v. SCHACK, *Gesch. d. Normannen in Sizilien*, 2 vol. 1889; L. v. HEINEMANN, *Gesch. d. Normannen in Unteritalien u. Sizilien*, I, 1893; CASPAR, *Roger II*, 1904.

as early as the eleventh century, the then war being in a sense a forerunner of the crusades. The Normans who settled in Lower Italy in 1017 first turned their attention to displacing what remained of the Greek sovereignty; they then effected the conquest of Apulia and Calabria, where they erected an independent kingdom under the suzerainty of the Holy See. Having now firmly established themselves on the mainland, they invaded Sicily under the leadership of duke Robert Guiscard, on whom Pope Nicholas II had bestowed the island as a fief (1059). After a war of thirty years (1061-91), Count Roger succeeded in wresting the island from the Saracenic power, and assumed the rule as a vassal of his brother Robert. His son Roger II (1101-54) united the two portions of the kingdom, became king (1130), and extended his realm by the conquest of Naples (1139).

In **Spain** the Moors, though not indeed entirely expelled from the country during this period, were confined within much narrower frontiers. After the fall of the Omniade dynasty (1031), the caliphate of Cordova being broken up into a number of petty kingdoms or emirates, the Christian princes were not slow to avail themselves of the disadvantage in which their enemies were placed. Toledo, the capital, was recovered by Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile (1085). The Almoravides, whom the Moors now summoned from Morocco, and the Almohades, who half a century later (1146) usurped their power, prevented for the time being any further progress. The great battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212) nevertheless gave the day to the Christians, and twenty-five years later nearly the whole of Andalusia was in their hands. Only the extreme south, where the emir Mohammed Aben Alamar founded the kingdom of Granada (1238), continued in the power of the Moors till 1492, when Ferdinand the Catholic finally drove the Arabs from their last footing in Spain.

## CHAPTER III

### SECTS AND HERESIES<sup>1</sup>

#### § 118

#### Cathari and Albigenses<sup>2</sup>

THE period under consideration is remarkable for the number of sectarian movements which took place during it. Of these, some were entirely new, whilst others were ancient errors in a new dress. The tendency of the age to make of the religious life something wholly outward, not unnaturally caused a reaction in favour of inward religion which frequently took an heretical turn.

The most important of the sects of the period is that of the **Cathari** (or 'Puritans'). Their name comes from their boasted asceticism, their abstinence from all defilement, and from their incidental claim to constitute the Church undefiled. Their origin is far from clear. It would seem that the Paulicians and Bogomiles (§ 89) migrated from Bulgaria to the West, there joined forces with what remained of the Manichæans, casting the latter's peculiar doctrines into a gnostic form. That they came from the East, or were to some extent under eastern influence, is proved not only by the name of Cathari (*Καθαροί*) by which they called themselves, but also by the names given to them by their opponents, such as *Bulgari*, *Bugri*, *Publicani*, *Popeliciani* (= *Pauliciani*). The sect first comes on the scene in the eleventh century, and by the twelfth century it had groups of adherents throughout the

<sup>1</sup> Ch. U. HAHN, *Gesch. d. Ketzler im MA.* 3 vol. 1845-50; DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sektengesch. des MA.* 1890.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. SCHMIDT, *Hist. et doctrine des Cath. ou Albig.* 2 vol. 1849; DOUAIS, *Les Albigeois*, 1879; J. GUIRAUD, *Questions d'histoire*, 1906 (for their ethics and *Consolamentum*). On their origin see *Z. f. KG.* 1894; *Rqh.* 1894, I, 50-83.

principal countries of Europe. Their headquarters were, however, in southern France and in northern Italy. They belonged to two schools. Those of the one, the majority being in France, held the Paulician doctrine of an absolute dualism, and believed in the existence of two eternal principles, each of which was the creator of a different world. The other school, prevalent especially in Italy, agreed with the Bogomiles in looking on the evil principle as being merely a fallen spirit, Satan, or the God of the Old Testament. Besides this, there were other minor differences of view, but in the main the various parties were at one. They believed in the migration of souls, and accordingly refused to put any animal to death; they refrained from worshipping in churches, rejected the sacraments, the veneration of pictures and crosses; they also considered oaths, wars, the death punishment, and civil government to be unlawful. They likewise abstained from marriage and from flesh-meat (though not from fish), and even from eggs and milk (though not from wine), and observed long and severe fasts.

But the Perfect only were bound to keep these injunctions, those, namely, who had received the spiritual baptism or *Consolamentum*. This was their only sacrament, and it was conferred after a kind of catechumenate, by the bestowal of the Lord's Prayer (the only orison they recognised) and the imposition of hands and of the book of the Gospels. This baptism was held to be necessary for salvation, and had to be renewed after a fall into sin. The simple Faithful, forming by far the greater number, merely accepted the pledge called the *Convenenza*, by which they undertook to receive the *Consolamentum* before death. The latter were not only dispensed from the stricter code of morality, but, persuaded that they had at their disposal the means necessary for salvation, they could give full vent to their passions. Under the circumstances it was a matter of some difficulty to decide whether those who had received the *Consolamentum* under the impression that they were dying, were obliged, on subsequent recovery, to observe the mode of life of the Perfect. Converts were therefore frequently compelled to bring about their own death, by depriving themselves of food. Others freely accepted the *Endura*, as this mode of suicide was called.

The Church soon took steps against the heresy, especially in southern France, where, as it stood under the protection of many of the nobles, it was becoming distinctly dangerous. To expel the error the Church made use both of persuasion and of stronger measures. As her first efforts met with but poor success, Innocent III<sup>1</sup> decided on yet greater severity, the murder of his legate Peter of Castelnau (1208) hastening the consummation. At the Pope's appeal a large army assembled to fight the **Albigenses**, as the French Cathari were called, and to punish their supporters, Roger, viscount of Beziers, and Raymond VI, count of Toulouse. The war was protracted for some twenty years, partly owing to the self-seeking policy of Simon de Montfort, who commanded the crusaders (1209-29), but, in the end, the power of the heretics was broken. The final extermination of the error was left to the Inquisition (cp. § 121).

## § 119

### The Waldensians<sup>2</sup>

The founder of the Waldensians was (Peter?) Waldes, a native of Lyons. Having amassed much wealth as a broker, he acquired a religious turn by reading certain portions of the Scriptures which he had caused two priests to translate into the vernacular. On becoming (1173) acquainted with the story of St. Alexius, he settled his landed property on his wife and gave the remainder of his fortune partly to those from whom he had obtained it, partly to the poor, and a few years later (1177) began his mission as a preacher of penance. His efforts were directed to restoring the manner of life of the Apostles, his disciples being pledged to poverty, to the practice of wandering about, and to the use of sandals. He soon collected a band of like-minded spirits, and, in obedience to our Lord's command when sending forth the Apostles, they proceeded in pairs preaching throughout the continent. It was not long

<sup>1</sup> A. LUCHAIRE, *Innocent III : la croisade des Albigeois*, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by DIECKHOFF, 1851; HERZOG, 1853; K. MÜLLER, 1886 (and in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1886); PREGER, 1890 (and in the *Abh. München*); COMBA, 2nd ed. 1902; HUCK, 1897 (*Dogmenhist. Beitrag zur Gesch. d. W.*); *Z. f. KG.* XV, 454-60; *KL.* XI, 1185-95.

before the movement made itself felt even in far-off lands, especially after the expulsion of the preachers from Lyons. In northern Italy particularly it found many adherents, even in the order of the Humiliati (§ 127). For a time the sect was able to work openly, seeing that apart from the measure taken against them at Lyons, and the prohibition of preaching decreed by the Third Lateran Council, no attention was paid to them. They were, however, again obliged to withdraw into secrecy when Lucius III formally included (1184), among the heretics whom he excommunicated, the Humiliati or Poor Men of Lyons (*Pauperes de Lugduno*). This was the name by which the Waldensians were commonly known, though they were also called *Leonistae*, from Lyons, whence they originally came, and sometimes *Sabatati* or *Insabatati*, from the sandals they wore. As to their peculiarities, they were obliged not only to relinquish their fortunes, but also to refrain from all manual toil. They therefore depended for their living on the alms of their friends and admirers, who still remained entangled in the life of this world—of the Believers (*credentes*), as they were called by the Catholics, in contradistinction to the preachers, who were styled the Perfect. To the vow of poverty they united one of chastity and of obedience to their superiors. They rejected purgatory and intercession for the dead, indulgences, oaths, military service, and the death penalty.

The sect soon split into two branches. The Lombards demanded a certain independence, and the right of electing and consecrating lifelong superiors; in spite of the efforts of Waldes, they also insisted on maintaining their guilds of craftsmen, and finally severed their connection with the others. After the founder's death an attempt was made at the conference of Bergamo (1218) to re-establish unity, but it was of no avail. The division led to certain differences in practical conduct, for whereas the French sectarians, in spite of their doctrines, continued outwardly in the Church's fold, and attended Divine service with the Catholics, the Italians went farther, and, believing the worth of the sacraments to depend on the personal sanctity of the minister, they rejected the sacraments of the Church and conducted their own services. But they were not able to continue this practice for long, and as early as the end of the thirteenth century they were compelled,

in order to avoid persecution, to receive the sacraments of the official Church, though they persisted in confessing their sins only to their own brethren. This Lombard branch of the sect showed very considerable activity, and invaded a large portion of Germany, Bohemia, and Poland; the French branch, on the contrary, was soon confined to the mountain valleys of Piedmont. In the sixteenth century the sectarians either went over to Protestantism, or at least reorganised themselves on a Protestant basis. There is a legend of comparatively early invention, that the Waldensians were connected with the primitive Church; that when Constantine the Great had heaped power and wealth on Silvester, a band of devoted men resolved to preserve inviolate the Apostolic life, and had become the parents of the sect. This legend, which received general credence among the Protestants until the middle of last century, is now everywhere acknowledged to be devoid of foundation.

## § 120

### Smaller Sects

Besides the two sects just dealt with, our period can show numerous others of less notoriety. Of these some, such as the Petrobrusians, have something in common with the Cathari, whilst others, for instance that of the Apostolic brethren, have affinity with the Waldensians, though in neither case would there seem to have been any direct relations between the sects. As to the remainder, namely the Amalricians and the other pantheistically minded heretics, they constitute a new and entirely distinct development.

I. **The Petrobrusians.** At the beginning of the twelfth century a priest named Peter of Bruys preached for nearly twenty years in the south of France against infant baptism, the Eucharist and Mass, against the veneration of images and the cross, against church-building, prayers and offerings for the dead, and against the Old Testament. He was burnt to death at St. Gilles in 1137 by a mob infuriated by his proceedings. After his death his work was taken up by the Cluniac monk Henry. The latter had already, twenty years previously, stirred up trouble at Le Mans by his preaching. He was indicted ultimately (1148) before the Council of Rheims;

as to what followed, history is silent. Cp. DÖLLINGER, I, 75-98 ; J. v. WALTER, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, 1906.

II. **Tanchelm**, a Dutch layman, violently assailed the clergy and pronounced their sacraments invalid on account of their sins. He, none the less, led a very wicked life himself, pretended to be equal with Christ, stating that he too had received the fulness of the Holy Ghost, and publicly betrothed himself to the Blessed Virgin. He met his death in 1115 at the hand of a cleric.

III. **Eudo**, or **Eon de Stella**, a Breton, gave himself out as the Judge of the world, referring to his own name the words of the Church's prayer: 'Per eum qui venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos.' He was sentenced to imprisonment by the Council of Rheims in 1148, and some of his more obstinate followers were put to death.

IV. **Arnold of Brescia** declaimed against the Temporal Power and against the Church's possession of landed property. If we may believe Otto of Freising (*Gesta Frid.* II, 20), he held that no cleric having property, no bishop holding fiefs, no monk who was not truly poor, could hope for salvation. After his condemnation by the Lateran Council in 1139 he went to France, and thence to Switzerland. Later on (c. 1144) he returned to Italy. His connection with the revolution at Rome resulted in his execution by Barbarossa in 1155. HAUSRATH, *Die Weltverbesserer*, vol. II-III, 1891-95 ; *Neue k. Z.* 1902, pp. 792-808.

V. The **Pasagians**, a small sect of northern Italy, in the twelfth century insisted on the observance of the Mosaic Law, and looked on Christ as the first of God's creatures.

VI. The **Luciferians** worshipped Lucifer, whom they held to have been unjustly expelled from heaven, and who they believed would, together with his followers, ultimately be restored to his rights, whilst Michael and his angels would be relegated to hell. The sect had a considerable following, and may possibly be a development of that category of the Cathari which professed a mitigated dualism. In Germany they were persecuted by Conrad of Marburg, whose excessive cruelty to these heretics brought about his violent death in 1233. Cp. KALTNER, *Konrad v. M.* 1882.

VII. **Amalric of Bena**, a Paris professor, held it to be an article of faith that every Christian must believe himself to be a member of Christ ; that unless this was believed in with as deep a faith as the birth and death of the Redeemer or any other article of the Creed, there was no chance of salvation. This membership of Christ he explained as an indwelling of the Son of God, and understood this in a pantheistic sense. His teaching was condemned in 1206. Even then he had made numerous disciples, and in the hands of some of these his doctrine soon assumed the form of a system. The Amalricians spoke of a threefold incarnation of God: of the Father in Abraham, of the Son in Christ, and of the Holy Ghost in each Christian. In the present age, which is that

of the Holy Ghost, every Christian in whom He dwells is as much God as Christ was. On the ground of this system they mercilessly criticised the Church, whilst, however, claiming for themselves complete freedom to commit sins of the flesh. The existence of the sect was only discovered in 1209 after the founder's death, and its ringleaders, amongst them the goldsmith William of Paris, were, some of them, burnt, and others imprisoned. Soon after this (1212) a similar doctrine was mooted at Strasburg by a certain **Ortlieb**, who gave his name to the Ortliebarians. In this instance, however, a kind of rationalism is manifest; the world is without a beginning, Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and merely proclaimed anew the true religion which had long been known, and which is identical with that now preached by the Ortliebarians. Amalric's true successors would, however, appear to be rather the so-called **Brethren of the Free Spirit**, consisting of both men and women, and known accordingly as Beghards and Beghines. They make their appearance about the middle of the thirteenth century in different towns of Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. In their determination to carry their theories into practice, they far outstepped their predecessors, and stand forth as the extremest partisans of freedom of thought and conduct. Finally, to the number of those who were touched by Amalric's spirit, we must add the Paris professor **David of Dinant**. His *Quaterni*, or *Liber de tomis sive de divisionibus*, which was condemned by the same Council of Paris in 1209, at least contained ideas of a pantheistic turn. Cp. REUTER, *Gesch. d. relig. Aufklärung im MA.* II (1877), 218-49.

VIII. The **Apostolic Brethren**. They owed their establishment to Gerard Segarelli of Parma (1260). His wish was to restore the Apostolic life by practising poverty and preaching penance, but his errors brought on him persecution, and he ended his life at the stake (1300). His successor Dolcino was even more violent against the Church, whose approaching chastisement he prophesied. He ultimately took refuge in a stronghold in the territory of Novara, and aided by his followers terrorised the surrounding districts, until he was slain in 1307 by the crusading army led against him by Bishop Rainer of Vercelli. Cp. KRONE, *Fra Dolcino*, 1844.

IX. The **Stedingians**, a Frisian tribe in the neighbourhood of Bremen, declined to pay their tithes to the archbishop of Bremen, and on being excommunicated they rose in revolt, and had to be repressed by special crusades (1232-34). They were also charged, especially at the Council of Bremen in 1230, with many ecclesiastical offences, though these seem to have been merely a consequence of their quarrel with the bishop. Mg. by SCHUMACHER, 1865.

## § 121

The Inquisition<sup>1</sup>

The warfare against the errors of the period led to the establishment of an institution called the Inquisition, of which the task consisted in searching out and punishing heretics. The institution dates back to the Council of Verona (1184), where the bishops were directed either personally or with the help of their commissioners to search out heretics in suspected districts, who were then to be punished as they deserved by the secular power. The Councils of Avignon (1209, c. 2) and Montpellier (1215, c. 46) ordained further that in each parish a cleric and several laymen should be bound under oath to denounce heretics, whilst the Council of Narbonne (1227, c. 14) gave these officials the right of pursuing their victims *manu militari*. These privileges were renewed by the Council of Toulouse in 1229, which practically constituted the Inquisition in the form in which it was to become famous. According to the decrees of this Council, anyone who knowingly harbours a heretic shall lose his property and receive due punishment (c. 4); the house in which a heretic is found is to be demolished, and the ground on which it stood is to be confiscated (c. 6). Contumacious heretics and their protectors are to receive the *Animadversio debita* (c. 1), which, as is apparent from another decree (c. 11), was to consist in the sentence of death, which under ordinary circumstances would be carried out at the stake. This latter mode of punishment was just then becoming the usual one for heretics, as we can see from the enactments of Frederick II (1224) and Gregory IX (1231). In Germany and the north of France it was in use even in the eleventh century, and there are isolated instances of its earlier use elsewhere. On the other hand, in southern France and in Italy the measures thus far taken against heretics had been confined

<sup>1</sup> BERN. GUIDONIS, *Practica inquisitionis haeret.* ed. DOUAI, 1875; NIC. EYMERICUS, *Directorium inquisitorum haer. prav.* ed. PEGNA, 1578 (a record of the proceedings of the Inquisition in 1321 and 1376); P. FREDERICQ. *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haer. prav. Neerlandicae*, I-III, 1889-1906; DOUAI, *Documents pour servir à l'hist. de l'Inquis. dans le Languedoc*, 1900; LEA, *Hist. of the Inquis. of the Middle Ages*, 3 vol. 1888; HENNER, *Beiträge zur Organisation u. Kompetenz der päpstl. Ketzergerichte*, 1890; TH. DE CAUZONS, *Hist. de l'Inquis. en France*, 1908; VACANDARD, *Engl. Trans. The Inquisition*. 1908.

to confiscation of property, imprisonment, branding, or banishment ; the Fourth Lateran Council (c. 3), for instance, had contemplated nothing more severe than the deprivation of goods and the loss of civil rights. Those who relented were to have their life spared, though they were to be for ever excluded from public offices, and were condemned to bear two crosses on their coats (c. 10). Should they retract only out of the fear of death or some other such motive, they were to be imprisoned for the remainder of their life (c. 11). To prevent miscarriage of justice, judgment in such cases was to be left to the bishop or to a properly empowered cleric (c. 8). Gregory IX transferred the Inquisition into the hands of the Dominicans (1232). Innocent IV sanctioned the use of torture by the inquisitors as a means of extracting the truth. The condemned man was ultimately handed over to the secular arm for the execution of the punishment.

The **execution of heretics** was not a new custom introduced by the Inquisition, having long been the practice in the East as well as in the West. The custom also outlasted the Middle Ages, and was even adopted for a time in the Protestant world, a fact which tends to show that it was not an outcome of mere blood-thirstiness. Our ancestors looked on the practice as necessary to safeguard the faith and the order of the Church against the attacks of heretics ; their opinion may be the better appreciated by recollecting that, at the time, heresy seemed to portend danger not only to the ecclesiastical, but also to the social fabric. Nor must it be forgotten that penalties of old were generally far harsher than those in use at the present day. The Inquisition was, moreover, not an institution to endure long, and the separation of Christendom into a number of confessions soon rendered it obsolete.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH

#### § 122

#### The Roman See

THE Roman Church had from the beginning the first place among the Churches, but her primacy in the course of the ages did not always stand forth to the same extent. During the period we are considering, the Apostolic See became more and more the centre of church government, and whereas formerly the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals had only reserved to it the decision of *causae maiores*, it now became the custom to refer to its judgment a number of other questions. It was Gregory VII (*Reg.* VIII, 21) who laid down the principle that to the Roman Church, as to the mother and mistress of all other Churches, all more important matters must be submitted; that her decision is irreformable and admits of no appeal: in fine, that the Papacy stands above both kingdom and Empire. These rights are in part contained in the *Dictatus papae*, a collection of twenty-seven short sayings which were incorporated in Gregory's *Registrum* (II, 55), and which in the main represent his views, though from the style of some of the dictates, and from the relation in which they stand to the collection of Cardinal Deusdedit, they would not seem to be Gregory's actual work. The change in the extent of the Pope's authority was reflected in a corresponding change of language. The opinion ventured on by Baronius that Gregory VII by express command reserved the title of *Papa* to the occupant of the Roman See, is by no means sure, seeing that it is probably only based on dictate 11: *Quod hoc unicum est nomen in mundo*, yet the opinion is true to this extent, that we

now find for the first time the title of Pope used in the full and exclusive meaning which it was henceforth to bear.

Details which testify to greater concentration of power are the following :—

I. **Metropolitans** were compelled to promise canonical obedience to the Pope. An oath to this effect was demanded by Gregory VII in certain special instances and for motives of church policy ; Gregory IX made the law general and Martin V extended the obligation to bishops also.

II. **Canonisation**, which had previously been performed by each bishop for his own diocese, was reserved as a special privilege of the Holy See by Alexander III (c. 1, X, *de reliquiis*, 3, 45). The Fourth Lateran Council also decreed (c. 62) that no newly found relics should be honoured save when approved by the Apostolic See. In this its object was to prevent a recurrence of certain abuses which had of late crept in, owing to the older practice.

III. In the twelfth century it became customary to reserve to the Pope the absolution from certain grievous sins.

IV. **Appeals to Rome** became much more frequent. In many instances the appeal was lodged merely to escape punishment, and besides this objection there were others, for thereby cases, even the most trivial, were indefinitely postponed, with the result that justice could no longer take its course. These abuses afforded a grievance to Bernard of Clairvaux (*De consideratione*, c. 2), and to many others of his day.

V. Now that the Popes claimed immediate jurisdiction over the whole Church, they appropriated the right of appointing their own nominees to foreign dioceses. The beginning of this practice may be traced back to Innocent II ; at first it was usual only to recommend the candidate, but in the course of time the request made way for a command. As the innovation frequently secured places to worthy men who could not have otherwise obtained promotion, it had at least one good result. But on the other hand it also opened a way to place-seeking and to other grave abuses, and everywhere excited discontent. At Lyons in 1245 the English complained bitterly of the number of Italians who held high office in the English Church, and their complaint, made as it was during the great struggle with Frederick II, was frequently re-echoed in subsequent years, especially by Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. Innocent IV ultimately declared his intention of renouncing his **right of Provision**. Alexander IV promised (*Execrabilis quorundam*, 1255) that no chapter of canons should have more than four *Mandata de providendo*. In spite of these promises the practice continued to be indulged in, and was soon extended yet farther. Clement IV formally reserved (in the Decretal *Licet Ecclesiarum*, c. 2 *de praeib.* in VI, 3, 4) to the Holy See the right of appointing to all *beneficia apud sedem apostolicam*

*vacantia*, that is, to all benefices whose previous occupants had died at the Roman court. At the same time Clement laid down the principle that the Pope has the *plenaria dispositio* of all church offices. Cp. PHILLIPS, *KR.* V, 488-512; FELTEN, *R. Grosseteste*, 1897; STEVENSON, *item*, 1899.

VI. Greater stress was now laid on the Pope's fulness of power in the matter of **doctrinal decisions**. In earlier times it had indeed been usual to urge that the Roman See had always preserved the faith inviolate (Formula of P. Hormisdas, cp. § 55), or that the Church of the Apostles had never quitted the path of truth, thanks to the prophecy of Christ (*Luke* xxii. 32, *Tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*), and that it would continue to preserve the purity of the faith until the end (Agatho). Now, however, Thomas of Aquino (*Sum. Th.* II, 2, qu. 1, art. 10) expressly laid down the doctrine that the Pope, to whom, according to the Decretal *Maiores* of Innocent IV (c. 3, X, *de bapt.* 3, 42), all matters of import must be submitted, has also the right of finally deciding all questions pertaining to faith. This doctrine Aquinas bases, not only on the verse of St. Luke (xxii. 32), but also on *1 Cor.* i. 10, because the oneness of faith which St. Paul here demands could not otherwise be preserved.

VII. **General Councils** had been, in former times, summoned by the emperor; the summons now emanates from the Pope. There were several reasons for this alteration. Since the beginning of the Eastern Schism all the Councils, with the exception of two, comprised only Latin bishops. The new Empire, moreover, did not stand in quite the same relation to the Church as the ancient. Besides the Empire, there were other Christian States, and though the emperor took the highest rank among the princes of Europe, the others too were independent sovereigns. Under such circumstances the old order was bound to go, and the assembling together of the Council was bound to become the task of the ecclesiastical head of the Church, especially as Councils by their very nature were purely ecclesiastical gatherings.

VIII. **Church and State** had, even in antiquity, been likened respectively to the soul and body, or to the sun and moon, and thereby the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal had been implied. But the comparison was mostly taken ideally rather than really. In practice the two powers were really reckoned as mutually independent, and if one of them did assert any supremacy over the other, it was the secular power; nor was this the case only in the East where the Church was almost wholly under the control of the Empire, but also in the West. In our period, however, a different idea came to prevail. The superiority of the Church power over the State, or, to use the expression then in favour, of the sword of the spirit over the secular sword, became a firm persuasion. Gregory VII declared that Peter had been made by Christ lord over every earthly kingdom (*Reg.* I, 63); if the Apostolic

See may exercise its supreme power to judge matters spiritual, why should it not also act as judge in matters temporal (*Reg. IV, 2*)? The Pope has the right under certain circumstances of deposing kings and emperors. Nor does he even hesitate to state that the spiritual power alone comes from God, whereas the secular power has its origin in sin (*Reg. IV, 2*; VIII, 21). Ideas such as these were not indeed allowed to pass unchallenged, but, on the whole, the new way of looking at things, this hierocratic system, as we might term it, swayed men's minds throughout the Middle Ages. It also received symbolical expression in the practice of kissing the Pope's foot, and in that of holding the Pope's stirrup, by which princes signified their respect. The latter custom (*Officium stratoris*), which was not entirely new (according to the *Donatio Constantini* this honour was rendered even to Silvester), was now enforced. Previously, to kiss the feet was a mark of respect payable to any bishop, but in the *Dictatus papae* (9) we read: *Quod solius papae pedes principes deosculantur*. Cp. *Th. Qu.* 1893, p. 522 f.; *St. a. ML.* 1894, II, 486-88; R. DOMEIER, *Die Päpste als Richter über die deutschen Könige*, 1897.

## § 123

### The College of Cardinals<sup>1</sup>

The presbyterium of the Roman bishop must primitively have consisted of all the priests of the Roman diocese. In the course of time the priestly college came to comprise only those in charge of the principal churches of the city (*tituli*), or the so-called cardinal priests; besides these, the Pope's senate consisted also of the Roman deacons (cardinal deacons), and the neighbouring bishops, *i.e.* occupants of the suburbican sees, who, according to an arrangement of Stephen III (769), had to perform in turn for a week at a time the services at the Lateran. Even in former ages the cardinals occupied a somewhat higher position than the rest of the clergy, but the importance of their dignity was greatly increased by the power of electing the Pope, which was conferred on them by Nicholas II, and which subsequently to Alexander III was exercised exclusively by them. In their new quality of papal electors

<sup>1</sup> PHILLIPS, *KR.* vol. VI; J. P. KIRSCH, *Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalskollegiums im 13 u. 14 Jahrh.* 1895; SÄGMÜLLER, *Tätigkeit u. Stellung der Kardinäle bis Bonifaz VIII.* 1896; P. M. BAUMGARTEN, *Untersuchungen u. Urkunden über die Camera Collegii Cardinalium für die Zeit 1295-1437*, 1898; H. J. WURM, *Die Papstwahl*, 1902.

they shared in the increase of papal power and prestige. Important questions which formerly would have been laid before Councils were now discussed at the Consistory, or cardinals' meeting. Whereas in earlier times cardinals took rank according to their order, they gradually, since the thirteenth century, came to take precedence of all other dignitaries, even of archbishops and patriarchs. As a sign of their dignity, Innocent IV empowered all secular cardinals to wear the red hat, a privilege which was by Gregory XIII extended to cardinals belonging to religious orders. At a later period they also received the purple mantle (introduced by Paul II?) and the title of Eminence (from Urban VIII, 1630). Their incomes grew in proportion. In the thirteenth century it was quite regular for cardinals to hold a plurality of benefices. The college of cardinals also received one-half of many of the revenues of the Roman See, for instance of the *Servitia communia*—which bishops and abbots were compelled to pay to the Pope on their nomination or confirmation—of the visitation fees—which certain archbishops and abbots had to hand over when visiting the Curia, or at the time fixed for this visit—and of the census or taxes which were raised on the lands of the Roman Church, or which were paid by exempted churches and monasteries, or which were due from such States as had acknowledged the Pope's suzerainty (Naples and Sicily, Corsica, Sardinia, England). They also took their portion of Peter's Pence. Nicholas IV, who settled the cardinals' rights in this respect, also bestowed on them a share in the government, and allowed them a voice in the nomination or deprivation of the rectors in the provinces of the Papal States, and of the collectors whose duty it was to raise those of the taxes in which the cardinals shared. At the beginning of the period the number of cardinals was fifty-three (seven bishops, twenty-eight priests, eighteen deacons); but it was, later on, considerably reduced. Sixtus V (1586) finally fixed their number at seventy (six bishops, fifty priests, fourteen deacons).

The cardinal bishoprics were those of Ostia, Albano, Porto, Silva Candida, or S. Rufina, Sabina, Praeneste (Palestrina), and Tusculum or Frascati. S. Rufina, as far back as the time of Calixtus II, was merged in the bishopric of Porto.

## § 124

**Cathedral Chapters and Episcopal Elections—Vicars General and Titular Bishops**

I. After the same manner as the college of cardinals and through a like cause, the **cathedral chapters**<sup>1</sup> increased their importance considerably during this period. At the conclusion of the investiture quarrel, when the canonical election of bishops had been re-established, the whole city, according to ancient custom, performed the election. Gradually, however, the laity and common clergy lost this right, which was then reserved to the canons. The process seems to have been accomplished in the twelfth century, being presupposed by the Twelfth General Council (c. 24). In consequence of this alteration the canons also became the bishop's sole official counsellors, and even obtained the distinct right of helping him in the government of his diocese. The bishop was now required to seek their consent in a number of matters, whereas previously he had merely to ask their advice, without being in any way bound to follow it. There can be no doubt that the increase in their influence was in part due to their high birth, the chapters consisting largely of nobles, nobility of birth actually giving a claim to admission into some of these foundations.

II. As the archdeacons had come in the course of time to usurp many of the bishop's own rights, especially by claiming separate jurisdiction, their office was variously curtailed in the twelfth and thirteenth century. At about the middle of the thirteenth century, the bishops adopted the custom of appointing each a **vicar general** (*Vicarius generalis, Officialis*) over the diocese, and as the latter was empowered to quash the judgments of the archdeacon's court, the importance of the archdeacons was considerably diminished. As an institution they survived, however, to the time of the Council of Trent, and in certain localities, though shorn of most of their ancient privileges, they continued to exist as late as the eighteenth century.

III. At the time of the Saracen invasions many bishops who had been expelled from their sees sought refuge in the

<sup>1</sup> Ph. SCHNEIDER, *Die bisch. Domkapitel*, 1885.

dioceses of colleagues more fortunate than themselves. On the demise of these bishops, successors were appointed in the hope that the dioceses would soon again be rescued from the power of the infidel. In this wise there arose the institution of **titular bishops**, that is of bishops consecrated to the title of a see held by the Moslem (hence styled bishops *in partibus infidelium*), and who were consequently without a see of their own, but who acted as auxiliaries in episcopal work to the diocesan bishop in whose diocese they resided. The institution was especially welcome in Germany, where the prince-bishops were only too pleased to shift the burden of their episcopal duties to other shoulders.

## § 125

### The Corpus Iuris Canonici<sup>1</sup>

As the older collections of laws fell short of the logical requirements of the age, and as the ancient law was in many respects in contradiction with more recent legislation, Gratian, a monk of Bologna, who had been the first to teach canon law as a branch of knowledge distinct from theology, compiled (soon after 1140) a new collection which should not be open to the same reproach. This work, commonly known as the *Decretum Gratiani*, was received with great applause, was frequently glossed, and, by being adopted in the schools and courts, obtained legal authority. The legislative activity of the Church soon made it necessary, however, to collect and codify the decretals of later Popes, and this task, after several previous attempts, was imposed by Gregory IX on Raymond of Pennaforte (1230-34). His collection comprises five books, and received the title of *Decretales Gregorii IX*. The same reason which necessitated this compilation continued to demand the production of similar works. The next in order of time was the collection made at the direction of Boniface VIII (1298), which, coming after the five books of Gregory IX, was styled *Liber sextus*. Another such collection was the *Liber Clementinarum*, called after its contents, which

<sup>1</sup> PHILLIPS, *KR.* vol. IV, 1851; SCHULTE, *Gesch. der Quellen u. Literatur des kanon. Rechtes*, 3 vol. 1875-80.

comprised the constitutions of Clement V. The last works of this character were the *Extravagantes Ioannis XXII* and the *Extravagantes communes*, compiled towards the end of the Middle Ages by the Frenchman Chappuis. The contents of the former are sufficiently indicated by its title; the latter comprises the decretals of later Popes, as well as a few enactments of John XXII and his immediate successors not found in the previous work. All these collections together form the *Corpus iuris canonici*; they were not, however, assembled in a single work until after the invention of the printing-press.

Consisting really of several distinct works, the arrangement of the *Corpus* is not the same throughout. Gratian's *Decretum* consists of three parts, of which the first (and the same applies to the third, which is headed *De consecratione*) is divided into *distinctiones* and *capita*, whereas the subdivisions of the second are *causae*, *quaestiones*, and *capita*. The later collections are all divided up into 'books,' 'titles,' and 'chapters.' In referring to these works it is usual to indicate the chapter before the distinctive name of the part, and then to give the book and title. The symbol used for the collection of Gregory IX is *X* (= *Extra*) and for that of Boniface VIII it is *in VI* (= *sexto*), and it is customary to add also the heading of the title. Cp. the references given above (§ 122, II, V, VI, &c.).

## § 126

### Sacerdotal Celibacy

I. As the attempts of previous Popes to secure obedience to the law of celibacy had met with only partial success, Gregory VII proceeded to enforce the law with greater severity. Not only did he, at the Lenten Council of 1074, re-enact the decrees of his predecessors Nicholas II and Alexander II, by which married priests had been forbidden to exercise their priestly functions and the laity required to avoid their ministry, but he also dispatched legates to see that these decrees were properly carried out. Whether he was impelled thereto by a political motive is very doubtful, and the words which are often ascribed to him, *Non liberari potest ecclesia a servitute laicorum, nisi clerici liberentur ab uxoribus*, are not to be found in his works, nor do we find even a

hint of the idea which they express. The truth is rather that he looked on marriage as incompatible with the priesthood. The measures which he took gave rise to vehement protests. The Council of Paris in 1074 characterised the law of celibacy as intolerable and unreasonable. In Germany a letter went the rounds which purported to have been written by St. Ulrich of Augsburg († 973) to Pope Nicholas († 867) in commendation of priestly marriage. In spite of this, Gregory stood firm. Urban II went even farther, and at the Council of Melfi (1089, c. 12) issued a decree which not only punished in the usual way all subdeacons (and consequently all higher clerics) who transgressed the law, but laid it down that in case of contumacy the wife was to be enslaved by the owner of the land. The decree was doubtless only meant as a deterrent, but it marks the beginning of a great alteration in practical discipline. Thus far, clerics in the higher orders could enter into a valid marriage, though they thereby exposed themselves to the loss of their office, but the decree of Melfi rests on the assumption that a subdeacon is not a fit subject for marriage, and in consequence that a marriage entered on subsequent to ordination is null and void. This same idea was expressed explicitly by the Lateran Councils of 1123 (c. 21) and 1139 (c. 7), and by the Councils of Pisa (1135, c. 1) and Rheims (1148, c. 7).

From the nature of the subject it is evident that effect could not immediately be given to the decrees in question. There were throughout the period frequent individual cases in which the law was disregarded, as we gather from constant complaints of Councils. Some of these Councils, such as that of Rome in the autumn of 1078 (c. 11) and the Twelfth General Council (c. 14), were even compelled to threaten with punishments those bishops who for money or through weakness connived at the life led by their clergy. In certain countries the law was not put into complete operation till long after. In England the Council of Winchester (1076) saw no harm in allowing such of the clergy who lived in villages or were attached as chaplains to castles to retain their wives. In Hungary the Council of Gran (1114, c. 31), reverting to the practice of antiquity, which is that of the Eastern Church, and in consideration of human frailty, gave a general permission to such of the clergy as had been married before ordination to continue to live with their wives. The law was enforced, and then only with difficulty, in Poland, Silesia, and Moravia towards the end of the twelfth century, in Sweden and Denmark at about the middle of the thirteenth century, and in Hungary only after 1267.

Cp. HEFELE, V, 20 ff.. and for further documents, p. 1170. *Th Qu.* 1886, pp. 179-201.

II. In the Eastern Church a practice diametrically opposed to that of the West came into operation, probably during this same period. This was to appoint to the cure of souls only married men, in other words it became the general rule to contract marriage previous to ordination. A consequence of this practice was that the bishops, on whom continence was imposed by custom, came to be chosen from among the monks.

It is not easy to determine when the practice arose, but the Russian Council of 1274 seems to have been acquainted with it. Cp. STRAHL, *Gesch. d. russ. K.* 1830, pp. 260-62; SCHAGUNA (*Kompendium des kanon. Rechts*, 1868, § 183) wrongly traces it back to Canon XIII of the Council in Trullo.

## § 127

### Monasticism <sup>1</sup>

#### A. GENERAL REMARKS

Religious community life looms very large during this period, and the number of vocations to the cloister is quite remarkable. The phenomenon is, however, quite natural, and was merely the outcome of the ascetical spirit which animated those ages, and which could nowhere expand itself so well as in the monastery. Owing to the growth of monasticism, the institution now takes a more important place in the Church than heretofore; the Gregorian reform, for instance, owed its success very largely to the support of the Cluniac congregation, and in a later age, similar support was furnished to the Papacy by the mendicant Orders.

Most of the earlier foundations of the period adopted the Benedictine rule. It was not, however, long before new societies were formed, and as the differences between them threatened confusion, the Fourth Lateran Council (c. 13) and the Second Council of Lyons (c. 23) were impelled to

<sup>1</sup> HELYOT, *Hist. des ordres monastiques*, 8 vol. 1714-19; HENRION-FEHR, *Allg. Gesch. der Mönchsorden*, 2 vol. 1855; F. HURTER, *Gesch. P. Innocenz III.*, vol. III-V. Cp. § 72.

forbid the foundation of any more new Orders. It was at the time of the previous Council that the mendicant Orders came into being, which, together with the Orders of Knighthood and the so-called Third Orders, form the most noteworthy contributions of the period to the conventual life. The characteristics of these institutions are the following.

The mendicant Orders not only bound each individual friar to poverty, but also forbade the monastery to possess more than was absolutely necessary, leaving the upkeep of the house to the charity of the Faithful among whom the friars worked as missionaries. The Orders of Knighthood or Military Orders came into being during the crusades and sought to combine the duties of the knight with those of the monk, undertaking to protect Christian pilgrims on their way to the Holy Places against attacks from the infidel, and generally seeking to defend by the sword the Christian cause in the East. In the case of both mendicant and military Orders we find traces of the period in which they were founded. Both are highly centralised and monarchical institutions, having a single head, known variously as the General or the Grand Master, whereas the Benedictine and allied Orders always consisted of a number of independent houses, each enjoying almost equal rights. This centralisation soon made a new disposition necessary; each Order was divided into a certain number of provinces or tongues, at the head of each of which stood a provincial or master.

The Third Order was the result of a combination of the religious with the secular life. Its members continued to live in the world, but devoted themselves to penance and asceticism, or even adopted in a certain measure the pious practices of the Order with which they were associated, for which reason they were sometimes called *fratres de paenitentia*. The founder of the institution was Francis of Assisi, who conceived it for the benefit of married people, who, being prevented by their partner from entering the cloister, were anxious for a rule of life which should serve in lieu thereof. Unmarried people were, nevertheless, to be found even at an early date among the tertiaries, whilst other religious bodies, apart from the Franciscans, also founded Third Orders of their own.

It was also a pious custom of the time to receive the monastic

garb when at the point of death, or to be buried in a monastery, so as to share, when dead, in the blessings and graces of the cloister.

## B. THE CARTHUSIANS AND CISTERCIANS

I. The Order of the **Carthusians**<sup>1</sup> is an outgrowth of the community established (in 1084) by St. Bruno of Cologne in the desert of the Chartreuse (*Carthusium*) near Grenoble. In the office of scholastic which he had filled at Rheims he had been shocked by the unholy life of Manasses, archbishop of the city, and, led by his love for retirement, had devised a rule similar to that of the Camaldolese, which, combining the characteristics of the life of the hermit and of the conventual monk, became that of an Order remarkable among all for austerity of life. Bruno also established a second settlement of his Order at La Torre in Calabria (1091), where he died (1101). The main elements of the rule, which was committed to writing by Guigo the fifth prior (1137), consist in the observance of almost unbroken silence, in entire abstinence from flesh-meat, and in the division of the day between prayer and labour, the latter being either agricultural or literary. The monks wear a white habit, and their cells consist of detached cottages built against the wall of enclosure. At its most flourishing period the Order reckoned some 180 houses, twelve of which were convents of women.

II. The foundation of the **Cistercian**<sup>2</sup> Order was laid by Robert, abbot of Molesme, who, disgusted with the life led by his monks, erected a new monastery at Citeaux (*Cistercium*) near Dijon (1098). To counteract the relaxation which the Cluniac monasteries had begotten of their wealth, he determined to apply the rule of St. Benedict in all its purity and severity. It was not, however, long before certain alterations were made in the mode of life, with this consequence, that the

<sup>1</sup> *Annales Ord. Carth.* 1084-1429, ed. LE COUTEULX, 8 vol. 1888-91. Bg. of Bruno by TAPPERT, 1872; LÖBBEL, 1899; GORSE, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> *Nomasticon Cisterc.* ed. SÉJALON, 1892; MANRIQUE, *Annales Cist.* 4 fol. 1643; L. JANAUSCHEK, *Orig. Cisterc.* I, 1877; E. HOFFMANN, *Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterzienserordens*, 1905 (*Freib. Hist. Studien*, I). Bg. of St. Bernard by NEANDER, 2nd ed. 1848 (Engl. Trans. *Life and Times of St. Bernard*, 1843); VACANDARD, 2 vol. 1895; F. WINTER, *Cisterzienser des nordöstl. Deutschlands*, 3 vol. 1868-71.

foundation assumed the appearance rather of a new Order than of a mere branch of the Benedictines. Abbot Alberci (1099-1109) exchanged the black for a white habit. His successor, Stephen Harding, who compiled the statutes known as the *Charta caritatis*, pushed the observance of poverty to the extremest limit, insisting on the greatest simplicity even in the adornment of the monastic church. This Order also held exemption in contempt. As the Order owes its celebrity largely to St. Bernard, the Cistercians are sometimes called Bernardines. After the admission of St. Bernard, who brought with him thirty friends and relatives (1112), the reputation of the Cistercians became so great that it was soon necessary to erect the monasteries of La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond. Bernard himself became abbot of Clairvaux. In 1300 the number of monasteries of men alone had grown to near 700, and the number of convents of women was perhaps even greater. The Cistercians were especially successful in contributing to the spread of the Gospel among the people of the north.

### C. THE CANONS REGULAR ; THE PREMONSTRATIENSIS 1

The same movement which called into life so many cloistral institutions, also made itself manifest in a new development of the chapters of canons. The Roman Councils of 1059 and 1063 (c. 4), considering the possession of private property as incompatible with the canonical life, issued an appeal to clerics to share all their revenues and to lead an Apostolic life. This appeal was not disregarded, and in the twelfth century many chapters bound themselves by the ordinary religious vows and thus, side by side with the *Canonici saeculares*, we now find *Canonici regulares*. Most of the latter adopted the Augustinian rule, which came into prominence about this time, and though, to begin with, the chapters of canons regular had mostly no connection one with the other, they are found soon after grouped in congregations, some of which counted as many as a hundred houses. Of these institutes the most important was that of the **Premonstratensians** or Norbertines. They

<sup>1</sup> KL. II, 1829-35; BERNHARDI, *Lothar v. Supplinburg*, 1879, pp. 83-108; F. WINTER, *Die Prämonstr. im nordöstl. Deutschland*, 1868; MADELEINE, *Hist. de S. Norbert*, 1894; P. A. ZAK, *Der hl. Norbert*, 1900.

were founded by St. Norbert, a native of Xanten on the Rhine, and their mother-house was the monastery of Prémontré or Praemonstratum near Laon, established in 1120; the founder soon after (1126) became archbishop of Magdeburg, and introduced his canons into Germany. They afterwards became so numerous as to attain the rank and importance of a real Order. Their habit is white.

Other similar societies were: (1) the canons regular of the Lateran; (2) the congregation of St. Rufus near Avignon; (3) the canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre, founded at Jerusalem in 1114; (4) the congregation of St. Victor at Paris (mg. by FOURIER BONNARD, 1904); (5) the Gilbertines, established by Gilbert of Sempringham in 1148 (mg. by GRAHAM, 1904); (6) the canons of the Cross, who wore a red star and who owed their foundation to the Blessed Agnes of Bohemia (1236); (7) the congregation of St. Geneviève at Paris.

#### D. THE MENDICANT ORDERS

I. St. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226)<sup>1</sup> was the founder of the first great mendicant Order, that of the **Friars Minor**, *Fratres minores*, or Franciscans.<sup>2</sup> After having led a gay life in his youth, he resolved to renounce the world, and after he had been expelled from his father's house (1207) for having given away to the chapel of St. Damian some rolls of cloth belonging to his parents, he devoted himself to the service of the poor and sick, to the restoration of the above-mentioned chapel, and of the church of the Holy Angels, or Portiuncula, near Assisi. Two years later, in this same church, happening to be struck by the words which had been uttered by Christ when sending forth His disciples (*Matt. x. 9, 10*), he came to feel that his task was to preach penance. He was soon joined by a few companions, and together they formed a community known as the Brethren of Penance (*Viri paenitentiales*), living under the so-called first rule (1209-10), which bound them to the strict observance of the Gospel precepts.

<sup>1</sup> Bg. by E. VOGT, 1840; K. HASE, 1856; SABATIER, 1894 (Engl. Trans. 1894); PRUDENZANO, 1896; LITTLE, 1897; CHRISTEN, 2nd ed. 1902; DOREAU, 1903; G. SCHNÜRER, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> L. WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, 8 fol. 1625; ed. II (to 1611), 24 fol. 1771-1864; H. BÖHMER, *Analekten zur Gesch. des Franziskus v. A.* 1904; W. GÖTZ, *Quellen zur Gesch. d. hl. Fr.* 1904; RHE: 1906, pp. 410-33 (*La question franciscaine*); K. MÜLLER, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens u. d. Bussbruderschaften*, 1885; *Provinciale O. fr. m.* ed. C. EUBEL, 1892.

The community soon reached the status of an Order and was formally approved by Honorius III in 1223, who in 1221 had already sanctioned a new redaction of the rule drawn up with the help of Cardinal Ugolino. The friars, who wore a brown (or grey, cp. Grey Friars) habit, became extraordinarily popular. Maidens, of whom the most prominent was St. Clare of Assisi (1212), widows, and married persons of both sexes were moved to join, and thus there arose a second Order of St. Francis, intended for women, and known as the Poor Clares or Damianists<sup>1</sup> on account of their mother-house being situated near the chapel of St. Damian. Another association was also founded for the benefit of those desiring to remain in the world, and its members were styled *Fratres de paenitentia*.<sup>2</sup> This association, or Third Order, as it came to be designated afterwards, possessed houses of tertiaries for both men and women, which owed their existence to the fact that members of the Third Order living in the world occasionally elected to take solemn vows and retire to the cloister. In consequence of a decision of Leo X, that all who adopted the rule revised by him should belong not to the Third, but to the First Order, the congregations of regular tertiaries were afterwards merged into the aforesaid First Order.

Whilst the new institution was spreading widely—a *Provinciale* drawn up c. 1340 speaks of 1,453 houses—it was being rent within by great dissensions. The severity of the rule in the course of time proved displeasing to some. Elias of Cortona,<sup>3</sup> Francis's successor in the generalship, introduced some relaxations, and though his innovations were vehemently opposed by Anthony of Padua<sup>4</sup> and Cæsarius of Spires, and twice led to his being deposed, they left their mark. Many of his brethren sided with him, and as others remained unalterably attached to the rule in all its old severity, the Order was practically split into two parties, who were in a state of permanent warfare. The only general who succeeded in maintaining the peace during his period of office was Bonaventure.

<sup>1</sup> On the beginning of the Order, see *Röm. Qu.* XVI (1902), 93-124; SCHNÜRER, pp. 60-68.

<sup>2</sup> *Regula antiqua fratrum et sororum de paenitentia*, ed. SABATIER, 1901; P. MANDONNET, *Les règles et le gouvernement de l'ordre de paenitentia au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 1902.

<sup>3</sup> E. LEMPP, *Frère Elie de Cortone*, 1901.

<sup>4</sup> Mg. by K. WILK, 1907.

Nicholas III attempted in vain to pacify the combatants by his Bull *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), and Celestine V was ultimately obliged to sever the stricter party from the rest of the Order and incorporate it in the Order of the Celestinian-hermits which he himself had founded.

II. The second great mendicant Order, that of the **Friars Preachers**, *Fratres praedicatorum*, or Dominicans,<sup>1</sup> is hardly less ancient than the Franciscans. It was founded with the object of converting the Albigenses. When St. Dominic (1170–1221)<sup>2</sup> first decided to devote himself to this mission, finding that many Catholics allowed their children to be educated by the heretics, he determined to erect at Prouille, near the Pyrenees, a convent of women for the education of girls (1206). A little later (1215) he established at Toulouse an association of preachers, which received the approval of the Holy See, and soon (1220) developed a rule of its own, in lieu of the rule of St. Augustine by which it had been previously governed. At the commencement of the next century the Order had already 562 monasteries scattered through twenty-one provinces. The colour of the habit is white; to the black mantle worn outside the Dominicans owe their old name of Black Friars. The saint also laid the foundation of a secular association for the defence of Church property known as the *Militia Christi*, which developed subsequently into a Third Order, the Brethren of Penance of St. Dominic.<sup>3</sup>

III. The **Carmelites** are an older foundation than the Franciscans or Dominicans. Their Order may be said to have begun when the crusader Berthold of Calabria took up his abode with ten companions (1156) near the cave of Elias on Mount Carmel. The Carmelites themselves even claim to be the lineal descendants of the school of prophets established by Elias. The institution, however, only became a mendicant Order when it migrated to Europe in the thirteenth century and exchanged the hermit life for life in community. Its first general in the West was Simon Stock. In 1247 Innocent IV relaxed the rule somewhat to make it suitable to the colder

<sup>1</sup> MAMACHI, *Annales O. Pr.* 5 fol. 1746; *Monumenta ord. fratrum praedicatorum historica*, 10 vol. 1897–1901.

<sup>2</sup> Bg. by LACORDAIRE, 1840 (Eng. Trans. 1883); DRANE, 1857–67; PRADIER, 1902.

<sup>3</sup> KLEINERMANN, *Der dr. O. v. d. Busse des hl. D.* 1884.

climate of the Carmelites' new home. The Order increased remarkably, its cause being furthered not a little by the Scapular which St. Simon Stock was said to have received from the Blessed Virgin as a preventative against unprepared death.<sup>1</sup> The habit of the Order is brown. From the colour of their cloak they were, however, known as White Friars.

IV. Apart from the canons regular of St. Augustine, numerous heremital congregations obeying the Augustinian rule sprang into being during the twelfth and thirteenth century. Among these were the Guilielmites, called after St. William of Aquitaine (founded c. 1156), and the Jambonites, founded by Blessed John Bonus of Mantua (1168-1249); these produced a fourth great mendicant Order. To prevent quarrels, such as had already occurred between Franciscans and Jambonites on account of the likeness of habit, Innocent IV united all the hermits living in Tuscany into a single society, that of the **Augustinians**, or, to use its full title, of the hermits of St. Augustine, and the union was enforced throughout Europe by Alexander IV (1256). The habit of this Order is black.

## E. THE ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD<sup>2</sup>

I. The **Order of St. John**<sup>3</sup> had its cradle in the Hostel of St. John the Baptist at Jerusalem, which had been erected in 1048 by merchants from Amalfi for the reception and care of pilgrims. The conquest of the Holy City by the crusaders greatly increased the importance of the foundation. Gerard († c. 1120), who was then master of the hostel, gave it a new rule, and not long after new houses made their appearance, not only in Palestine, but also in the West, principally at the Mediterranean ports. From its beginning the Order had combined military duties with those of the hospitaller, as its task had always been both to serve and nurse the pilgrims, and to act as their escort. Under Gerard's successor, Raymond du Puy, the hospitallers already constituted a military power of some importance. The division between fighting brethren

<sup>1</sup> Cp. LAUNOY, *Dissert. V de S. Stockii viso, de Sabbat. bullae privil. et Scap. Carmel. sodalitate*, *Opp.* II, II.

<sup>2</sup> PRUTZ, *Kulturgesch. der Kreuzzüge*, pp. 233 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by WINTERFELD, 1859; ORTENBURG, 1866; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, 1904.

and serving brethren, or between knights and servants, arose, however, only later, when the Order had almost lost its character of an institution for the care of the sick. At home the knights wore a black mantle with a white Maltese cross, on the field they wore a red coat-of-mail.

II. The Order of the **Templars**,<sup>1</sup> *Pauperes commilitones de templo*, came into life c. 1119, when eight French knights, headed by Hugo de Payens, took the common religious vows, adding another, viz. to defend the Holy Land and all Christian pilgrims. The name proceeds from the fact that the knights were at first lodged in the king's palace at Jerusalem, which, owing to its situation, was known as Solomon's temple. Partly through the influence of St. Bernard, who helped to draw up its rule at the Council of Troyes in 1128, the Order soon became very prominent, and accomplished many deeds of valour in Palestine. By boundless ambition, and one-sided prosecution of its own interests, it also succeeded in doing great damage to the Christian cause in the East. The dress of the Order consisted of a white mantle with a red cross.

III. The foundation of the **Teutonic knights**<sup>2</sup> was laid with the erection of a field hospital near Acre in 1190 by the united efforts of the members of the German hostel at Jerusalem, of a few merchants from Lübeck and Bremen, and of duke Frederick of Swabia. As an Order it dates back, however, only to 1198. These knights, under their worthy Grand Master Hermann of Salza, undertook the subjection and conversion of the yet heathen Prussians (1226), and after the fall of Acre they transferred their headquarters to Marienburg on the Nogat. Their distinctive dress was a white mantle with a black cross.

IV. Owing to the similarity of the conditions then prevailing in Palestine and in the Spanish peninsula, some Orders of knight-hood came into existence in Spain and Portugal. They originated in the latter half of the twelfth century. Their importance was, however, merely local. Such were the Orders of Calatrava, of Alcantara, of Santiago de Compostella, of Avis, and of the Wing (of St. Michael).

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by WILCKE, 2 vol. 2nd ed. 1860; G. SCHNÜRER, *Die ursprüngliche Tempelregel*, 1903; H. PRUTZ, *Die Autonomie des Tempelordens*, 1905 (SB. München).

<sup>2</sup> SALLES, *Annales de l'ordre Teutonique*, 1887; A. KOCH, *H. v. Salza*, 1885.

## F. SMALLER ORDERS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Besides the Orders already mentioned, numerous smaller religious societies came into existence during the period. Such were:—

I. The Order of **Grandmont**, founded by Stephen of Tigerno, who erected the first monastery on Mount Muret near Limoges (1076), but which derives its name from the neighbouring Grandmont, whither his disciples betook themselves on the master's death (1124). They obliged themselves to extreme poverty and refused to possess landed property.

II. The **Antonines**, or hospitallers of St. Anthony, were instituted as an association of lay-brothers, at Didier-de-la-Mothe in Dauphiné, by a French noble Gaston and his son Guérin in thanksgiving for the latter's recovery from St. Anthony's Fire (1095). The brotherhood was later on erected into an Order (1218), and later still into a congregation of canons regular (1297), and thereby robbed of its former character. Cp. ADVIELLE, *Hist. de l'ordre hosp. de S. Antoine*, 1883.

III. The Order of **Fontevraud** (near Angers), founded by Robert of Arbrisselles (1100), was noted for its austerity, and was also remarkable on account of its double monasteries, in which the abbess always had the direction of both houses. J. v. WALTER, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs, I., R. Arbrissel*, 1903.

IV. The **Humiliati**, according to their oldest rule (1201), were a brotherhood of artisans (principally workers in wool), some of whom even then lived in communities, as monks, nuns, and canons. They came into existence at Milan in the twelfth century. TIRABOSCHI, *Vetera Humiliat. monumenta*, 3 tom. 1766-68.

V. The **Bridge-building Brotherhood** (*Fratres pontifices*), an association well known in the south of France, is supposed to have been established by a certain Bénézet. It undertook the building and repair of bridges and roads, as well as the housing and protection of travellers. It was approved by Clement III (1189), but on the relaxation of its rule was abolished by Pius II. Cp. GRÉGOIRE, *Recherches hist. sur les congrégations hospit. des frères pontifes*, 1818; THURSTON, *St. Bénézet and his Biographer* (M. A. B. DE SAINT-VENANT), *Cath. World*, Dec. 1907.

VI. The **Trinitarians** were an Order founded by St. John of Matha and St. Felix of Valois (1198) for the redemption of Christian slaves from the Saracens. They had numerous houses in both France and Spain. P. DESLANDRES, *L'ordre des Trinitaires*, 2 vol. 1903.

VII. The Order of **Our Lady of Mercy** (*de mercede redemptionis captivorum*) was a similar foundation due to Peter Nolascus and Raymond of Pennaforte (1223). For a whole century it remained an Order of knighthood; in consequence, however, of a decree of John XXII to the effect that the general must needs be a priest,

the knights migrated in a body to other Orders. *St. a. ML.* 1896, II.

VIII. The **Hospitallers of the Holy Ghost** were founded by Guido of Montpellier in 1198, and soon spread to other towns, e.g. to Rome (S. Spirito in Sassia). Mg. by BRUNE, 1892.

IX. The **Servites** (*Servi B. V. M.*) were started in 1233 by a few rich merchants of Florence, and devoted themselves to the especial worship of the Blessed Virgin. The Order comprised convents of women, one branch being known as the Mantellate. The Third Order owes its origin to St. Philip Benizi († 1285), and to St. Juliana Falconeria, who was its first member. Cp. *Hist. de l'ordre des S.* (1233-1310), 2 vol. 1886; SOULIER, *Vie de saint Philippe Bénizi, propagateur de l'ordre des S.* 1886.

X. The **Beghines and Beghards**, the former being an association of maidens and widows devoted to education and to the nursing of the sick, founded at Liège towards the end of the twelfth century by Lambert le Beghe; the latter, a similar association of men, founded somewhat later, but which soon deviated from its object, and incurred a persecution to which it succumbed before the end of the Middle Ages. Cp. HALLMANN, *Gesch. des Ursprungs der belg. Begh.* 1843; *Z. f. KG.* XVII, 279 f.

XI. Finally, we may mention the **Scottish monasteries** of Germany. They owed their foundation to Marian, an Irishman (*Scotus*), who erected in 1073 the monastery of Weih St. Peter, near Ratisbon. The principal monastery was, however, that of St. James, founded in 1090, in the same city, and, all told, the congregation possessed twelve houses. In the course of the fifteenth century several of the monasteries, owing to their relaxation of discipline, were handed over to German monks. In the sixteenth century, on account of a misunderstanding caused by the name of Scotus, some of the houses were appropriated by monks from Scotland, who remained in possession at Erfurt till 1820, and at St. James in Ratisbon till even more recently. Cp. *Z. f. christl. Archäologie u. Kunst*, ed. QUAST and OTTE, I (1856), 21-30; 49-58; *St. Bened.* 1895, pp. 64-84.

## CHAPTER V

### WORSHIP, MORALS, AND CHRISTIAN ART <sup>1</sup>

#### § 128

#### Prayer and Worship

I. As the word **Sacrament** during both antiquity and the earlier Middle Ages had been used in several meanings, a certain uncertainty prevailed as to what was a sacrament and what was not. As soon, however, as the word obtained a settled significance, we find unanimity as to the number of the sacraments, the sevenfold number being accepted by the Greek as well as by the Latin Church. Its first witnesses are Gregory of Bergamo († 1146), Peter Lombard († 1164), and the *Vita Ottonis Bambergensis* († 1139).<sup>2</sup>

II. Considerable alterations occurred in the administration of the **Holy Eucharist**.<sup>3</sup> Early in the period, the common eastern method, or *Communio intincta* (§ 100), was adopted in certain parts of the West. It was, however, condemned as not in agreement with Christ's command, and the separate communion under both elements was insisted on. In spite of this, it became the practice in the twelfth century to communicate the laity only under the species of bread, and communion under both kinds gradually ceased to be the rule. For a while, however, in some places wine, into which a few drops from the priest's chalice had been poured, continued to be given to the Faithful. Communion was henceforth only given to those who had attained the use of reason, in consequence of

<sup>1</sup> G. GRUPP, *Kulturgesch. des MA.* 2 vol. 1894.

<sup>2</sup> KRAWUTZKY, *Zählung und Ordnung d. hl. S. in ihrer gesch. Entw.* 1865. Gregory's *Tractatus de veritate corporis Christi* was first edited by UCCELLI, 1877; it was republished by HURTER in his *Opuscula selecta*, 1879.

<sup>3</sup> J. SMEND, *Kelchversagung u. Kelchspendung*, 1898.

which the old usage of administering communion to infants immediately after baptism became obsolete. As a substitute for communion, the ablutions of the Mass, or even a sip of common wine, continued to be administered to the newly baptised. All these changes rested on the desire of avoiding any profanation, and, conjointly, of showing the greatest possible veneration for the Sacrament. As a protest against the teaching of Berengar, it became the practice, subsequent to the eleventh century, to elevate the Host immediately after the consecration, that it might be adored by the Faithful. Gregory X enacted that, as a sign of the respect due to the Eucharist, the Faithful should kneel from the consecration to the Communion, except indeed at Christmas time and during Eastertide. Another custom which then arose was that of kneeling—on Sundays and feast-days and during Paschal time it was usual only to bow the head—when the Blessed Sacrament was being carried to the sick. Urban IV finally instituted a special feast in honour of this Sacrament.

As veneration for the Sacrament increased, its reception became less frequent,<sup>1</sup> nor was the fear of approaching too often confined to the mass of the people, who had already previously abandoned the practice of frequent Communion, it affected even the more devout folk, who now refrained from communicating more than from three to six times in the year. The Fourth Lateran Council (c. 21) laid it down that the Eucharist must be received at least at Easter.

Mass also came to be said less frequently. The Fourth Lateran Council complains (c. 17) that many priests celebrate scarcely four times in the course of the year. On the other hand, some priests continued to indulge in the old practice of saying more than one Mass daily, until this was forbidden by the Councils of the thirteenth century,<sup>2</sup> which made it a rule to allow two Masses only in cases of necessity, at burials, on Christmas Day and at Easter. One of these Councils (Tarragona, 1239, c. 6) even restricted the concession to Christmas Day, a restriction which gradually came to be applied generally.

<sup>1</sup> DALGAIRNS, *Holy Communion*, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> London, 1200, c. 2; Oxford, 1222, c. 6; Treves, 1227, c. 3; Rouen, 1231, c. 12.

As for the theology of the mystery, the Church's doctrine of the nature of the change wrought in the Mass, as it was laid down in opposition to that of Berengar of Tours, received adequate expression in the term of Transubstantiation. This word, which was not unknown in the twelfth century (it is first found in Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, † 1133), was chosen as the fittest by the Fourth Lateran Council, and soon came into general use.

III. The custom of redeeming penance had already in the previous period adversely affected the Church's **penitentiary discipline**. Still greater alterations were now made by the introduction of the doctrine of Indulgences,<sup>1</sup> which offered the complete or partial remission of the punishment due to sin, in exchange for the performance of some good work. The crusades played a very important part in the adoption of Indulgences. Urban II began by granting a plenary indulgence to every crusader, and soon this came to be granted not only to those who actually took the cross, but to those also who equipped a crusader, or gave an equivalent sum of money. Lesser indulgences were also available for those who could only afford to pay a smaller sum towards the cause of the Holy Land. At the same period we also hear of indulgences being granted for the building of churches and monasteries, and subsequent to the twelfth century they were even bestowed for such wholly secular works as the construction of bridges and the repair of roads. Under these circumstances public penance gradually lost ground. Peter of Poitiers († 1205) mentions in his *Book of Sentences* (III. 14) that even in his day there were many Churches in which it was unknown. The Church had accordingly to find other means of keeping alive the spirit of penance, and among the dispositions taken to secure this end the famous decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (c. 21) holds the first place: each one of the Faithful, who has attained to the use of reason, must confess his sins at least once a year to his parish priest, and fulfil the penance imposed on him to the best of his ability.

IV. To the end of the twelfth century the ordinary prayers in use among the Faithful were the Our Father and the Creed.

<sup>1</sup> A. GOTTLOB, *Kreuzablass u. Almosenablass*, 1906 (*Kirchenrechtl. Abh.* ed. by STUTZ, 30-31).

We now hear of the **Hail Mary**. In its earlier form the latter comprised only the angel's salutation and that of Elizabeth. A little later it is found with the addition: 'Jesus (Christ), Amen'; the latter portion of the prayer, beginning 'Holy Mary,' and containing the petition for a happy death, is first heard of in the fifteenth century. The prayer in its present form has, however, been in popular use only since the middle of the seventeenth century. Cp. *Hist. J.* V (1884), 88-116.

V. The **Rosary** came into use with the Hail Mary. Its origin is very obscure, and it seems to have been the result of a gradual development. Only at the end of the Middle Ages was its introduction ascribed to St. Dominic by Alan de la Roche (Alanus de Rupe, †1475), himself a Dominican, and a great advocate of the Rosary. The devotion became general in the sixteenth century. Cp. HOLZAPFEL, *St. Dominikus u. der Rosenkranz*, 1903, in the publications of the *Kirchenhist. Seminar* (of Munich) I, 21.

VI. The **Salve Regina** was a common hymn and prayer from the end of the eleventh century, the pilgrims and crusaders of the first crusade singing it on their march. It was also the daily song of the seafaring people on the Spanish coasts, and possibly for this reason was ascribed to the bishops Adhemar of Puy and Peter of Compostella (1090), though probably both its text and the old tune to which it was set belong to Hermannus Contractus (§ 107), *KL. X*, 1580.

## § 129

### Church Festivals

I. Far and away the most important feast which originated in this period is that of **Corpus Christi**.<sup>1</sup> The visions of the nun Juliana, in which she perceived the moon (symbol of the cycle of feasts) in full splendour, save that in one quarter it was dark, led to the establishment of the festival in the diocese of Liège (1246). Urban IV, previously James of Troyes, and archdeacon of Liège, imposed its observance on the entire Church (1264), though, as he died shortly after, the decree was not generally obeyed. The feast only came to be universally celebrated after the decree had been repeated by Clement V and John XXII at the beginning of the fourteenth century. It was at this time likewise that the feast obtained its present character, and began to be accompanied by the procession, which until then had been customary only in a few Churches.

<sup>1</sup> *R. Qu.* XVI (1902), 170-80.

Other general, or at least common, feasts which now make their appearance are those of the Exaltation of the Cross, of the dedication of the local church, of St. Lawrence, St. Nicholas, and St. Michael. Each province and diocese had, moreover, its peculiar festivals. Generally speaking, the number of feast-days was very considerable, though not everywhere the same. The Council of Szaboles in Hungary (1092, c. 38) mentions (apart from the Sundays) thirty-eight, that of Toulouse (1229, c. 26) forty special feasts. The Council of Oxford (1222, c. 8) speaks of fifty-three whole holidays, besides the twenty-one half-holidays on which work might be performed after the service held at the church. The number in Spain cannot have been much smaller, seeing that the Council of Tarragona (1239, c. 5), out of compassion for the needs of the poor and to prevent idleness, was moved to decrease the number, notwithstanding which the Council still insists on the full observance of no less than thirty-nine festivals. The agglomeration of feast-days at Easter and Whitsun must have been especially irksome to business. We consequently find that, in several calendars of the period, the Wednesdays after Easter and Whitsun are set down as work-days; in one (that of Tarragona) even Whittuesday is not a holiday.

II. The **Mysteries**,<sup>1</sup> which were used in the first instance to illustrate the Passion and the Resurrection, were soon joined by miracle plays setting forth the events of Christ's life and the deeds of several of the saints. From the eleventh century these sacred dramas added considerably to the solemnity of the feasts on which they were performed. The representations were at first given in the churches, and so long as actors and audience were animated with the proper spirit, they served both to edify and to instruct. At a later date when these conditions were no longer present, and when theatricals had been gradually banished from the churches (since the thirteenth century), these plays still afforded a not unsuitable recreation with which to while away the enforced holidays.

Besides these plays we hear of others of quite a different character, of parodies of the church celebrations at the Feast of Fools

<sup>1</sup> MONE, *Schausp. d. MA.* 2 vol. 1846; L. WIRTH, *Die Oster- u. Passionsspiele bis z. 16 Jahrh.* 1889; H. ANZ, *Die lat. Magierspiele*, 1905.

and Feast of Asses, recitations of merry tales and jesting references to the clergy at a similar feast held at Easter. Such buffooneries, which were completely out of place in church, were early condemned by both Councils and Popes. The prohibition remained long after a dead letter. The Feast of Fools, which was peculiarly French, continued to be observed until the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the Feast of Asses survived even longer. Du TILLIOT, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. de la fête des fous*, 1741; *St. a. ML.* 1894, II, 571-87.

### § 130

#### Ethico-Religious Status of the Period<sup>1</sup>

This period, like the previous one, and even more so, presents remarkable contrasts. The history of the times is replete with manifestations of their rudeness and immorality; in the absence of a strong and settled government, and so long as conflict prevailed between Church and State, abuses were inevitable. When too much play is given to the individual, the result can only be an increase of the selfish spirit. Yet the period had its bright as well as its dark side, in fact scarcely any other is so rich in great men and good deeds. We here meet a whole series of noble personages among the Popes and bishops, among the missionaries, crusaders, and writers, and in the body of the laity. Characters such as those of Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, Dominic, Lewis IX of France, Elizabeth of Thuringia († 1234), to mention but a few, will ever excite both wonder and admiration, and their importance is all the greater in that they did not stand alone, but left behind them whole bands of devoted disciples. As for deeds, we have only to think of the number of churches and institutions for the relief of suffering mankind which were then established. Even to-day there remain countless cathedrals and other churches to testify to the intense religious zeal of those ages, and even now there are localities which still profit by the funds then sunk in the foundation of lazarettos, hospitals, and such-like charitable establishments. Towards the end of the period a certain falling off in the religious life cannot escape the diligent

<sup>1</sup> UHLHORN, *Christl. Liebestätigkeit im MA.* 1884; CH. SOMMER, *Deutsche Frömmigkeit im 13. Jahrh.* 1900. Mg. on St. Elisabeth by MONTALEMBERT, 1883 (Engl. Trans. 1904); *Hist. Z.* 69 (1892), 209-44; E. HORN, 1902.

observer. In the course of the thirteenth century monasticism, which had attained so high a level, began to sink, and owing to the influence which the Orders exercised throughout the period, the decay of monastic discipline could not fail to have an evil effect even in other spheres. The secular clergy were the first and foremost to suffer thereby, and some light is thrown on their morality by the fact that Innocent IV, in the allocution with which he opened the Council of Lyons in 1245, mentions as the object of his deepest concern, besides the other misfortunes of the times, the sins of the clergy.

§ 131

**Architecture : the Romanesque Style<sup>1</sup>**

The basilica, the style preferred of old in the West, continued to hold its own during the earlier Middle Ages. But since the eighth century a new style had made its appearance in Lombardy, a style which, owing to its having come into existence during the period of the formation of the Romance languages, is now known as the **Romanesque**. Adopted generally by the monks, it crossed the Alps between the eleventh and twelfth century, and soon prevailed all over the West. The general plan of the new building was not unlike that of the basilica, but for the rest there were differences.

A new feature in this style is the choir, a rectangular area situated between the apse and the transept, or nave, somewhat narrower than the latter, but containing sufficient room for the high-altar and the clergy. In the case of a church provided with a transept, the resulting ground-plan was consequently that of a Latin cross. Most frequently Romanesque churches were actually provided with two choirs, one at the east and the other at the west. Owing to the crypt underneath, the choir was usually raised a little above the level of the rest of the church. Another peculiarity of the style is the tower. Not that the tower was unknown previously, but whereas the basilica, if it possessed any, had only one, which stood moreover at some distance from the main building, the Romanesque

<sup>1</sup> Literature: § 71, OTTE, *Handb. der christl. Kunstarchäologie*, 2 vol. 5th ed. by WERNICKE, 1883-85; BORRMANN and NEUWIRTH, *Gesch. d. Baukunst*, II, 1904; H. BERGNER, *Hdb. der kirchl. Kunstaltertümer in Deutschland*, 1905.

church was provided with several, built into the main edifice. The walls were adorned with blind arches and pilasters of novel form, friezes and moulded cornices adding to the decoration. The building was thus beautified even without, instead of presenting the even, unbroken surface of the older basilica. The former timber ceiling was now replaced by the vaulted roof, which first assumed the barrel shape and later on came to be groined. Columns now made room for the more solid pillars required to support the greater weight. The windows, always somewhat small, were invariably crowned with the round arch, and the same held good for the portals. The round arch also prevailed throughout the vaulting, and has even given its name to the whole style. The most remarkable monuments of this style are, in Germany the cathedrals of Spire, Worms, and Mainz, and the abbey-church of Laach; in France, the cathedrals of Clermont and the church of St. Sernin at Toulouse; in Italy, the cathedrals of Modena and Parma.

The style prevailed on this side of the Alps during the whole of the eleventh and twelfth century, and though at first of the utmost simplicity, it acquired in the course of time great splendour and wealth. New features, however, gradually found their way into it, in France first and then in Germany. The round arch made way for the pointed arch, and the circular apse for one of polygonal form. These innovations were the forerunners of a new style of architecture, but as they were no more, they are usually spoken of as the **Transition Style**. The cathedrals of Limburg and Bamberg are instances in point.

Among the innovations thus introduced was the rood-screen separating the choir from the nave; this arrangement seems to have been adopted only in churches attached to monasteries and pious foundations, its object being to protect the choir from being distracted by the laity. The result of this addition was that the church was divided into two portions, just as it is by the Iconostasis of the Greeks. Above the rood-screen it soon became the practice to place a loft (*Lectorium*) from which the Biblical lessons were read and sermons preached, and which also served to contain the cantors. The screen and loft were retained till the end of the Middle Ages, though the screen came to be constructed more and more lightly, until

at last it survived only as an iron grating. The loft was now supported by pillars, and beneath it was usual to place an altar, the loft thus serving as a ciborium or baldachin.

A new change was not long in following the previous. As the loft was by no means a convenient place from which to address the congregation, the preacher's desk or **Pulpit** was removed into the body of the church.

The altar retained its old form during this period, and in certain localities even later. As early as the ninth century it became the custom not only to surmount it with a ciborium, but to back it with a reredos, a structure which was at first quite low. This form of altar was so common in the period as to be called the Romanesque altar. It was also known as the baldachin altar because it was usually surmounted by a curtained canopy or baldachin. Relics were often kept in the body of the reredos. Subsequent to the fourteenth century the reredos developed into a heavy construction adorned with statues and pictures.

## CHAPTER VI

### CHURCH LITERATURE<sup>1</sup>

#### § 132

#### Scholasticism and Mysticism—Realism and Nominalism<sup>2</sup>

WHEREAS the theological literature of the previous epoch mainly consisted in a mere reproduction of the writings of the Fathers, the Scholasticism of the period now under review was an entirely new invention. It was distinguished by a special fondness for dialectics and system, and a tendency to treat Theology as an exact science. Its principal object was to cast the faith into the categories of the understanding, and thus to form a Christian philosophy. Its main instrument was the syllogism and its method was deductive. The doctrines of the Church were split into their component parts, explained, defended against objections, and proved to be in accordance with reason.

Side by side with the scholastic movement, another of a completely different character was in progress. Mysticism stood for intuitive knowledge, and sought to reach truth by contemplation, and union with God by purification of the heart.

In spite of the vast difference of method, Scholasticism and Mysticism were not necessarily opposed, in fact

<sup>1</sup> A. STÖCKL, *Gesch. der Philos. des MA.* 3 vol. 1864-66; F. ÜBERWEG, *Grundr. d. Gesch. d. Philos. d. patrist. u. scholast. Zeit*, 9th ed. by HEINZE, 1905 (cp. Engl. Trans. *Hist. of Philosophy*, 2nd ed. 1875); J. BACH, *Dogmengesch. d. M.* II, 1875; H. REUTER, *Gesch. d. relig. Aufklärung im MA.* 2 vol. 1875-77; HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius*, II (*aetas media*), 2nd ed. 1906; M. DE WULF, *Hist. de la philos. médiévale*, 1905 (Engl. Trans. *Hist. of Mediaeval Phil.* 1909); W. TURNER, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 1903; E. MICHAEL, *Gesch. d. deutschen Volkes v. 13 Jahrh. bis zum Ausgang des MA.* vol. III, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> H. O. KÖHLER, *Realismus u. Nom. in ihrem Einfluss auf d. dogm. Systeme d. MA.* 1858; J. H. LÖWE, *Kampf d. R. u. N. im MA.* 1876.

they were not seldom both represented in one and the same person.

Far deeper dissension was occasioned by the question of reality of Universals, which succeeded in dividing the scholars of the time into two camps. On the one side were the Nominalists, who held that only individuals were real, and that genera and species were but concepts or words (*voces, nomina*). Their axiom was: *Universalia post rem*. Opposed to them were the Realists, who ascribed reality to both genera and species, but who were divided into two parties according as they, like Plato, posited the universals of individual things as archetypal ideas in the Divine intellect and in the mind of man (*universalia ante rem*), or, following Aristotle, held that the universal is inherent in the individual, from which our mind separates it only by mental abstraction (*universalia in re*). We hear of the quarrel of the two schools at the very inception of the period, but, as yet, the conflict had not become general. Realism under one or the other form was the more prevalent doctrine.

### § 133

#### The Universities<sup>1</sup>

Simultaneously with the revival of the spirit of learning new scholastic establishments were called into existence. In the course of the twelfth century, the cathedral and monastic schools proving insufficient to control the outburst of intellectual activity, new institutions were founded, which might be called free schools, in the sense that they were conducted by scholars who chose of their own initiative to devote themselves to teaching. These schools were at first without either rule or fixity, but at the very end of the century they acquired an organisation, and were thus transformed into Universities, or, as they were called in the Middle Ages, *Studia generalia*. That of Paris dates back to the end of the twelfth

<sup>1</sup> BULAEUS, *Hist. Universitatis Paris. et al. Univ.* 6 fol. 1665-73. DENIFLE and CHATELAIN, *Chartularium Univ. Par.* 4 tom.; *Auctarium*, 2 tom. 1889-97. DENIFLE, *Die U. d. M.A., bis 1400*, I, 1885; G. KAUFMANN, *Gesch. d. deutschen U.* 2 vol. 1888-96; RASHDALL, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 2 vol. 1895; F. X. SEPPELT, *Der Kampf der Bettelorden an d. U. Paris*, in the *Kirchengesch. Abh.* ed. by SDRALEK, III, 1905.

century, when the instructors of the various branches, Theology, Law, Medicine, and Philosophy (*Artes*), formed themselves into a corporation (*universitas*) whose rights were fully acknowledged by the beginning of the thirteenth century. The birth of the High Schools of Bologna and Oxford, which occurred about the same time, was just as spontaneous. The other Universities which came into being in this period are of somewhat later date, and were mostly founded by cities or princes (Naples, 1224). All the early Universities belong to Latin countries, or to England. It was only in the following period that such schools were established in Germany and in the other northern countries.

The most famous of all were the Universities of Paris and Bologna, the former having the best school of Theology and the latter the best school of Law. It was said that the number of students attending that of Paris was no less than 30,000; this is undoubtedly an exaggeration, but it is certainly true that Paris held the first rank among mediæval Universities. It was almost reckoned as a third great power, on a level with the Papacy and the Empire. Certain other schools had also a large attendance. To lodge those who were without resources of their own, and for the students' protection, colleges were also founded. One such foundation at Paris was that of Robert de Sorbonne, chaplain to Lewis IX (1257). His college attained such eminence, that it lent its name to the theological faculty, and finally to the whole University.

The word 'University' had, as the reader will have noticed, a different meaning formerly from what it has now. It acquired its present meaning, of a place of universal study, in Germany, towards the end of the fourteenth century. According to the older use of the word, the University denoted not only the establishment as a whole, but each one of its parts, *i.e.* each of the Faculties and each of the Nations; to explain this apparent anomaly we must bear in mind that the instructors in each faculty formed a separate corporation (*universitas*), and that the same was the case with the scholars of each Nation or province. At Paris there were four Nations: *viz.* those of France, Picardy, Normandy, and England (including the Germans), composed of the scholars of all four Faculties, and of the Masters of the Faculty of Arts.

## § 134

The First of the Scholastics <sup>1</sup>

I. The parent of Scholasticism was **St. Anselm**,<sup>2</sup> born at Aosta in Piedmont, monk and abbot at the monastery of Bec in Normandy, and finally (1093–1109) archbishop of Canterbury. The tendency of his mental efforts is sufficiently described in his own words: *Credo ut intellegam*, and: *Neglegentiae mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intellegere*. His fame is based more especially on his *Proslogium* and *Cur Deus Homo*. The former contains the well-known ontological demonstration of God's existence, proving the reality of God's existence from the fact that we are able to think of something than which nothing greater can be thought of. An appendix to this work is the *Liber apolog. adv. respondentem pro insipiente*, a defence of the ontological demonstration against the attack of Gaunilo, a monk of Marmoutiers, in his *Liber pro insipiente*. The other work contains a new theory of the Redemption, in which Anselm, after dismissing a notion not unknown among the Fathers, of a certain right over mankind acquired by Satan through their sins, expounds his doctrine of satisfaction.

II. Another writer of mark was **Hugo of St. Victor** († 1141)<sup>3</sup> with his two books, *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*; among the other works attributed to him is the *Summa sententiarum*, a handbook of dogmatics, recounting the views of the Fathers (*sententiae Patrum*). Another *Book of Sentences* was compiled at about this same time by an Englishman, Robert Pulleyn, who, after lecturing at Paris and Oxford, became a cardinal and chancellor of the Roman Church († c. 1150). Both these works were, however, outclassed by the *Sententiarum libri IV*, of **Peter Lombard**,<sup>4</sup> first lecturer at Paris, and then (1159–64) bishop of the same city. His work, which at first encountered some opposition, afterwards gained

<sup>1</sup> MIGNON, *Les origines de la scolastique et Hugues de Saint-Victor*, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by MÖHLER (*Ges. Schr.* I, 32–136); HASSE, 1883; J. M. RIGG, 1896; DOMET DE VORGES, 1901; B. FUNKE, *Grundlagen u. Voraussetzungen der Satisfaktionstheorie des hl. Anselm v. C.* 1903. [*Rev. de Philos.* Dec. 1909.]

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by LIEBNER, 1832; KILGENSTEIN, 1898; H. OSTER, 1906.

<sup>4</sup> O. BALTZER, *Die Sentenzen des Petrus L., ihre Quellen u. ihre dogmengesch. Bedeutung*, 1902; J. ESPENBERGER, *Die Philosophie des Petrus L.* 1901.

so excellent a reputation that it earned for its author the title of Master of the Sentences, and was used as a manual of Theology throughout the Middle Ages, numberless theologians adding to it their comments.

III. In the person of **Peter Abaelard** (1079–1142)<sup>1</sup> we meet a man whose position was in many respects quite different from that of his contemporaries, who did not scruple to set against St. Anselm's *Credo ut intellegam* his own *Intellego ut credam*, who maintained that doubt was the best path to Truth, and whose inclination to reckless and paradoxical views caused him to emit several other opinions likely to excite scandal. His recently discovered treatise on the Trinity was condemned to be burnt by the Council of Soissons in 1121. Twenty years later, at the demand of St. Bernard, the Council of Sens (1140 or 1141) rejected a number of his propositions.

IV. Some of Anselm's contemporaries, who were famous lecturers in their day, have left us little more than their names. Among them was **Roscellin** of Compiègne (mg. by PICAVET, 1896), the archdeacon **Anselm of Laon** († 1117, mg. by LEFÈVRE, 1895), and **William of Champeaux** († 1122), the founder of the chapter of St. Victor at Paris, and later bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne (mg. by MICHAUD, 1867). Roscellin was a Nominalist, and his doctrine regarding the Trinity savoured somewhat of Tritheism; to explain how one Divine Person alone had become incarnate, he maintained that the relations between the Second Person and the two other Persons of the Trinity must be the same as those existing between created persons. The principal opponent of his views was St. Anselm, and at a Council of Soissons (1092) he was forced to recant.

V. **Gilbert de la Porrée**, bishop of Poitiers († 1154), in the course of his Commentary on Boethius, also advocated a wrong opinion concerning the Trinity. Applying to the Trinity the two categories *quo est* and *quod est* (that by which a thing is, *i.e.* its subsistence, and that which it is, *i.e.* an individual being), he explained that the Divine Paternity, Filiation, and Procession are different from and superadded to the Divine Persons and the Divine Being. In consequence of this his doctrine at times amounts to a form of Tritheism, at others to a kind of Divine quaternity. His opinion was condemned by the Council of Rheims in 1148. Cp. *Enzykl.* of ERSCH and GRUBER, s. v.

<sup>1</sup> Mg. by H. HAID, 1863; S. M. DEUTSCH, 1884; HAUSRATH, 1893; MCCABE, 1901; E. KAISER (*Pierre Abélard critique*), 1901.

## § 135

The Heyday of Scholasticism<sup>1</sup>

Increasing in power during the twelfth century, Scholasticism reached its prime in the thirteenth century. Its success was largely due to the greater facilities for study. So far, the only works of Aristotle known in the West had been his books on logic, but about this time his physical, metaphysical, and ethical works were obtained through the Moors of Spain; and though they were at first looked at askance and even formally condemned by the Church, the general feeling in their favour was so strong that the Stagyrte became *the* Philosopher of the Schoolmen, and soon usurped in Theology the position previously occupied by Plato.<sup>2</sup> The principal exponents of the new learning were the members of the two new Orders of the Franciscans and Dominicans, to which all the great scholars of the time belonged. Of these the best known were:—

I. **Alexander of Hales**,<sup>3</sup> of English origin, who settled at Paris as a professor, became a Franciscan, and was surnamed by his scholars *Doctor Irrefragabilis* († 1245). His great work was a commentary on the sentences known as the *Summa Theologiae*. He was the first to use the syllogism with that prominence characteristic of Scholasticism.

II. **Albertus Magnus** (1193–1280),<sup>4</sup> a scion of the Bollstädt family, born at Lauingen, educated at Padua and Paris, where he joined the Dominicans. He taught in several places, was for two years (1260–62) bishop of Ratisbon, and died at Cologne. Of all the scholastics he was undoubtedly the most learned, and in consequence received his title of ‘the Great,’ being, however, also known as *Doctor Universalis*.

III. **Thomas of Aquino** (1227(?)–1274),<sup>5</sup> a disciple of

<sup>1</sup> MARTIGNÉ, *La Scolastique et les traditions franciscaines*, 1889; H. FELDER, *Gesch. der wiss. Studien im Franziskanerorden bis um die Mitte des 13. Jahrh.* 1904; F. X. SEPPELT, *Wissenschaft u. Franziskanerorden*, in the *Kirchengesch.* Abh. ed. by SDRÁLEK, IV, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> SCHNEID, *Arist. in der Scholastik*, 1876.

<sup>3</sup> *Philos. Jahrb.* 1880 [BADDELEY, *A Cotteswold Shrine, being a History of Hailes, &c.* 1908. Trans.].

<sup>4</sup> Opp. ed. JAMMY, 21 fol. 1651; ed. A. BORGUET, 38 tom. 1890–99. Mg. by SIGHART, 1857; G. v. HERTLING, 1880.

<sup>5</sup> Recent editions: Paris, 34 vol. 1882–89; Rome, I–XI, 1882–1903. Mg. by K. WERNER, 3 vol. 1858–59; VAUGHAN, 1890; L. SCHÜTZ, *Thomas-Lexik.* 2nd ed. 1895.

Albert's, who, though his acquirements were less extensive than his master's, surpassed him in talent and in theological acumen, so much so that he is reckoned the Prince of Scholastics. His title of *Doctor Angelicus* he owed to the exceptional purity of his life. He taught at Paris and in various Italian cities, and died on his way to attend the Second Council of Lyons. His principal works are his two great *Sums*, the lesser, or *Summa contra gentiles*, a defence of the Christian doctrine against the Jews and Moslems; the greater, or *Summa theologica*, his last and ripest work, covering the whole field of Dogma and Morals.

IV. Giovanni di Fidanza, better known as **Bonaventure** (1221-74),<sup>1</sup> deserves to rank as a friendly Franciscan rival of the great Dominican. He became general of his Order (1257), cardinal bishop of Albano (1273), was entrusted with the management of the negotiations with the Greeks at the Fourteenth General Council, and died at Lyons while that Council was in progress. He was known as the *Doctor Seraphicus*. His *Breviloquium* is the best mediæval compendium of Dogmatics. His *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum* entitles him to a place among the mystics.

To the above we must add the names of a few others, who, though their work was not of the same decisive importance, occupy nevertheless an honourable place in the history of learning.

I. **Vincent of Beauvaix** was a Dominican; he acted as tutor to the sons of Lewis IX († 1264), and left us in his *Speculum (historiale, naturale, doctrinale)* an encyclopædic exposition of the learning of the time, which some other hand completed by the addition of the *Speculum morale*. Mg. by SCHLOSSER, 1819; A. VOGEL, 1843; Z. f. KG. I.

II. **Henry of Ghent**, a canon (1267) and archdeacon of Tournai († 1293), was the author of many essays (*Quodlibeta*) on the Sentences, and of a *Summa*. He was surnamed *Doctor Solemnis*. M. DE WULF, *Études sur Henri de Gand*, 1895.

III. **Roger Bacon** of Oxford († 1294) was a Franciscan conspicuous for his learning, especially in the field of natural science. Known among his friends as *Doctor Mirabilis*, he was nevertheless subjected to considerable persecution on account of the nature of his work. *Opus Maius*, ed. BRIDGES, 1897. Mg. by CHARLES, 1861; L. SCHNEIDER, 1873; *Rquh.* 50 (1891), 118-42.

IV. **Raymond Lullus** was a Spaniard, who in his zeal to convert

<sup>1</sup> Recent editions: QUARACCHI, 10 tom. 1882-1902. Bg. by A. M. DA VICENZA, 1874, G. DA MONTE SANTO, 1874.

the Mohammedans was led to concoct a system in which Christian doctrine was enforced by rigorous demonstration. In his *Ars Magna* he believed that he had discovered the royal road to all knowledge. He ended his long life (1315) as a martyr at the hands of the Saracens. Mg. by A. HELFFERICH, 1858; M. ANDRÉ, 1900.

## § 136

The Mystics<sup>1</sup>

The first place in the rank of the Mystics belongs to **St. Bernard**, one of the noblest men of his time, who by word and pen and deed strove unceasingly to rouse his generation to higher things. His mysticism was mainly practical, as his efforts were directed less to a deeper knowledge than to a greater love of God. His principal works are *De diligendo Deo* and *De consideratione* († 1153).

Speculative Mysticism was cultivated more especially in the School of **St. Victor**. Hugo of St. Victor was not unsuccessful in this field, but it was to Richard († 1173), his religious associate, that the task fell of combining into a system the scattered views and suggestions of his predecessor.

Mention must also be made of Rupert, abbot of Deutz († 1135),<sup>2</sup> for a distinctly mystic element prevades his numerous works, which are mainly of an exegetical character. His fondness for synthetic views of history is traceable to the same cause.

A similar inclination is to be noticed in the Cistercian abbot, **Joachim de Floris** in Calabria († 1202).<sup>3</sup> In his case it was, however, complicated by a tendency to prophetism. He postulated a threefold period to correspond with the three Divine Persons. The first age is the pre-Christian—characterised by the rule of the letter of the Old Testament—which is the age of married folk and laymen; the second is the Christian period, which lasts till 1260 (*i.e.* forty-two generations of thirty years; cp. *Matt.* i. 17), is the clerical age, and is ruled by the letter of the New Testament; during the third age, finally

<sup>1</sup> W. PREGER, *Gesch. d. deutschen Mystik*, I.

<sup>2</sup> Mg. by R. ROCHOLL, 1886; *Z. f. KG.* XXII (1901), 343-61.

<sup>3</sup> Mg. by SCHNEIDER, 1873. DENIFLE, *Archiv f. Litt. u. KG. d. MA.* I (1885), 48-142; *Rquh.* LXVII (1900), 457-505; *Z. f. KG.* XXII (1901), 342-61. P. FOURNIER, *Études sur J. de F.*, 1909.

that of the Holy Ghost and the monks, the spirit of the Scriptures or *Evangelium aeternum* (*Apoc.* XIV, 6) will prevail. With the opening of the new age in 1260, the image was to make room for the Truth, partial knowledge was to be merged in perfect knowledge, whilst the fleshly Church was to be superseded by the Church of the spirit; a new Order was then to convert to God nearly the whole world.

Joachim's fancies found acceptance especially among the stricter Minorites, or so-called Spirituals. But no sooner had the Franciscan Gerard of Borgo San Donnino given his assent (1254) to the doctrine in his *Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum*—a kind of general introduction to Joachim's *Concordia Vet. et novi Testamenti, Expositio super Apocalypsin, Psalterium decem choridarum*—than he was violently taken to task. The *Introductorius* (after having been examined by the commission of Anagni, 1255) was condemned by Alexander IV; as for the works of Joachim himself, they were reprobated by a provincial Council of Arles (after 1263). The idea of a renewal of the Church still continued to find support among the Franciscans, as may be seen from Peter John Olivi († 1298) and Ubertino of Casale. J. Ch. HUCK, *Ubertin v. Casale*, 1903; E. KNOTH, *item*, 1903.

In a certain number of women, in **Hildegard** of Bingen (1179) and **Elizabeth** of Schönau († 1156), to mention but the most prominent instances in point, the mystic tendency showed itself in ecstasies and visions. Their revelations took a practical reforming character, without, however, assuming the apocalyptic form so noticeable in Joachim. *Hildegardis opp.* ed. PITRA, 1882 (*Analecta*, VIII); DAMOISEAU, 3 vol. 1893-95; mg. by SCHMELZEIS, 1879; F. W. ROTH, *Die Visionen der hl. Elisabeth*, 1884.

At the very end of the period we meet the Franciscans **David** of Augsburg († 1272) and his disciple **Berthold** of Ratisbon († 1272). Their work was, however, more of a homiletic nature. Cp. WIESER, *Berthold v. R.* 1889; GREEVEN, *Predigtweise des Franziskaners B. v. R.* 1892; E. BERNHARDT, *B. v. R.* 1905; *Z. f. KG.* XIX (1899), 15-46; 340-60 (on David of A.).

Finally, we must not forget **Jacobus de Voragine** († 1298), the Dominican, afterwards archbishop of Genoa. He is the author of many sermons, and of a *Legenda Sanctorum*, which, owing to the esteem in which it was held, came to be called the *Legenda Aurea*, or Golden Legend.











BR 145.2 .F8613 1910

v.1 SMC

Funk, F. X. von (Franz  
Xaver), 1840-1907.

A manual of church  
history /

AXJ-3884 (awsk)



