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TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The "History of Doctrines" is a branch of theological science familiar to the German student, but as yet almost entirely unknown in this country. In most, if not in all German Universities, lectures on this subject are yearly delivered, and a number of compendiums of various merit have been published by different writers. The present publication was selected for translation by my esteemed tutor, Dr. Davidson, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Lancashire Independent College, because it was thought that the compendiousness and clearness of the work would contribute to render it acceptable to the English reader. Throughout it has been the Translator's aim, not so much to give a literal translation, as to adapt the original to English modes of thought, without however permitting himself in any case to alter the sense of the original. A few passages, which were found to be of such a nature as to convey little definite meaning in translation, have been omitted. How far the Translator has succeeded in accomplishing the end proposed, must be left to the decision of competent judges; he would however feel gratified in knowing that he has been permitted to do some service in the language of a country, among whose people he has met with so much that will ever be pleasant in his recollections.
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

It seems unnecessary that the Translator should say much about the department of science to which the present work belongs, about its nature, use, etc., since the introduction to the work itself will give all needful information. A "historical development of the doctrines of Christianity" cannot fail to be regarded as highly interesting and instructive by every thinking mind, and especially by every divine who would not rest satisfied with the simple and unqualified reception of the peculiar doctrines of the creed adopted by his denomination. The knowledge of what the most eminent theologians of all ages have thought on points frequently the subjects of much controversy, will be found of special use to those who are desirous of taking any part in such controversies.

The Author of the present work is Professor of Theology in the university of Basle, and belongs to the orthodox school of Germany. He observes however himself: "Respecting my theological views, I do not think it necessary to enter into any lengthened remarks, inasmuch as they will be clear from the work itself to such an extent as is allowable in a writing of a professedly historical character, in which the subjective opinions of the writer should neither be prominently brought forward at the expense of truth, nor wholly kept back at the expense of liberty." (Extract from the Author's preface.) It may be sufficient to add that Professor Hagenbach enjoys a high and deserved reputation in his own country as a theological writer.

The English reader will probably regret that the Author should have paid so little attention to English theology; but English theology is not much studied in Ger-
many, nor does the English language possess works on the History of Doctrines. The Translator has endeavoured to supply this defect by adding references to such works as he thought would be most useful and accessible to the English reader. These references and other notes are included in brackets [ ].

The Translator has further allowed himself to introduce some of the German abbreviations used in the original, of which he wishes to inform his readers before they proceed to the perusal of the work itself. Instead of the usual abbreviation “ss.” the reader will find “flwg.” (meaning following) through the first half of the present volume; 1. c. means loco citato; ibid. is put instead of ibidem or eodem loco. The sign † before the name of an author shows that he is a Roman Catholic writer; the sign * signifies that his work is deserving of special notice.—It is customary in some modern German works to omit the numeral 1 in the number of years, when titles of books are quoted published during the last six or seven centuries; thus “ 834 ” instead of “ 1834.” The reader will meet with a few instances of the kind, where the titles of books have been printed from the original.

In conclusion, the Translator takes this opportunity of expressing his best thanks to his friend and fellow-student R. A. Vaughan, B. A., for his kind assistance in preparing the MSS., and to Dr. Davidson for the aid which he has afforded him.

CARL W. BUCH.

Lancashire Independent College,  
August 12th 1846.
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INTRODUCTION.


§ 1.

DEFINITION.

The History of Doctrines (history of opinions, Dogmengeschichte)\(^{(1)}\) is that branch of theological science which exhibits the gradual development of the doctrines (dogmas)\(^{(2)}\) of the Christian church, the various aspects they have assumed in the course of time, and the changes they have undergone through the influence of civilization in different ages of the world.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) [Kitto (Cyclopaedia of Bibl. Literat. vol. i. pref. p. xiii.) proposes the term Doctrine History, "since we have no corresponding term in the English language." Dr. Credner gives the following definition of the history of doctrines, (Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. pref. p. xiii.): Doctrine History in a less limited sense than that in which the term is usually taken, points out the peculiar doctrines which have, from time to time, been received as articles of Christian belief. But as a variety of opinions with regard to the essentials of the Christian religion has arisen, not only among the various and different sects as separate bodies; but likewise at sundry times among the members of even one and the same sect or party, Doctrine History must necessarily include all the peculiar features of schismatic views, their origin and history, the causes of their rise and gradual development, as well as their connection with the Scriptures, from which they all claim to be derived, and by which they must be tried. Comp. also
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Tholuck, Theolog. Encyclop. and Methodol. transl. by Prof. Park, in Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. i. 1844, p. 556: It (the history of doctrines) exhibits to us the processes of thought, in which the scientific men of different ages have endeavoured to apprehend and to vindicate the doctrines of Christianity.]

(2) On the meaning of the word δόγμα (statutum, decretum, præceptum, placitum) v. Suicer, Thesaurus sub voce. Münscher, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, edit. by von Colln, p. 1. Baumgarten-Crusius, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengesch. p. 1. Augusti, Dogmengeschichte, § 1. Klee, D. G., Prolegomena. Nitzsch, System der christlichen Lehre, 2 edit. p. 35, 37. Hagenbach, Encycl. p. 259. [Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, transl. by L. Woods, Lond. 1843, p. 24. Credner in Kitto, l. c. p. xiii. A dogma is understood to be the doctrine of a particular party or sect, etc.] The word δόγμα signifies in the first place: decree, edict, statute. Comp. (Sept. vers.) Dan. ii. 13; vi. 8. Esth. iii. 9. 2 Macc. x. 2; and in the New Testament Luke ii. 1, (where it has a political sense only), Acts xvi. 4, (used in a theological sense, denoting the apostolical decrees to the gentile Christians,) Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14, (in the latter passage it is also used in a theological sense, but has no reference to Christian belief and Christian doctrine, as some think; it rather relates to Jewish ordinances, comp. Winer, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 4. ed. 1836, p. 197.) Its use in the sense of doctrine, or gospel cannot be established from any passage in the N. T.; the words employed to express this idea, are: ἤμαρτητος, κήρυγμα, λόγος τοῦ Χιου, etc. In the writings of the Stoics δόγμα, (decretum, placitum,) signifies: theoretical principle. Marcus Aurelius ις iaur. 2, 3: ταῦτα σοι ἀξίων, ἀσί δόγματα ἵσων. Cic. Acad. quaest. iv. 9: Sapientia neque de se ipsa dubitare debet, neque de suis decretis quae philosophi vacant δόγματα. The Fathers adopted similar language, and taking the word δόγμα (to which the predicate ρέεν was sometimes applied) in a more comprehensive sense, understood it to imply all that is contained in the doctrines. The passages from Ignatius, Clement of Alex. (Paed. I. 1. Strom. viii. p. 924, edit. of Potter), Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, a. o. are given by Suicer, Thes. sub voce. They also used it in reference to the opinions of heretics, with the epithet μυστήρια, or others of similar import, but not so frequently as the terms δικαία, νόημα, comp. Klee l. c. Cyrill of Jerusalem, (Cat.
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4, 2.) makes a distinction between doctrines and ethics, and understands by δόγμα that which relates to faith, by πράξις that which refers to moral actions; ὁ τε Ἰεωνιστικὸς τρότος ἐν δύο τοῖς σωμάσι τοῖς, δόγματοι σωμάτω καὶ πράξεως ἀγαθῶν. The former are the source of the latter. We meet with similar expressions in the writings of Seneca; he describes the dogmas as the elements of which the body of wisdom is composed, as the seat of life; Ep. 94, 95. A peculiar, and most curious definition of the word δόγμα is given by Basilius de Spiritu S. c. 27: ἄλλο γάς δόγμα καὶ ἄλλο πνεύμαν τό μίν γάς σωμαται, τά δέ πνεύματα δημοσιεύεται; (esoteric and exoteric doctrine.) According to Nitzsch, it was only in consequence of the representations of Döderlein, that many writers explained δόγμα to mean Sententia doctoris aliquius rather than ipsa doctrina, doctrinal opinion rather than doctrinal idea. The definition of the history of doctrines, its importance, and the mode of its treatment, are closely connected with the above definition of the term δόγμα. In the one case, the history of doctrines will be considered as nothing but a collection of fanciful notions and opinions, which owes its existence to chance; in the other, it will be regarded as the organic development of a vital principle, whose seeds already exist, (comp. § 10.)

(3.) It is necessary here to guard against a twofold error. There are some who perceive in every new mode of representing divine truth, in every change of phraseology, an alteration or corruption of the doctrine of the church; they erroneously suppose, that none but biblical terms are to be introduced into dogmatic theology, and would make the history of doctrines a mere history of corruptions. There are others who will admit nothing, but a progressive development of the true doctrine within the pale of the church, and seem to forget, that disorders and diseases often make their appearance in a strong and healthy body. True science has to consider both these conditions; religion too advances, comes to a stand, and goes back; it has its excellencies and its defects, its stages of purity, and its stages of corruption. (Thus it would be incorrect to reject the doctrine of the Trinity, of original sin, the sacraments, etc. because those terms themselves are not used in Scripture; but it is our duty to examine whether any thing extraneous has been mixed up with them, and how far the development of a doctrine may become dangerous to the truth of the gospel.)
THE RELATION OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES TO ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

The history of doctrines properly constitutes a part of ecclesiastical history, [Church History, Credner v. Kitto, l. c. p. xvii.], but is now separated from it on account of its wide extent, and treated as a particular science.\(^{(1)}\) The history of doctrines further forms the transition from ecclesiastical history to dogmatic theology properly so called.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Comp. § 16. and Hagenbach Encyclop. p. 229. “Whether we consider the history of doctrines as a separate branch of theological science, or regard it as a part of ecclesiastical history, is in itself indifferent, and the distinction, if there be any, is merely nominal. For apart from the difference of extent which depends on external relations, the subject of investigation is the same in both cases, only under various aspects. The subject of the history of doctrines properly so called, is the dogma as it presents itself in the various stages of its development; that of ecclesiastical history, is the dogma in its relation to external circumstances.” Hase, Kirchengeschichte, pref. p. iv. v.

\(^{(2)}\) Many think that the history of doctrines is a kind of appendix to dogmatic theology, rather than an introduction to it; but this opinion is erroneous, and appears to arise both from incorrect views on the nature of dogmatic theology, and from a misapprehension of its historical character; (one-sided conception of dogmatic theology, either from the biblical, or from the speculative point of view.) The history of doctrines forms the point of connection between historical theology on the one hand, and didactic (systematic) theology on the other. Ecclesiastical history is its foundation, dogmatic theology both of the present, and the future is the subject of its researches.
(and the theology of the N. T. in particular) as its basis; in like manner the general history of the church presupposes the life of Christ and the apostolic age.

Those writers who reduce theology in general to biblical theology, and exclude dogmatic theology altogether, consistently look upon the history of doctrines as a mere appendix to biblical theology. But in our opinion biblical theology is only to be regarded as the foundation-stone of the edifice; the history of doctrines as the historian of its progressive construction; and dogmatic theology as the builder, who is still engaged in its completion. It is no more the object of doctrine history fully to expound all the doctrines of the Bible, than of ecclesiastical history to give a complete account of the life of Christ and his Apostles. But as the history of primitive Christianity is the only solid foundation and starting-point of church history, so the history of doctrines must rest upon and begin with the theology of both the New and Old Testaments.

§ 4.

RELATION TO SYMBOLIK.

The history of doctrines takes in the Symbolik*(1.) of the church, since it must have respect not only to the general formation and import of public confessions of faith,(2.) but also to the distinguishing principles set forth in them.(3.) Symbolik may however be separated from the history of doctrines, and treated as comparative dogmatic theology. It stands in the same relation to the history of doctrines, as the church statistics, [comp. Credner in Kitto, 1. c. p. xvii.], of any particular period stand to ecclesiastical history in general.

* [Comp. Credner in Kitto, 1. c. p. xiii. Pelt, Theol. Encyclop. p. 448, defines Symbolik as that branch of theological science, which considers the distinguishing principles of the various sections of the Christian church.]
(1) On the sense in which the church uses the term σημείον comp. Suerer, Thesaurus, p. 1084. Creuzer, Symbolik, § 16. Marheineke, christliche Symbolik, vol. i. towards the beginning. Neander, Kirchen Geschichte, i. 2, p. 536, flwg. [Pelt, Theol. Encyclop. p. 456. Maximus Taurinensis (about the year 460), says in Hom. in Symb. p. 239: Symbolum tessera est signaculum, quo interfideles perfidosque secernitur.] By symbols (in the doctrinal sense of the word, but not in its liturgical, nor technical sense) we understand the public confessions of faith, by which those belonging to the same section of the church recognise each other, as soldiers by the watch-word (tessera miliaris.)

(2) The earlier symbols of the church (e.g. the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds), may be called the Shibboleth (Judg. xii. 6.) of the Catholic church, by which she was distinguished from all heretics. It is evident that these symbols are deserving of special consideration in the history of doctrines. They are in relation to the private opinions of individual ecclesiastical writers, what systems of mountains are in relation to the hills and valleys of a country. They are as it were the watch-towers from which we can survey the entire field of observation, the principal stations in the pursuit of the study of the history of doctrines, and cannot therefore be separated from, nor considered out of their connection with other sciences.

(3) Since the age of the Reformation the symbols are in relation to Protestants, what they formerly were in relation to heretical sects—the barrier which the ancient church erected in opposition to all who held other than orthodox views. On the other hand, the Protestants were naturally led, in a similar manner to set forth their own distinguishing principles. Their confessions of faith had moreover regard to the differences which had arisen out of controversies within the pale of the Protestant church herself, (Lutherans and Calvinists), and to other opinions more or less at variance with those held by the orthodox party, (Anabaptists, Unitarians, a. o.) And lastly, the Roman Catholics found it necessary to exhibit the doctrines of their church in new confessions of faith. These and other circumstances made it desirable that a separate theological science should be formed, whose special object it should be to consider the distinguishing principles before mentioned. It became first known
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under the name Elenchtkik or Polemics, which was afterwards changed into that of Symbolik. (This latter name has not so much reference to the struggle which had been carried on between the different parties in the church, as to the historical knowledge of the points at issue, and the nature of that struggle.)

§ 5.

RELATION TO PATRISTICS.

Inasmuch as the history of the dogma in its relation to the church is the primary object of doctrine history, the private opinions of ecclesiastical writers will come before us only when these writers either exerted, or endeavoured to exert some real influence upon the form of belief adopted by the church. The full investigation however of the literary character and history of the fathers, as well as of their doctrinal opinions, and the influence which the latter had upon the former, must be left to that particular science which is called Patristics (Patrology.)

On the definition of the term Patristics, comp. Hagenbach Encyclopaedia, p. 241, flwg.; the idea conveyed by it is by no means definite and clear. But even if we enlarge it, so as to make it embrace not only the Fathers of the first six centuries, but all who have been of some standing in the church, either as founders of new systems or as reformers, (comp. Möhler, p. 20) it is evident that a great deal of what is contained in the writings of

Sack, however, has recently published a work on Polemics (christliche Polemik, Hamburgh 1838.) as a distinct science.

The distinction made by some writers, and Roman Catholics in particular, between Patristics and Patrology, (v. Möhler, Patrologie, p. 14.) appears to us on the whole unfounded. [Comp. however, Credner in Kitto, l. c. p. xiv., where the same distinction is made.]
the Fathers must be introduced into the history of doctrines. The very study of the sources leads to the examination of their works. But we would not maintain, as Baumgarten-Crusius does, (Dogmengeschichte, p. 12.) that the history of doctrines already includes the most essential parts of the science in question; the relations and interests of individuals, which constitute what may be called the essential part, the characteristic feature of Patrology, have either none but a subordinate, or no place at all in the history of doctrines. Thus the object of the one is to know the system of Augustine, of the other (Patristics) to know the history of his person. Concerning the literat. comp. § 14.

§ 6.

RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF HERESIES AND THE HISTORY OF UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

The history of doctrines considers the opinions of heretics only as they represent any particular tendency of the theological mind, or by way of contrast set the doctrines of the church in a clearer light. Those who wish more fully to investigate the internal character of heretical systems, will obtain the desired information either in the history of heresies properly so called, or in the history of universal religion. Neither is it the object of the history of doctrines to discuss the relation between Christianity, and other forms of religion. On the contrary, it presupposes the history of comparative religion, in the same manner as dogmatic theology presupposes apologetic theology. [Comp. Credner in Kitto, l. c. p. xvii. Tholuck in Bibliotheca Sacra, i. p. 556: This term has ordinarily been employed to
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denote the science which exhibits the historical grounds for the truth, and the divine authority of Christianity: Evidences of Christianity. Pelt, l. c. p. 375, 377.]

(1) In an ecclesiastical point of view, the history of heresies may be compared to pathology, the history of doctrines to physiology. They depend on each other, but at the same time differ, according to the opposite objects they have in view.

(2) The term: history of heresies, is seldom used in modern works, but the science to which it is applied, continues to form a distinct branch of theology. The very able publications of recent writers on the Gnostic systems, Ebionitism, Manichaeism, Unitarianism, etc., and the lives of some of the Fathers, are of great use to the historian of Christian doctrines; but he cannot be expected to incorporate all the materials thus furnished into the history of doctrines. It is necessary that we should possess some knowledge, e. g. of the Gnostic and Ebionitic tendencies, because orthodoxy was in danger of being corrupted by them; but they would not come into consideration, if they did not differ from the orthodox belief. Their internal history must be treated on its own grounds. Nor is the history of doctrines the proper place to enter into a minute examination of the systems of Basilides and Valentine; it suffices to have a clear and distinct idea of the points of contrast between the emanation-theory of the Gnostics, and the monotheistic theology of the church.

§ 7.

RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS, AND THE HISTORY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

Although the history of doctrines has some topics in common with the history of philosophy,(1) yet they are no more to be confounded with each other, than dogmatic theology and philosophy. The history of doctrines should also be separated from the history of Christian ethics, inasmuch as dogmatic theology and ethics themselves have been separated.(2) And lastly the history of dogmatic theology forms a part only of the history of doctrines.(3)


(2) Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, p. 9.

(3) Comp. § 11.
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§ 8.

AUXILIARY SCIENCES.

Although the different branches of theological science which have successively come before us, are strictly distinct from the history of doctrines, they are nevertheless connected with it as auxiliary sciences. Archaeology, and the sciences auxiliary to ecclesiastical history, may be added to their number.

1. Ecclesiastical history itself may be viewed in the light of an auxiliary science, since form of church government, of worship, the private life of Christians, etc. have had more or less influence upon the development of the doctrines. In like manner Patristics, the history of heresies, the history of universal religion, the history of philosophy, and the history of Christian ethics, are to be numbered amongst the auxiliary sciences.

2. From the connection between the doctrines and the liturgy of the church, it is obvious, that Archaeology must be considered as an auxiliary science, if we understand by it the history of Christian worship. This may easily be seen from the use of certain doctrinal phrases, (e. g., ἔσορτος etc.) in the liturgies of the church, the appointment of certain festivals, (the feast of Christ's holy body, that of the conception of the Virgin Mary,) the influence of the existence or absence of certain liturgical usages upon the doctrines, (e. g. of the withholding of the sacramental cup from the laity upon the doctrine of concomitance, comp. § 195.) a. o. Works of reference: Bingham. Orig. J. antiqu. ecclesiasticæ. Halae, 1751-61. [Bingham, J., Antiquities of the Christian church, and other works. Lond. 1834, fïwg. 8 vols. A new edition is in course of publication.] J. Jahn, Biblische Archaeologie. Vienna, 1807-25, 2nd edition, 5 vols. [The Latin abridgment was translated by Prof. Upham, and republished in Ward's Library of Standard Divinity.] Augusti, J. Ch. W., Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archaeologic. Leipz. 1817-31, 12 vols. [Christian Antiquities, translated and compiled from the works of Augusti by the Rev. Lyman Coleman of Andover, 1844. De Wette, W. M. L.,
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§ 9.

IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.


The importance of the history of doctrines, in a scientific point of view, partly follows from what has already been said: 1. It forms one of the most important branches of ecclesiastical history. 2. It serves as an introduction to the study of dogmatic theology. But it is no less useful in a moral and practical aspect. On the one hand, it exerts a beneficial influence upon the mind of man, by placing before him the efforts and struggles of others in relation to their most important concerns. On the other, it is of special use to the student of theology, for it will preserve him both from that one-sided and rigid adherence to the letter which may be styled false orthodoxy, and from the adoption of daring, superficial, and hastily formed opinions, (false heterodoxy and neology.)

(1) Comp. § 2.

(2) Comp. § 10. The importance of the history of doctrines in both these respects has frequently been overrated. The various parties in the church have either appealed to it in support of their peculiar views, or dreaded its results. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, I. p. 16, 20.
§ 10.

Scientific Treatment of the History of Doctrines.

The advantage which may be derived from the study of the history of doctrines, depends more or less on the mode of its treatment. That method alone is correct and useful, which clearly represents the constant change, which the definitions of doctrines are undergoing, while the great and essential truths which they teach, remain the same in all ages, and shows in a philosophical manner the connection between the external causes of that change, and the internal dynamic principle.

Although it cannot be said that nothing but the prevailing notions of the age, differences of climate, personal feelings, passions, court intrigues, priestly impositions, and the fanaticism of monks, have determined the character of dogmatic theology, yet we should not wholly set aside their influence. They have not made the dogma, but they have assisted in giving it the form in which it has come down to us.

§ 11.

Arrangement.

The history of doctrines has to consider, on the one hand, the history of the doctrine of the church in general, and of the doctrinal tendencies which are represented by it; and, on the other, the history of dogmas, i. e. of those particular doctrines, opinions, and notions which form the standard of the church in different ages. Both are to be connected so as to illustrate each other; the general
may be made clearer by the particular, and the particular by the general. We think it best therefore to commence each period with the general history of doctrines which, though closely allied to, yet is not identical with the history of dogmatic theology, and then to pass over to special history of doctrines.

The history of dogmatic theology presupposes the general history of doctrines, though the latter takes from the former, and incorporates some of its results. They stand in the same relation to each other as the history of jurisprudence to the history of law, the history of aesthetics to the history of art.

§ 12.

DIVISION INTO PERIODS.


The periods of the history of doctrines are to be determined according to the most important epochs (periods of development) in the history of the theological mind. They do not quite coincide with those adopted in ecclesiastical history, and may be specified as follows:—

I. Period. From the close of the Apostolic age to the death of Origen, (from the year 80—254), the age of Apologetics.

II. Period. From the death of Origen to John Damascenus, (240—730,) the age of Polemics.

III. Period. From John Damascenus to the Reformation, (730—1517,) the age of Systems (scholasticism in its widest sense).

IV. Period. From the Reformation to the Abolition of the Formula Consensus in reformed Switzerland, and the rise of the Wolfian philosophy in Germany, (1517—1720,) the age of polemico-ecclesiastical Symbolik.
V. Period. From the year 1720 to the present day, the age of criticism, of speculation, and of antithesis between faith and knowledge, philosophy and Christianity, reason and revelation.

(1) Inasmuch as the divisions in ecclesiastical history, and in the history of doctrines are not founded upon the same principles, it is evident that the periods themselves will not be the same. It is true that the development of the doctrine of the church is connected with the history of church-government, of Christian worship, etc., but the influences which they exert upon each other, are not always manifested at the same time. Thus the Arian controversy took place during the age of Constantine, but was not called forth by his conversion, which, on the other hand, is of so much importance, that it determines a period in ecclesiastical history. On the contrary, the notions of Arius arose out of the speculative tendency of Origen and his followers, which was opposed to Sabellianism. Accordingly, we think it better to fix in this instance upon the death of Origen, and the rise of the Sabellian controversy, which are nearly coeval, as the principle of division.

(2) The numerical differences are very great. Baumgarten-Crusius adopts twelve periods, Lenz eight, etc.; Münsher gives a different division in his compendium from the one in his manual—in the former he has seven, in the latter only three periods, (ancient time, middle ages, and modern times.) Engelhardt has adopted the same division. But we think it alike inconvenient to make the periods too long, and to have too great a number of divisions. We admit that the periods in the history of doctrines may be of greater extent, than those in ecclesiastical history, because a system of doctrines does not undergo either so frequent, or so rapid changes, as Christian life in general; but natural boundaries which are so distinct as the age of Constantine, should not be lightly disregarded. Generally speaking, Klee agrees with us, though he considers the division into periods as superfluous. Vörlander also, in his tables, has adopted our terminology.

(3) In answer to the question: Why not commence with the first year of our era? comp. § 3. We call this period the age of Apologetics, because it is best characterized by the great number of apologetical writings in defence of Christianity against
both Judaism and Paganism. Its theology is almost entirely of
the same description. The controversies which took place within
the church itself, (with Ebionites, Gnostics, etc.), for the most
part arose out of the opposition which Christianity met with on
the part of judaizing teachers and pagan philosophers, and ac-
cordingly the activity which was manifested by the church, part-
took more or less of an apologetical character. The Fathers of
this period were little concerned about systems, and the work
of Origen πρὸς ἔχον is the only one in which we find some at-
tempt, at least, at systematic theology.

(4) During the second period the conflict proceeds in another
direction. Since there was little, or no occasion for apologetical
writings after the conversion of Constantine, most writers en-
tirely abandoned this field, and entered into questions of a
polemical nature. The history of ecclesiastical controversies,
from the rise of the Sabellian, down to the close of the Mono-
theelite controversy, forms one continuous series, the different
parts of which are so intimately connected with each other,
that it cannot well be interrupted. It is concluded by the work
of John Damascenus, (ἰκθίος πίστεως.) This period with its nu-
merous conflicts, its synods and councils, is undoubtedly the
most important for the history of doctrines, if its importance
consists in the efforts that were put forth to complete the build-
ing, the foundations of which had been laid in the preceding
period.

(5) This period which we call the scholastic, in the widest
sense of the word, might be sub-divided into three shorter
periods. 1. From John Damascenus to Anselm, Archbishop of
Canterbury; during this period John Scotus Erigenus takes the
most prominent position in the west. 2. From Anselm to Ga-
briel Biel, the age of scholasticism properly so called, which may
again be subdivided; and, 3. from Gabriel Biel to Luther, (the
period of transition.) Generally speaking, mystical and scho-
lastic tendencies alternately prevail during this period; even
the forerunners of the Reformation more or less adhere to the
one or the other of these tendencies, though they belong in some
respects to the next period.

(6) We might have fixed upon the year 1521, in which the
first edition of Melanchthon’s Loci Communes was published—or
upon the year 1530, in which the Confession of Augsburg was
drawn up, instead of the year 1517; but for the sake of con-
venience, we make our date agree with the one adopted in eccle-
siastical history, especially as the theses themselves were of im-
portance in a doctrinal point of view. Inasmuch as the distin-
guishing principles of the different sections of the church are
brought out very prominently in the age of the Reformation, the
history of doctrines naturally assumes the character of Symbolik,
(comp. § 4.) The ages of Polemics, and of Scholasticism, may
be said to re-appear during this period, though in a different
form; we also see various modifications of mysticism in opposi-
tion to one-sided rationalism. We might commence a new period
with Calixt and Spener, if their peculiar notions had been gene-
really spread at that time. Such, however, was not the case.

(7) It may excite surprise that we make the abolition of the
test (formula consensus) in the reformed church of Switzerland
determine the extent of the preceding period, since no great im-
portance seems to be attached to it. *But it is the signal for
the overthrow of those barriers, which had been erected by the
confessions of faith. The Wolfian philosophy, which had eman-
cipated itself from the fetters of systematic theology, and been
brought within the reach of all classes, took its rise about the
same time in Germany, while the principles of deism and na-
turalism (which developed themselves in the preceding period)
were spread from England and France into other countries.
Thus it happens, that, while in the fourth period the polemical
and the scholastical of the second and third periods are repeat-
ed, the fifth period has the apologetical tendency in common
with the first. The question is no more about less important
denominational differences, but about the existence, or non-ex-
istence of Christianity. This fifth period, which by no means
presents one uniform aspect, may be subdivided into three
shorter periods. The first of these (from Wolf to Kant) for the
most part represents the conflict between a stiff and lifeless
form of dogmatic orthodoxy, and an imperfect enlightenment.
The second (beginning with Kant) exhibits the efforts which
were made in favour of rationalism, which, having no positive
creed, is almost wholly restricted to ethics, in order to secure
its ascendancy both in science and in the church, in opposition
to every form of belief. And, lastly, the third period (which
embraces the nineteenth century) presents to our view a picture
composed of the most heterogeneous parts, of attempts at re-
action and restoration, at idealization and accommodation, and is
preparing a new period, of which it forms itself the commencement, but for which history has not yet a name.

§ 13.

SOURCES OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

a. Public Sources.

Every thing may be considered as a source of the history of doctrines, which gives a fair representation of the religious belief of a certain period. In the first place come the public confessions of faith or symbols (creeds) of the church; in connection with them we have to compare the acts of councils, the decretals, edicts, circular letters, bulls, and brevets of ecclesiastical superiors, whether clerical or civil, and, lastly, the catechisms, liturgies, and hymn-books which have received the sanction of the church.


b.) Partly contained in the Acts of Councils.

a) Decrees of Civil Governments exercising authority in Ecclesiastical Affairs, (viz. emperors, kings, magistrates): Codex Theodosianus, c. perpetuis commentariis Iac. Gothofredi etc. Edit. Nova in vi. Tom. digesta, ed. Ritter, Lpz. 736.—Codex Justinianus, edid. Spangenberg, 1797. Balluzii (Steph.) Collectio Capitularium Regum Francorum etc. Par. 780, ii. f. Corpus Juris canonici, (editions of J. H. Böhmer 747, and A. L. Richter 833.) Under this head come also the regulations concerning the Reformation, agendas, religious edicts of Protestant governments, which, at least formerly, were in a great measure based upon doctrinal principles.


(*) Catechisms become important only from the age of the Reformation, especially those of Luther, of Heidelberg, of Cracow, the Roman Catholic catechism, etc. Some of them, e. g. those just mentioned, may be found in collections of symbolical books, (n. 1), others are separately published. Comp. Langemack, historia catechetica, Stralsund 729—33. iii. 740, iv.


(6) Rambach, Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus allen Jahrhunderten der Kirche, Altona 816—22. iv. 8, and the numerous psalm-, and hymn-books. — How much sacred songs have contributed to the spread of doctrinal opinions, may be seen from the example of Bardesanes, [Giesler, i. § 46, n. 2], of the Arians, and, in later times, of the Flagellantes, the Hussites, etc.; from the history of the sacred hymns of the Lutheran, and the sacred psalms of the Reformed church, the spiritual songs of Angelus Silesius, the Pietists and Moravian brethren, and (in a negative point of view) from the inferior value of modern hymn-books. Comp. Augusti, de antiquissimis hymnis et carminibus Christianorum sacris in historia dogmatum utiliter adhibendis Jen. 810, and de audiendis in Theologia poëtis, Vratisl. 812. 15 — Hahn, A., Bardesanes Gnosticus, primus Syrorum hymnologus, 820. 8. †Buchegger, de origine sacra Christianorum poëseos, Frib. 827. 4. Hoffmann, Dr. H., Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luthers Zeit, Breslau 832.

§ 14.

b. Private Sources.

Beside the aforesaid public sources we have a number of private sources. These are, 1. the works of the
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fathers, theologians, and ecclesiastical writers of all ages since the Christian era;\(^{(1)}\) but they are not all of the same description, and we have accordingly to distinguish between scientific and strictly doctrinal works on the one hand, and practical (sermons) and occasional works (letters, etc.) on the other.\(^{(2)}\) 2. The works of secular writers, \textit{e. g.} of Christian philosophers and poets of certain periods.\(^{(3)}\) 3. Lastly, We may derive additional information from that indefinite form of popular belief, which manifests itself in legends, proverbial sayings, and songs, and from the monuments of Christian art, inasmuch as they represent certain religious views.\(^{(4)}\)
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B. Collections of the Works of Ecclesiastical Writers during the Middle Ages, (more important for ecclesiastical history in general, than for doctrine-history in particular: Mei-bomius, Basnage, Muratori, Mabillon, * Martene et Durand (Thesaurus Anecd. v. f.) * Pertz (Monumenta, 826—35) etc. comp. the literature in Hase, Kirchengeschichte, p. 182, p. 205, flwg. For the east: Scriptores Byzantini (Par. 645, ss.) and latest edition by *Niebuhr, Bonn, 820, ss.

C. Collections of the Works of the Reformers: Bretschneider, Corpus Reformatorum, Italæ 834-39. vi. 4. (containing as yet works of Melanchthon only); the works of individual reformers in their proper place.


(a) Since the older theologians, e. g. Origen, drew a distinction between what they taught the people, πατριανὸς διδάσκαλος, and
what they propounded in a scientific manner; since popular writers generally do not make any pretension to dogmatic precision, it is easy to see that practical works are not of so much importance for the history of doctrines, as strictly dogmatic works. But, like all liturgical works, etc., they may be regarded as indications of the dogmatic mind of certain periods.—Homiliarium patristicum, edid. Ludov. Pelt et A. Rheinwald, Berol. 829. deinde H. Rheinwald et C. Vogt, Ber. 831.—Lenz, F. G. H., Geschichte der christlichen Homiletik, ii. Braunschw. 839. 8. Paniel, pragmatische Geschichte der christl. Beredsamkeit und der Homiletik, i. 1. 2. Lpz. 839. 8. During the middle ages, the sermons of Berthold, Tauler, etc. in the time of the Reformation those of the Reformers, etc. come into consideration. Modern homiletical literature also gives a more or less faithful representation of dogmatic tendencies.

(3.) Comp. § 13. n. 6. As sacred hymns were numbered among the public sources, so poetical compositions in general may be considered as private sources, e. g. the works of some of the earlier poets, of those commonly called Minnesingers, Dante's divina comèdia, and many others. In like manner, a comparison between the poetical views of Milton, Shakespeare, or Gôtze, and the doctrinal opinions of the church, might lead to interesting results. A history of Christian poetry in its whole extent, and all its relations to the dogmatic mind of every period, does not as yet exist.

(4.) The influence which popular belief, (though mixed up with remnants of heathenish superstitions), may have exerted upon certain dogmatic notions, e. g. concerning the devil and hell, is deserving particular attention, (comp. Grimms deutsche Mythologie.) The dogmatic mind also manifests itself in the silent monuments of art: ecclesiastical buildings, tombs, vasa sacra, paintings, e. g. representing the general judgment, or the Deity itself, (comp. Grineisen, C. über bildliche Darstellung der Gottheit, Stuttg. 1828.) Coins, gems, etc. (Münter, Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen, Altona 825. 4. Bellermann, die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxasbilde, Berlin 817.)
§ 15.

c. Indirect Sources.

We have not always access to direct sources, but must frequently consult indirect sources, i.e. accounts or reports which have been transmitted to us by other writers, as this is the case, to a great extent, in relation to the opinions of heretics, many of whose writings were destroyed at an early period. In like manner, the works of some of the Fathers are either entirely lost, or have come down to us only in a corrupt form. In the use of both the direct and indirect sources much critical skill is needful.

(a) Hence the accounts given by different writers of Cerinthus, the Ebionites, Gnostics, Manicheans, etc., frequently vary from one another, and even contradict each other.

(b) Thus in the case of Origen, of whose writings we frequently have nothing but the translations of Rufinus, or the relations of Jerome and Eusebius.

§ 16.

Compendiums.

As all the sources are not at the command of every reader, and as their study, generally speaking, will only be useful when we have already acquired a general idea of the history which we intend more fully to investigate, we are directed, in the first instance, to the works of those who, by their own historical researches, have placed the treasures of science within the reach of all who are desirous of obtaining information. The history of doctrines itself has been treated as a separate branch of theological science only in modern times; yet some of the earlier ecclesiastical writers, no less
than theologians, than theologians, have prepared the way for it. Bes-
side those works which treat on the history of doctrines exclusively, we have to compare the modern works on ecclesiastical history, as well as biographies of the fathers and treatises on particular subjects, along with those works on dogmatic theology and Christian ethics, which combine the historical with the symboli-
cal. Lastly, The literature of symbolik forms (according to § 4.) a part of that of the history of doctrines.

The history of doctrines was formerly treated in connection with ecclesiastical history, or dogmatic theology, (comp. § 2.) Semler and Ernesti first shewed the necessity of separating the one from the other. The former attempted to treat them separately in his historical introduction to Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, Halle 759, iii. 4. His design was, (according to I. p. 101): "to expand the views of young divines or studiosis theologian in general, and to shew the origin, nature, and true ob-
ject of dogmatic theology." In the same year J. A. Ernesti pub-
lished his treatise: de theologiae historicae et dogmaticae con-
jungendae necessitate et modo universo Lips. 759. (Opusc. theol. Lips. 773. ed. 2. 792. p. 567.) he does not indeed speak of the history of doctrines as a separate science, but it is not difficult to perceive that he felt the necessity of its being so. Comp. also C. W. F. Walchs Gedanken von der Geschichte der Glau-

1 Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, etc. (Editions of Vales. Par. 1659. iii. Reading Cant. 720. iii. f.— Pocket edition of Eusebius by Heinichen, Lips. 827—28. iii.) [English translations of Euseb., Socrat., Sozom., Theod., and Evagrius, were published by Bagster, Lond. 6 vol.] Rufinus, Sul-
picius Severus, Cassiodorus, Epiphanius Scholasticus. Writers during the middle ages: Gregor. Turonensis, Beda venerabilis, Adamus Bremensis, Nicephorus Callisti, etc. (comp. the liter-
rature in works on ecclesiastical history.) Since the Reformation: the Magdeburger Centurien under the title: Ecclesiastica historia per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica, Bas. 559—74. xiii. f. † Cas. Baronius: Annales ecclesiastici, Rom. 588—607. xii. f. † Odoricus Raynaldus, Annales eccles. Rom. 646—74. x. f. (both edited by Mansi, along with the Cri-
tica historico-theologica of Pagi, Luccæ, 738. 39. xxxiii. f.—
1699. iv. f. + Nat. Alexander, Historia ecclesiastica, Par. 1676
—86. xxiv. 8. Venet. 759. 778. ix. f. + Fleury, histoire ecclésiastique, Paris 691—720. xx. 4. (continued by Jean Claude
Fabre, Paris 726—740. xvi. 4. and Al. de la Croix, Par 776—78.
vi.) Par. xxxvi. 12. 740. 41. + Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir
tà l'histoire ecclésiastique des 6 premiers siècles, justifiés par les
citations des auteurs originaux, Paris 693. ss.xvi. 4. L. Mosheimii,
Institutionum historiae eccles. antiquioris et recentioris libri IV.
Helmst. 755. 764. 4. Walch, Ch. W. F., Historie der Ketzer-
reien, Spaltungen und Religionsstreitigkeiten, Leipz. 762—85. xi.
Baumgarten, J. S., Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten
mit einigen Anmerkungen, Vorrede und fortgesetzten Geschichte
der christlichen Glaubenslehre, herausgegeben von Dr. J. S.
Semler, Halle 762—64. iii. 4. By the same: Geschichte der
Religionsparteien, herausgegeben von J. S. Semler, ibid. 766. 4.

(3) + Petavius, (Dion.), Opus de theologicis dogmatibus, Par.
644—50. iv. Antw. 700. vi. "(This work is no less ingenious than
profound, and deserves to be more carefully and frequently
studied, than is generally done." [Dorner.]) + Thomassin, L.,
dogmata theologica, Par. 684—89. + Dumesnil, Lud., Doctri-
na et disciplina ecclesiae, ex ipsis verbis SS. codd. conc. PP. et
vett. genuinorum monumentorum sec. seriem temporis digesta,
iv. Col. 730. f. Io. Forbesius a Corse, Instructiones historico-
theologicae de doctrina christiana et vario rerum statu, ortisque
erroribus et controversiis etc. Amst. 645 f. Gen. 699, and in his
Operibus, Amst. 703. ii. f. (vol. 2.) The design of this work is
to prove the agreement between the doctrines of the Reformers,
and the opinions of the earlier Fathers, (especially in opposition
to Bellarmin.) The various loci of Chemnitz, Hutter, Quesstädt,
Baier, and of Joh. Gerhard in particular, contain much histori-
cal matter: J. Gerhard, loci theol. (Edit. of Cotta) Tüb.
762—89. xxii. 4. Works which form the transition to the treat-
ment of the history of doctrines as separate science: Lor. Rein-
hard, Introductio in historiam præcipiorum dogmatum, Jen.
795. 4., and J. S. Baumgarten, evangelische Glaubenslehre,
Halle 759. 60. 4 (the aforesaid preface to this work by Semler.)

(4) Compendiums and Manuals of the History of Doctrines:
Lange, S. G., ausführliche Geschichte der Dogmen, Lpz. 796,
(incomplete.) Wundemann, J. Ch., Geschichte der christlichen
INTRODUCTION.


(5) Complete Works of Modern Authors on Ecclesiastical History, which include more or less of the History of Doctrines: Schröckh, J. M., christliche Kirchengeschichte, Lpz. 768—803, xxxiv. 8, since the Reformation (continued by Tzschierner) 804—810, x. 8. Henke, allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche nach der Zeitfolge, Braunsch. 788, flwg. continued by Vater, ix. (in several editions.) Schmidt, J. E. Ch.,


(6.) Works which treat on particular subjects will be mentioned in their proper place. Essays in which the systems of individual fathers are more fully discussed, will be found in the works of Rössler, Augusti, Möhler, a. o. mentioned § 14. n. 1.

INTRODUCTION.


(b) Comp. § 13. n. 1. and § 4. (on the signification of Symbolik.) *Marheinecke, Dr. Phil., christl. Symbolik, oder historisch-kritische und dogmatisch-comparative Darstellung des katholischen, lutherischen, reformirten und socinianischen Lehr-
FIRST PERIOD.

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE DEATH OF ORIGEN,
OR FROM THE YEAR 80 TO THE YEAR 254.

THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

A GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING
THE FIRST PERIOD.

§ 17.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

On the Life of Christ, in general comp. the earlier harmonies of the gospels, [Davidson, S. in Kitto l. c. sub voce,] and the modern works of Hess, Hase, Paulus, Strauss, and (in reference to the latter) Weisse, Neander, Wilhe, Kuhn, Theile, etc. [Voices of the Church, in reply to Dr. Strauss, by the Rev. J. R. Beard, Lond. 1845.] Concerning the internal or apologetico-dogmatic aspect of his life, which forms the basis of the history of doctrines, comp. (Reinhard,) Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf, Wittenberg, 1781. new edit. with additions, by Heubner, Wittenb. 1830. (primarily as a reply to the Wolfenbüttel Fragments.) Herder, F. G., vom Erlöser der Menschen, nach den drei ersten Evangelien, Riga, 1796. By the same: vom Sohne Gottes, der Welt Heiland, nach Johannes, Riga, 1797. (Comp. Werke zur Religion und Theologie, vol. xi. or Christliche Schriften, part 1.) Böhme, Ch. T., die Religion Jesu Christi, aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt, Halle, 1825–27. * Ullmann, über die Sündlosigkeit Jesu, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1828. part 1, reprinted, Hamb. 1833. [Dr. Ullmann, on the sinless Character of Jesus, in Clark's Students' Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts.] By the same: Was setzt die Stiftung der christlichen Kirche durch einen Gekreuzigten voraus? in the Studien und Kritiken,
The incarnation of our Redeemer, and the introduction of Christianity into the world, may be considered as the germ of the history of doctrines.

The object of all further investigations is, in the positive point of view, to develop this germ; in the negative, to guard it against all foreign additions and influences. Accordingly, we assume as an apologetical axiom, that Jesus Christ brought to light something which, in relation to the past, was new and original, i.e. a revelation, and in relation to the future, is theoretically perfect, and does not stand in need of any correction or improvement. This is the principle on which the history of doctrines proceeds, and according to which we judge of all its phenomena. We cannot, therefore, separate his doctrine from his person. For the peculiar and spotless relation in which Christ, as the Son of God, stands to the Deity, as well as the spiritual and moral regeneration which from himself, as the Redeemer, should flow to the whole human race, form the germ and central point of his doctrine. It bears not the character of a system composed of certain already established ideas, but it is a religious and moral fact, the joyful news (ευαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα) of which should proclaim salvation to all men on the condition of faith, and a willingness to repent and obey in newness of life. Jesus is not the author of dogmatic theology, but the author and finisher of our faith, (Heb. xii. 2,) not the founder of a
sect, but emphatically the founder of religion and of the church. On this account he did not propound dogmas dressed in a scientific garb, but he taught the word of God in a simply human and popular manner, for the most part in parables and sentences. We find these enumerated in the canonical gospels, though in a somewhat different form in the gospel of John from that in the synoptical gospels. It is the common object of evangelical interpretation, of the history of the life of Jesus, of apologetics and biblical theology, to ascertain their peculiar contents, and to reduce them to certain fundamental ideas, and one uniform principle.

(1) Our Saviour, indeed, adopted many notions already in existence, especially the Mosaic doctrine of one God, and perhaps to some extent the prevailing opinions and expectations of the age concerning the doctrine of angels, the kingdom of God, etc. But to consider him merely as the reformer of Judaism, would be to take a very narrow view of his work.

(2) That Christianity should become more perfect, is impossible, from the Christian point of view, if we look merely at the idea of religion as taught by the Son of God; for this is no less perfect in itself than it is realized by the incarnation of Christ. There is therefore no room within the history of doctrines for a new revelation, which could supersede that system of which Jesus is the founder. (Comp. the recent controversy in reference to the question whether, and in how far individuals may be said to attain unto perfection.)

(3) In the synoptical gospels we find more of *doctrina Christi*, in John more of *doctrina de Christo*.

The first disciples of the Lord were, like their Master, far from propounding dogmatic systems. But as they had made the doctrine primarily taught by Christ himself, the subject of theoretical consideration and contemplation, as their hearts and lives practically bore witness to the truths they had received, and his spiritual nature had been renewed, and as it were personified in them, we find in the writings of the more talented among them, traces of a system of Christian doctrines. While Peter and James (and in this respect they may be compared with the synoptical writers) simply relate what is delivered to them without any subjective reflection, we find that an internal and contemplative perception of Christianity prevails in the writings of John, but a practical dialectic tendency in those of Paul, who was afterwards called. They may be said to be types of later theological modes of thinking and teaching.

(1.) If we speak of the apostolic doctrine in general, we have to bear in mind that we do not refer to the twelve apostles, of whose doctrinal views we possess but very imperfect knowledge. For it is yet uncertain, whether the Epistle of James was written by the apostle of that name, (Jacobus minor), or by James, the brother of the Lord, (which is more probable): the
same may be said respecting the Epistle of Jude. (Comp. Her-der, Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon, and the commentarica.) [Lardner, vi. 162-202; Wright, W., in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literat.] Accordingly Peter and John alone remain; but the second epistle of the one, and the second and third epistles of the other, were very early reckoned amongst the Antilegomena. [Wright, W., in Kitto, l. c. sub voce]; the genuineness of the second epistle of Peter in particular has again been impugned in modern times. Comp. De Wette's Einleitung ins N. Test. § 172. 173. [Neander, hist. of the plant. a. train. of the ch. ii. p. 33. 34. Wright, W., in Kitto, l. c. sub voce.]

(2) If the first epistle of Peter is genuine, it is undoubtedly of greater importance in the dogmatic point of view, than that of James, who gives an undue prominence to practical Christianity, and scarcely once refers to the doctrine of Christ, though he occasionally evinces a profound acquaintance with the nature of faith, and the Divine economy, (ch. i. 13. seq. 25; ii. 10. etc.) But dogmatic ideas appear in the writings of Peter more as a vast mass of materials, which are, as yet, in their rough state; "in vain we look in his writings for that decided originality, the stamp of which is so manifestly impressed upon the works of John and Paul." De Wette l. c. Comp. however, Rauch, Rettung der Originalität des ersten Briefes Petri, in Winer's and Engelhardt's Kritischem Journal, viii. p. 396. a. Steiger l. c.

["It bears with it the impress of the apostolic spirit." Neander l. c. ii. p. 33.]

(3) John and Paul are then the prominent representatives of the dogmatic theology of primitive Christianity. Concerning the former, we have to consider besides his epistles the introduction to his gospel, and the peculiarities before alluded to in his relation of the discourses of Christ. (On the book of Revelation the opinions of critics have ever been, and still are different. [comp. Davidson, S., in Kitto l. c. sub voce.] It is of special importance for Eschatology.) The manifestation of God in the flesh—union with God through Christ—life from and in God—and victory over the world and sin through this life, which is a life of love—these are the fundamental doctrines propounded by John. (Comp. Lücke's Commentaries on his writings; Rickli's Predigten über den ersten Brief; Tholuck's and De Wette's Commentaries on the gospel; Paulus über die 3 Lehr-
briefe.) [Frommann  l. c.  Wright, W., in Kitto  l. c. sub v. Neander, l. c. p. 240, flwg.  "Hence every thing in his view turned on one simple contrast;—divine life in communion with the Redeemer—death in estrangement from him."] Paul differs from John materially and formally.  a. Materially: John sets forth the principles of theology and christology, Paul those of anthropology, and the doctrine of redemption; nevertheless the writings of John are also of importance for anthropology, those of Paul for theology and christology.  But the central point of John's theology is the incarnation of the Logos in Christ; the fundamental principle of the Pauline doctrine is, justification by faith.  b. Formally: Paul develops his ideas before the soul of the reader, reproduces them in him, and unfolds all the resources of dialectic art, in which traces of former rabbinical education may still be seen.  John proceeds thetically and apodictically, draws the reader into the depths of mystic vision. [Germ. Anschauung ; comp. Rose, preface to his translation of Neander's history of the church, etc. ii. p. xv. xvi.], announces divine things in a prophetictone, and addresses himself more to the believing mind than to reason.  John styles his readers children, Paul calls them his brethren. (Comp. on the difference between Paul and John, Staudenmeier über Joh. Scot. Erigena, p. 220 flwg.) A peculiar theological tendency is represented in the epistle to the Hebrews. It is related to the Pauline doctrine with a prevailing leaning towards the typical; formally it holds the medium between the form in which Paul represents Divine truth, and the style adopted by John. [Neander, hist. of plant. a. train. ii. p. 212—229.] (On the question respecting its author, comp. the Commentaries of Bleek, [Stuart,] Tholuck, [translat. into English by J. Hamilton and J. E. Ryland, Edinb. 1842. 2 vol.] and [Alexander, W. L., in Kitto l. c. sub voce.] )

(4) The farther developement of the history of doctrines will show, how the tendency represented by John prevailed during the first period in relation to the doctrine of the Logos, and to christology; it was not until the second period that Augustine put the Pauline doctrine in the foreground.
§ 19.

CIVILIZATION OF THE AGE AND PHILOSOPHY.

Though it cannot be proved that any philosophical system of the age, and least of all the oriental-platonic philosophy, which had its chief seat in Alexandria, and is represented in its bearing upon Judaism by Philo, exerted any direct influence upon the writers of the New Testament, yet it must be admitted, that there exists a speculative connection between the notions propounded in these systems, and those set forth in the New Testament. But the speculative tendency of the earliest Fathers of the church, (after the age of the apostolical Fathers), induced them to adopt more distinctly, than had been done before, already existing logical definitions of philosophical schools. Thus it happened that during this period Stoicism, Aristotelianism, etc. made their appearance along with prevailing Platonism.

THE AGE OF APologetics.

(1613), the Parisian (1640), *Mangey (1742), Pfeiffer (5 vol. Erl. 1520), comp. the programme of F. C. Müller, Basel 1839. 4.

(2) This manifests itself especially in the doctrine of the Logos; but the mere abstract and ideal notion of philosophers becomes a concrete fact in Christianity, an historical event in the sphere of real life; on this account "it is alike contrary to historical truth, to deny the influence of the age upon the external phenomena and the didactic development of the gospel, and to ascribe its internal origin and true nature to the age. Lücke l. c.

(3) While Platonism, (though under different modifications), prevails in the writings of Justin Martyr, and the Fathers of the Alexandrian school in particular, Aristotelianism shows itself e. g. in the doctrine of the Artemonites, comp. Neander Kirchengesch, i. 3. p. 1000, [translat. by Rose, ii. p. 263 flwg.], and Stoicism in the writings of Tertullian (corporeity of God); generally speaking, during this period "philosophy appears in connection with theology." Schleiermacher l. c. p. 154.

§ 20.

TRADITION.—APostles’ Creed.


Before scientific theology developed itself by the aid of philosophical speculation as γνώσις, the teaching of the apostles had been historically established as a simple rule of faith, (πίστις, Acts vi. 7.) This was accomplished by
putting together those elements (στοιχεῖα) of Christian doctrine, which were accounted essential. The *πίστις αὐτοτοκικὴ was first transmitted by oral tradition, and afterwards appeared in a written form.\(^{(1)}\)

What is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed (apostolic symbol), is most probably composed of various confessions of faith, used by the primitive church in baptismal services. Though it did not proceed from the apostles themselves, yet it substantially preserved the principles of apostolic tradition.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Comp. the rules of faith of Ἰρηναῖος, adv. ἡρετ. i. c. 10. (Grabe c. 2.) Tertull. de virgini, vel. c. 1. de præscript. Hær. c. 13. advers. Prax. c. 2. Orig. de præscript. prooem. § 4. b. Münshcer edit. by von Cölln, i. 16—19. On the use of tradition and its relation to Holy Scripture comp. below, § 33 and 37.

\(^{(2)}\) The tradition of its apostolic origin mentioned by Rufinus exposit. symb. apost. (in Baron, annal. a. 44. No. 14. [Witsius l.c. p. 3.]) was already doubted by Laur. Valla, and afterwards by Erasmus; some of the earlier Protestants however, e. g. the Magdeburg. Centur. still attached credit to it.—Comp. Basnage, Exercitationes histor. crit. ad a. 44. No. 17. Buddei, Isagoge, p. 441. where the literature. Neander, Kirch. Gesch. i. 2. p. 5/5. [transl. by Rose, i. p. 351.] Marheinecke, l. c. p. 160. [Heylyn, l. c. p. 8. flwg. Barrow, l. c. 218. 219.]

§ 21.

HERESIES.

\textit{Ittig, Th., de haeresiarchis ævi apostolici. Lips. 1690. 1703. 4. [Burton, Edw., Theolog. Works, iii. Bampton Lectures on the Heresies of the Apostolic Age. Oxf. 1837. Comp. the introduction where the literature is given.]}\

Every departure from the apostolic canon was considered (in opposition to the Catholic church) as \textit{αἵρεσις} (Germ. Irrlehre, Ketzeri; Engl. heresy).\(^{(1)}\) So early as the apostolic age we find false teachers, some of whom
are mentioned in the New Testament itself, (2) others in the works of earlier ecclesiastical writers. (3) Concerning their personal history and doctrine many points are still involved in obscurity, which, in the absence of trustworthy historical evidence, cannot easily and satisfactorily be cleared up.

(1) 

ai’éfios (from ai’éfionai) and σχίσμα were primarily synonymous terms, (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.), but in later times the one was used to denote a departure from the true faith, the other to designate a disruption which took place in consequence of differences of opinion concerning liturgy, discipline, or ecclesiastical polity. The word ai’éfios was not originally employed in a bad sense, it is vox media; comp. Acts v. 17; xv. 5; xxvi. 5. [Burton, 1. c. p. 8.] Ecclesiastical writers themselves call Christianity a sect, (Tertull. Apol. i. 1, and in many other places), and even Constantine gives the Catholic church the name ai’éfios, Euseb. x. c. 5. On the contrary, in Gal. v. 20. the same term is used in connection with ἵδια, διχοσαλία, etc. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 1. (ψυκδοδ-

dάσκαλοι.) Synonymous terms are: ἡτεροδασκαλία, 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3. ψυχόνουσα χίσμα, ch. vi. 20; μετακολογία, ch. i. 6; the ad-

ject. aifèntos, Tit. iii. 10. Comp. Wettst. N. T. ii. 147. Suicer, Thesaurus sub v. Various etymologies of the German word Ketzer (ital. Gazzari, whether from xaSazis, or from the Chazares —like bougre from the Bulgares?) Comp. Mosheim, unparteiische und gründliche Ketzergeschichte, Helmst. 1746. p. 357 flwg. Wackernagel, alt deutsches Lesebuch, p. 675. On the scientific use of heresies: Orig. Horn. 9. in Num. opp. T. ii. p. 296: Nam si doctrina ecclesiastica simplex esset et nullis intrinsecus hier-

ticorum dogmatum assertionibus cingeretur, non poterat tam clara et tam examinata videri fides nostra. Sed idcirco doctrinam catholicam contradicentium obsidet oppugnatio; ut fides nostras non otio torpescat, sed exercitiis elimetur. Comp. August, de civit. D. xviii. c. 51.

(2) On the different parties in the Church of Corinth, (which, however caused only schisms in, but not separations from the congregation,) comp. Schenkel, Dan. de Ecclesia Corinthia primaeva factionibus turbata, Bas. 1838. [Neander, history of the plant. a. train. i. p. 268—282. Billroth, Comment. on the Corinth. transl. by Alexander, i. p. 11. Alexander, W. L., in
HERESIES.


(3) The heresiarch Simon Magus who is described in the N. Test. (Acts viii.) as a man of an immoral character, but not as a heretic, is nevertheless represented by Clem. Al. (Strom. ii. 11. vii. 17.) and Orig. (contra Cels. i. p. 57.) as the founder of a sect; by Irenaeus (adv. Haer. i. 23. 24.) and Epiphanius, (Haer. 21.) even as the author of all heresies. Concerning his adventures and disputation with Peter, many fictitious stories were current among the earlier writers, (v. the Clementina and Justin M. Apol. l. c. 56.)—On Simon Magus and the two Samaritans Dositheus and Menander, (Euseb. iii. 26.) comp. Neander, Kirch. Gesch. i. 2. p. 779. [transl. by Rose, ii. p. 118. Hist. of the plant. a. train. i. 67—74.—Burton l. c. Lect. iv. p. 87—118, and note 40; by the same: Lectures on the ecclesiast. hist. of the first cent., p. 77 flwg. Gieseler, l. c. i. § 18. n. 8. where the lite-
rature is given. Alexander, W. L., in Kitto l. c.] Marheinecke (in Daub's Studien l. c. p. 116.) Regarding the assertion of Heges. ap. Euseb. iii. 32. that the church had not been stained with any heresy previous to the time of Trajan (παρεινος καθηκα και ανάφαρες ημινη η ιερασια) com. Marheinecke l. c.

§ 22.

JUDAISM AND ETHNICISM.

There were two errors against which the new religion had to guard, lest it should lose its peculiar religious features, and disappear in another religion already in existence: against a relapse into Judaism on the one side, and against a mixture with paganism, with speculation borrowed from it, and with a mythologizing tendency on the other. Accordingly the earliest heresies of which we have any trustworthy account, appear either as judaizing, or as ethnizing (hellenizing) tendencies. But as Jewish and Pagan elements were blended with each other about the rise of Christianity, manifold modifications and transitions from the one to the other might take place.

Concerning the different forms of heathenism (occidental and oriental), as well as the earlier and later periods of the Jewish dispensation, comp. Dorner Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, p. 4. flwg.

§ 23.

EBIONITES AND CERINTHUS.—DOCETAE AND GNOSTICS.
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The judaizing tendency is chiefly represented by the Ebionites,(1) of whom the Nazarenes(2) are a species more nearly approaching the orthodox faith, and with whom other judaizing sects of a more indefinite character are connected. (3) How far Cerinthus(4) participates in this tendency, or whether he does not rather blend Gnosticism with Judaism, like the (yet doubtful) later Ebionites in the Clementine Homilies,(5) is a question demanding more careful investigation. In the first place come the Docetae(6) forming a strict contrast with the Jewish–Ebionitic tendency, and secondly, comprising many ramifications, the Gnostics,(7) some of whom however are more strongly opposed to Judaism than others.(8)

(1) On the derivation of Ebionites from נביון and their history, comp. Orig. contra Celsum II. towards the commencement; Irenaeus adv. Haer. I. 26. Tert. praescr. Haer. 33. de carne Christi, c. 14. Euseb. iv. 27. Epiph. Haer. 29. 30. Hieron. in Matth. viii. 9; xix. 20. in Iesai. xiii. Cat. script. eccles. c. 3. and the works on ecclesiast. history. [Neander, transl. ii. 9. flwg. Burton, l. c. Lect. vi. p. 183 flwg.] Their narrow attachment to Jewish tradition, which sought to impose the yoke of the law upon Christians, prevented them from forming a higher idea of Christ, than that involved in the Jewish conception of the Messiah. Accordingly, when they regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, this opinion did not proceed (as in the
case of the Artemonites § 24.) from a rationalistic source, but had its root in their spiritual poverty and narrow-mindedness; "for orthodoxy which is surpassed by the civilization of the age, and deserted by public opinion, becomes heresy." (Hase, Kirchengeschichte, p. 50.) With their Jewish notions concerning the law and the Messiah would accord the sensual, millennial expectations of which Jerome (l. c. but no other writer) accuses them.

(2) Origen (contra Cels. v. Opp. i. p. 625.) mentions two different kinds of Ebionites, of whom the one class approached the orthodox doctrine of the church more nearly than the other. These more moderate Ebionites are perhaps the same, to whom Jerome and Epiph. give the name Nazarenes, which was formerly applied to all Christians. They taught that the law (circumcision in particular) was obligatory on Jewish Christians only, and believed Jesus to be the son of the Virgin Mary, but a mere man; of course they rejected his pre-existence. Comp. the treatise of Gieseler l. c. [Burton l. c. p. 184.]

(3) Elkesaites, Sampaiei, etc. Epiph. Haer. 19. 1—30. 3. 17. (Euseb. iv.) "It seems impossible, accurately to distinguish these different Jewish sects, which perhaps were only different grades of the order of the Essenes, assisted, as we are, merely by the confused reminiscences of the fourth century." (Hase l. c. p. 7. 90.)

(4) Iren. i. 26. Euseb. h. e. iii. 28. (according to Cajus of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria) Epiph. Haer. 28. comp. Olshausen, hist. eccles. veteris monumenta praecipua, vol. i. p. 223-25. [Burton, l. c. Lect. vi. p. 174 flwg.] It appears from Irenaeus, that the sentiments of Cerinthus are allied to Gnosticism, as he maintains that the world was not created by the supreme God, and that the Aeon Christ had descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism. He denies however, in common with the Ebionites, that Christ was born of the virgin, but on different, viz. rationalistic grounds (impossibile enim hoc ei visum est.) According to the accounts given by Eusebius his principal error consisted in gross millennialism. Comp. the treatises of Paulus and Schmid, and on the remarkable, but not inexplicable mixture of Judaism and Gnosticism: Baur, Gnosis p. 404. 405.

(5) As Cerinthus is said to have blended Gnostic elements with Jewish notions, so did one section of the Ebionites, who are
related to have had their foundation in the Clementine Homilies. Comp. Neander's Appendix to his work on the Gnostic systems, and Kirchengesch. i. 2. p. 619. 20. [transl. ii. p. 14. 15. Lardner, N., Works ii. 376. 377. Norton, l. c. ii. note B. p. xxiii.—xxvii.] Baur, Gnosis, p. 403. and app. p. 760., and his afore-said programme. Schenkel however has broached a different opinion in his Dissert. (mentioned § 21. n. 2.), according to which the Clementine tendency would belong not to the judaizing, but to the rationalizing, monarchian tendency which was spread in Rome (comp. Lücke's review in the Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen 1839. parts 50 and 51.)

The Docetae whom Ignatius ad Eph. 7. 18. ad Smyrn. c. 1—8. already opposed, and probably even the Apostle John (1 John i. 1—3; iv. 2 flwg. 2 John vii.) (on the question whether he also alludes to them in the prologue to his gospel, comp. Lücke l. c.) may be considered as the forerunners of the Gnostics. [Burton l. c. Lect. vi. p. 158 flwg.] They form the most decided contrast with the Ebionites, inasmuch as they not only maintain (in opposition to them) the divinity of Christ, but also merge his human nature, to which the Ebionites exclusively confined themselves, in a mere phantom (by denying that he possessed a real body.) Ebionitism (Nazareism) and Docetism form, according to Schleiermacher (Glaubenslehre, vol. i. p. 124.), natural heresies, and complete each other, as far as this can be the case with one-sided opinions; but they quite as easily pass over from the one to the other. Comp. Dorner, Geschichte der Christologie, p. 36.

Like Docetism in the doctrine concerning Christ alone, so the more completely developed system of Gnosticism proceeds in its entire tendency to that other extreme which is opposed to judaizing Ebionitism. It not only contains some of the elements of Docetism (comp. the christology in the special history of doctrines), but in its relation to the Old Test. it possesses a character more or less antinomian, and in its eschatology is adverse to millennarianism. It opposes the spirit to the letter, the ideal to the real. To change history into myths, to dissipate positive doctrines in speculation, and therefore to distinguish between those who only believe, and those who know, to over-rate knowledge (γνῶσις) in religion,—these are the principal features of Gnosticism. On the different usages of γνῶσις in a good,

(8.) The different classifications of the Gnostics according to the degree of their opposition to Judaism (Neander), according to countries, and the preponderance of dualism, or emanation, Syrian and Egyptian Gnostics (Gieseler), Gnostics of Asia Minor, Syrian, Roman and Egyptian Gnostics (Matter), or lastly, Hellenistic, Syrian and Christian (?) Gnostics (Hase), present, all of them, greater or less difficulties, and require additional classes (thus the Eclectic sect of Neander, and the Marcionites of Gieseler.) But Baur justly remarks that the mere classification according to countries is too external (Gnosis p. 106.), and directs attention to the position on which Neander's classification is based, as the only correct one, "because it has regard not only to one subordinate principle, but to a fundamental relation which pervades the whole." The particular objections to the divisions of Neander see ibidem. The three essential forms into which Gnosticism may be divided, according to Baur, are: 1. The Valentinian, which admits the claims of Paganism, together with Judaism and Christianity. 2. The Marcionite, which refers especially to Christianity; and 3. the Pseudo-Clementine, which espouses the cause of Judaism in particular; see p. 120. But respecting the latter, it is yet doubtful whether it should be reckoned among the Gnostic tendencies. All the Gnostics are opposed to Judaism, and when Neander speaks of judaizing Gnostics, he means nothing more than that they showed a stronger leaning towards Judaism than the other sects, without being Judaizers in the sense of the Ebionites. Concerning the history of doctrines, it is sufficient to glance at their principal tenets, and the relation in which they stand to the Catholic church; further particulars will be found in the special history of heresies (comp. § 6), and in the history of the particular systems of Basilides, (A. D. 125—140), Valentine (140—160), the Ophites, Carpocrates and Epiphanes, Saturninus, Cerdo, Marcion (150), Bardesanes (170), etc.
§ 24.

MONTANISM AND EARLIEST MONARCHIANISM.

Werasdorf, de Montanisti9, Gedani, 1751. 4. Kirchner, de Montanistis, Jen. 1832. *Heinichen, de Alogis, Theodotianis, Artemonitis, Lips. 1829. [Neander, Hist. of the Church, transl. by Rose, ii. 172-194.]

The relation in which Christianity stood to the world, gave rise to another contrast besides the one which existed between the judaizing and ethnizing tendencies. In the establishment of the peculiar doctrines and rites of the religion of Christ, different questions necessarily arose concerning the relation of Christianity both to former historical forms of religion, and to the nature of man and his capacities in general. Thus it might easily happen that speculative minds would fall into two opposite errors. On the one hand an eccentric supranaturalism would manifest itself, which passing the boundaries of revealed religion, conceived the true nature of inspiration to consist in still continued, extraordinary emotions, and endeavoured to keep up a permanent disagreement between the natural and the supernatural. This is seen in what is called Montanism,(1.) which took its rise in Phrygia. On the other hand, an attempt would be made to fill the gulf between the natural and the supernatural, which by explaining the wonders and mysteries of faith, and adapting them to the understanding, might lead to critico-sceptical rationalism.(2.) This is apparent in the case of the first Monarchians (Alogi?) (3.) whose representatives in the first period are Theodotus and Artemon.(4) The Monarchians, Praxeas, Noëtus, and Beryllus,(5) commonly styled Patripassians, differ from the preceding in more profound views on religion, and form the transition to Sabellianism, which will come before us in the following period.
Montanus of Phrygia (in which country the enthusiastic worship of Cybele had been prevalent from a very early period) made his first appearance as prophet (Paraclete) about the year 170, in Ardaban, on the frontiers of Phrygia and Mysia, and afterwards in Pepuza. He distinguished himself more by an enthusiastic and eccentric character, than by any particular dogmatic heresy, so that he became the forerunner of all the extravagances which pervade the history of the church.—"If any doctrine was dangerous to Christianity, it was that of Montanus. Though only distinguished for external morality, and agreeing with the Catholic church in all her doctrines, he nevertheless attacked the fundamental principle of orthodoxy. For he regarded Christianity, not as complete, but as affording room for further revelations which, in his view, were even demanded and announced in the promised Paraclete." Marheinecke (in Daub and Creuzer's Studien,) p. 150. There he also points out the contradiction in which the positive Tertullian involved himself by joining this sect. Millenarianism, which the Montanists professed, agreed well with their carnally-spiritual tendency. This sect (called also Cataphrygians, Pepuzians) existed down to the sixth century, though repeatedly condemned by ecclesiastical synods. Sources: Euseb. (following Apollonius), v. 18. Epiph. Haer. 48. and Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 871 flwg.

This contrast is not established a priori, but rests on a historical basis, as may be seen from the fact that Tertullian from the Montanistic point of view, combated the Monarchians, and that on the other hand the Alogi, etc. opposed the millenarianism of the Montanists.

This term occurs in Epiph. Haer. 51. as a somewhat ambiguous paranomasia on the word Logos, (men void of understanding notwithstanding all their understanding), because they rejected the doctrine of the Logos and the Gospel of John in which it is principally set forth, as well as the book of Revelation and the millennial notions which are chiefly founded on it. But as the true character of the sect of the Alogi is not fully known (comp. however Heinichen l. c. and Jenaische Literat. Zeitung 1830. N. 89. Lücke, zur Offenbarung Johannis, p. 302. Neander, Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1004 flwg. [transl. ii. 265 flwg. Gieseler l. c. i. § 45.],) the name itself may be generalized in the dogmatic usage, and given to all those who either from a misapprehension, or a denial of the doctrine of the
Logos, regarded Christ as mere man. They did this, however, on rationalistic grounds, and from conscientious opposition, as e.g. Theodotus and Artemon, not from Jewish narrow-mindedness, as the Ebionites. But we must not rank all the Monarchians among the Alogi, for another sect (the Patripassians) so far from denying the Divine nature of Christ, which John designates by the term λόγος, confounded it with God, (the Father,) and consequently did not admit his personality lest they might detract from the Divine nature of the Godhead. On this account Neander makes a well-founded distinction between those two classes; Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 990 flwg. and Antignosticus, p. 474.

(4) Theodotus, a worker in leather (ὁ σκυτεως) from Byzantium, who resided at Rome about the year 200, maintained the mere humanity of Christ, and was accordingly excommunicated by the Roman bishop Victor. Euseb. v. 28. Theodoret, Fab. Haer. ii. 5. Epiph. Haeret. 54. (ἀπόστασαν τῆς Ἀλόγου αἰσχρως). He must not be confounded with another Theodotus (τραστυρι) who was connected with a party of the Gnostics, the Melchisedekites. Artemon (Artemas) charged the successor of Victor, the Roman bishop Zephyrinus, with having corrupted the doctrine of the church, and secretly brought in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. Comp. Neander, 1.c. p. 998. [transl. ii. p. 262. 263.] Heinichen, l. c. p. 26. 27. [Burton, Lectures on the ecclesiast. hist. of the second and third cent., (Works, vol. v.) p. 211, flwg. 236, flwg. 265, flwg. 387, and Bampton Lect. notes 100 and 101.] The prevailing rationalistic tendency of this sect (Pseudo-rationalism) may be seen from Euseb. 1.c. (Heinichen, p. 139.) οὐ τί αἱ ἀνθρώπου γαραφα ἡποτούς άλλοις ὀστούς σχήμα συλλογισμόθεν εἰς τήν τῆς ἀνθροποσ εἰς ἦς οὕτως σύστασις, φιλοσόφους ἀσκούσις . . . καταλυόμενες δι τάς ἀγίας τοῦ ἱσθοῦ γαραφας, γεω μορφιῶν ἐπιτηδεύσιν, ὅτα ἰδότι σύνεθε αὐτό τῆς γῆς κατοίκους καὶ τοῦ άνθρωπος ἐπιχέμενον ἄγνωστος. The homage they rendered to Euclid, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Galenus, ἡς ἡσθήν ὑπό τινων καὶ ἁρξάσθηναι.

(5) Praxcas, from Asia Minor, had gained under Marcus Aurelius the reputation of a professing Christian, but being charged by Tertullian with Patripassianism, was combated by him. Tertull. advers. Praxcam, lib. II. Noëtus, at Smyrna about the year 230, was opposed by Hippolytus on account of similar errors. Hippol. contra Haeresin Noeti. Theodoret, Fab.

§ 25.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The catholic doctrine(1) developed itself in opposition to the aforesaid heresies. But though the orthodox theologians endeavoured to avoid heretical errors, and to preserve the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles by firmly adhering to the pure faith which had been delivered to them by the Fathers, yet they could not make themselves wholly free from the influence which the civilization of the age, the intellectual faculties of individuals, and the preponderating disposition of the public mind, have ever exerted upon the formation of religious ideas and notions. On this account we find in the Catholic church the same contrasts, or at least the same diversities and modifications as among the heretics, though they manifest themselves in a milder and less offensive form. Thus we perceive on the one hand a firm, sometimes narrow-minded adherence to external rites and historical tradition, which was akin to legal Judaism, (positive tendency), combined in some cases, as in that of Tertullian, with the Montanist tendency. On the other we see some theologians exhibiting a more free and comprehensive disposition of mind, who sometimes in a more idealistic speculative manner followed the Gnostic doctrine, (true gnosis contrasted with false gnosis), sometimes adopted critico-rationalistic elements which were
allied to the Monarchian principles, though not identical with them.2


2. This was the case, e. g. with Origen, who now and then shows sober reasoning along with Gnostic speculation. On the manner in which the philosophizing Fathers knew how to reconcile gnosis with paradosis (disciplina arcani), comp. Marheinecke l. c. p. 170.

§ 26.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE FATHERS.

Steiger, de la foi de l’église primitive d’après les écrits des premiers pères, in les Melanges de Théologie reformée, edited by himself and Havernick, Paris 1833. 1er cahier. [Bennett, J., the Theology of the Early Christian Church, exhibited in quotations from the writers of the first three centuries. Lond. 1842.]

While the so-called Apostolical Fathers (with few exceptions) were distinguished by a direct practico-asce
tical rather than a definite dogmatic activity,1 the philosophizing tendency allied to Hellenism was in some measure represented by the apologists Justin Martyr,2 Tatian,3 Athenagoras,4 Theophilus of Antioch,5 and Minucius Felix6 in the West. On the contrary Irenaeus,7 as well as Tertullian,8 and his disciple Cyprian,9 firmly adhered to the positive dogmatic theology and realistic notions of the church, the former in a milder and more considerate, the latter in a strict, sometimes gloomy manner. Clement10 and Origen11 both belonging to the Alexandrian school, chiefly developed
the speculative aspect of theology. But these contrasts are only relative, for we find, e. g. that Justin Martyr manifests both a leaning towards Hellenism, and a strong Judaizing tendency; that the idealism and criticism of Origen are now and then accompanied with a surprising adherence to the letter, and that Tertullian notwithstanding his antignostic tendency evidently strives after philosophical ideas.

(1) The name *Patres apostolici* is given to the Fathers of the first century, who according to tradition were disciples of the Apostles. Concerning their personal history and writings much room is left to conjecture. [On their writings in general, we subjoin the following remarks of Neander: The remarkable difference between the writings of the Apostles and those of the Apostolical Fathers, who are yet so close upon the former in point of time, is a remarkable phenomenon of its kind. While in other cases such a transition is usually quite gradual, in this case we find a sudden one. Here there is no gradual transition but a sudden spring, a remark which is calculated to lead us to a recognition of the peculiar activity of the Divine Spirit in the souls of the Apostles. The time of the first extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit was followed by the time of the free developement of human nature in Christianity; and here, as elsewhere, the operations of Christianity must necessarily be confined, before it could penetrate farther, and appropriate to itself the higher intellectual powers of man.—Hist. of the Ch. transl. ii. 329.] The following are called Apostolical Fathers:

The Theology of the Fathers.


2. Hermas, (Rom. xvi. 14.) whose πωμν (shepherd) in the form of visions enjoyed a high reputation in the second half of the second century, and was even quoted as a part of Scripture. Some critics ascribe the work in question to a later Hermas, (Hermes), brother of the Roman bishop, Pius I., who lived about the year 150. Comp. Gratz, Disqu. in Past. Herm. Part I. Bonn. 1820. 4. Jachmann, der Hirte des Hermas. Konigsb. 1835. [Neander, l. c. p. 333. Lardner, iv. 97. 98. etc. Ryland, J. E., in Kitto l. c.]

3. Clement of Rome (according to some the fellow-labourer of Paul, mentioned Phil. iv. 3.) one of the earliest bishops of Rome, (Iren. iii. 3. 3. Euseb. iii. 2. 13. a. 15.) His first epistle to the Corinthians is of dogmatic importance in relation to the doctrine of the resurrection. The so-called second epistle is a fragment which owes its origin probably to some unknown author, [Lardner, l. c. ii. 33—35.] In the dogmatic point of view those writings would be of great importance, which are now generally considered as supposititious, viz. the Clementine Homilies (οψιλίας Κλημέντος), the Recognitiones Clemensitis (ἀνεγραφίας), the Constitutiones apostolicae, and the Canones apostolici; on the latter comp. Krabbe, über den Ursprung und Inhalt der apostol. Constit. des Clem. Rom. Hamb. 1829; and +Drey, neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutiones und Canones der Apostel, Tüb. 1832. [Neander, l. c. p. 331—333.]

5. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, according to tradition a disciple of the Apostle John, suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius (168.) Comp. Euseb. iv. 15. One of his epistles to the Philippians is yet extant, but only a part of it in the original Greek. Comp. Wocher, die Briefe der apost. Väter Clemens und Polycarp, mit Einleitung und Commentarien, Tübingen. 1830. [Lardner, ii. p. 94—109. Ryland, J. E., in Kitto l. c.]

tolorum Opera, textum ex editt. præstanti. repetitum re- 
cognovit, brevi annotat. instruxit et in usum prælect. aca- 
demicar. edid. † C. J. Hefele, Tub. 839. Comp. Ittig, Bibl. 
Patr. apost. Lips. 690. S. [Wake, Archbishop, the genuine 
Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, transl. Lond. 1737.] 
As to the extent to which we can speak of a theology of the 
Apostolical Fathers s. Baumgarten-Crusius, i. p. 81. note. 
It is certain that some of them, e. g. Hermas, entertained 
notions which were afterwards rejected as heterodox. The 
earlier divines, and those of the Roman-Catholic church in 
particular, endeavoured to evade this difficulty by calling 
those doctrines *Archaeisms*, in distinction from *heresies*.

(2) Justin Martyr (born about the year 89. † 163.) of Sychem 
(Flavia Neapolis) in Samaria, a philosopher by vocation, who 
even after he had become a Christian, retained the τάβι- 
βών, made several missionary journeys, and suffered martyrdom, probably 
at the instigation of the philosopher Crescens. His *two apologies* 
are of special importance; the first designed for Antoninus Pius, 
the second probably for Marcus Aurelius. He is the first eccle-
siastical writer whose writings manifest an acquaintance with the 
Grecian philosophy (in which he had formerly sought in vain for 
the full development of truth, and for peace of mind.) Though 
he is anxious to prove the excellencies of the religion of Christ, 
and even of the Old Testament dispensation in preference to the 
systems of philosophers, (by shewing that the latter derive their 
origin from the Mosaic system,) yet he also perceives something 
of a Divine nature in the better portion of the Gentile world. 
It must however be admitted that the tone prevailing in the apo-
logies is much more liberal than that which is found in the Cohor-
tatio ad Graecos (παραμνησίας πρὸς Ἑλλήνας.) Neander (Kircheng. 
i. 3. p. 1120) is therefore inclined to consider the latter as 
spurious on account of the strong terms in which paganism is 
spoken of, and Möhler (Patrologie, p. 225) agrees with him. 
Yet there are various circumstances which may account for such 
a difference in style: the disposition of mind in which the author 
who wrote his apologies would naturally be very different from that

* It is certain that Pseudo-Dionysius, whom some writers number among 
the apostolical Fathers, belongs to a later period. On the other side Möhler 
and Hefele reckon the author of the *epistle to Diognetius* among the apo-
tolical Fathers, which was formerly ascribed to Justin. Hefele, PP. app. p. 
The Age of Apologetics.

in which he composed a controversial treatise, especially if Neander's opinion be correct, that the latter was written at a later period of his life. These writings, as well as the doubtful λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας (oratio ad Graecos) and the Επιστολὴ πρὸς Διάγνηστον falsely ascribed to Justin M., and also the treatise περὶ μοναχίας, consisting in great part of Grecian excerpts, set the relative position of Christianity and Paganism in a clear light. The dialogus cum Thryphone Judaeo has reference to Judaism, which it opposes on its own grounds; its genuineness was doubted by Wetstein and Semler, but without sufficient reason, comp. Neander Kircheng. i. 3. p. 1125 flwg. The principal edition is that published by the Benedictines under the care of •Prud. Maran. Paris 1742. which includes also the writings of the following three authors, along with the (insignificant) satire of Hermias. [Comp. Justin Martyr, his life, writings, and doctrines, by Charl. Semisch. Transl. by J. E. Ryland. Edin. 1844. Neander, hist. of the ch. transl. ii. p. 336—349. Lardner, ii. p. 126—128, 140, 141.]


(4) Little is known of the personal history of Athenagoras; comp. however Clarisse, de Athenagorae vita, scriptis, doctrina, Lugd. 1819. 4. and Mühler, l. c. p. 267. His works are: Legatio pro Christianis (περὶ Χριστιανῶν) and the treatise de resurrectione mortuorum. [Lardner, ii. p. 193—200. Neander, l. c. p. 350—351.]

(5) Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, (170—180.) The work which he wrote against Antolycus: περὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως, manifests a less liberal spirit, but also displays both genius and power as a controversialist. Rössler, Bibliothek der Kirchen-väter, i. p. 218. numbers it among the most worthless works of antiquity, and Hase calls it a narrow-minded controversial writing, while Mühler praises its excellencies. There is a German translation of it with notes by Thiemann. Leipz. 1834.

(6) Ecclesiastical writers vary in their opinions concerning the period in which Minucius Felix lived. Van Hoven, Rössler,
Russwurm and Heinrich Meier suppose him to have been contemporary with the Antonines. (Meier, Commentatio de Minucio Felice, Turici 1824.) Tzschirner, (Geschichte der Apologetik, i. p. 257—252.) thinks that he lived at a later time (about 224—230); this seems to be the more correct opinion. Comp. Hieron. Cat. Script. c. 53. 58. Lactant. Inst. v. 1. A comparison of the treatise of Minucius entitled Octavius with the apolo- logy of Tertullian, and with the work of Cyprian de idolorum vanitate, favours the view that he wrote after the former, but before the latter. The work of Cyprian appears in some parts as a copy of the writing of Minucius; that of Tertullian bears the marks of an original. The dialogue between Caecilius and Octavius is of importance in the history of Apologetics, as it touches upon all the objections which we find separately treated by the other apologists, and adds some new ones. With regard to the doctrinal opinions of Minucius, and the spirit which pervades his book, we may remark that he is distinguished by a more liberal, hellenistic manner of thinking; but it is to be regretted that his views are less positive, less decidedly Christian than is desirable. We seek almost in vain in his book for more direct references to the Messiah. Editions: Edit. princeps by Balduin, 1560. Since that time: editions by Elmenhorst (1612.) Cellarius (1699.) Davisius (1707.) Ernesti (1773.) Russwurm (with introduct. and notes 1824.) Lübkert (with translation and commentary Leipz. 1836.) [Lardner, ii. p. 386-389. Bennett, l. c. p. 39-42.]

Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, bishop of Lugdunum, about the year 177, died in the year 202, "a clear-headed, considerate, philosophical theologian." (Hase, Guerike.) Except a few letters, and fragments, his principal work alone is extant, viz. five books against the Gnostics: "Ελεγχος και ἀνατροπή τῆς Ἰσω- θανόμου γνώσεως; the first book only has come down in the original language, the greatest part of the remaining four books is now known only in an old Latin translation. The best editions are those of Grabe, Oxon. 1702. and Massuet, Paris 1710. Venet. 1734. 47. Comp. Euseb. v. 4. 20-26. Möhler, Patrologie, p. 330. [Neander, l. c. p. 356—359. Davidson, l. c. p. 83 flwg. Lardner, ii. p. 165—193. Burton, v. p. 185. and passim. Bennett, l. c. 28—33.]

Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florons) was born in Carthage about the year 160, and died 220; in his earlier life he
was a lawyer and rhetorician, and became afterwards the most conspicuous representative of the antispeculative, positive tendency. Comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullian und Einleitung in dessen Schriften, Berlin 1825., especially the striking characteristic which he there gives of Tert. Münter, Primordia ecclesiae africanae, Hav. 1829. 4. "A gloomy, ardent character, by whose exertions Christianity obtained from Punic Latin a literature in which ingenious rhetoric, a wild imagination, a gross, sensual perception of the ideal, profound sentiments, and a lawyer's reasoning struggle with each other."

(Hase.) That sentence of his: "ratio autem divina in medulla est, non in superficie" (de resurrect. c. 3.), may guide us in our endeavours to ascertain the right meaning of many strange assertions, and to account for his remarkably concise style (quot paene verba, tot sententiae, Vinc. Lir. in comm. 1.) Of his numerous writings the following are the most important for the history of doctrines: Apologeticus—ad nationes—advers. Judaeos—advers. Marcionem—advers. Hermogenem—advers. Praxeam—advers. Valentinianos—Scorpiaceadvers. Gnosticos—de praescriptionibus advers. Haereticos—de testimonio animae—de anima—de carne Christi—de resurrectione carnis—de poenitentia—de baptismo—de oratione etc.; his moral writings also contain many references to doctrinal points, e. g. the treatises do corona militia—de virginibus velandis—de cultu feminarum etc. An edition of his complete works was published by *Rigialtius*, Paris 1635, fol.; and by Semler and Schütz, Hall. 1770. 6 vols. (with a useful index latinitatis.) [Neander l. c. ii. p. 362—366; p. 293—296. Burton, l. c. v. p. 233. a. passim. Lardner, ii. p. 267—272. a. passim. Davidson, l. c. p. 90 flwg.]

(a) Cyprian (Thascius Caecilius) was for a time public teacher of rhetoric in Carthage; his conversion to Christianity took place in the year 245; he became bishop of Carthage in the year 248, and suffered martyrdom 258. He possessed more of a practical than doctrinal tendency, and is therefore of greater importance in the history of ecclesiastical polity than of doctrines, to which he has contributed but little. The great task of his life seems to have been not so much theoretically to develope the doctrine of the church and the sacraments, as practically to demonstrate it by his life, and to uphold it in the tempests of the times. In his doctrinal opinions he rested on the basis laid by Tertullian, but adhered also to Minucius Felix, as
in his work de idolorum vanitate. From the foregoing considerations it will appear, that along with his numerous letters the work entitled: de unitate ecclesiae is deserving of special attention. In addition to these we may mention: libri iii. testimoniorum—de bono patientiae—de oratione dominica etc, Comp. Rettberg, Cyprian nach seinem Leben und Wirken, Göttingen 1834. Huther (Ed.), Cyprians Lehre von der Kirche, Hamburg 1839. Editions: Rigaltius, Paris 1648. fol. *Fell, Oxon. 1682. and the Benedictine edition by Steph. Balus and Prud. Maran. Paris 1726. Novatian, the contemporary and opponent of Cyprian, (ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἑτερομοίῳ ὑπερετομῖ,) Euseb. vi. 43.) must also be considered as belonging to this period, if the treatise: de trinitate (de regula veritatis s. fidei) which goes under his name, proceeded from him. It is by no means correct, as Jerome would make us believe, that this treatise contains nothing but extracts from Tertullian. “This author was at all events more than a mere imitator of the peculiar tendency of another, on the contrary he shows originality; he does not possess the power and depth of Tertullian, but more spirituality.” Neander, i. 3, p. 1165. Editions: Whiston, in sermons and essays upon several subjects, Lond. 1709. p. 327. Welchmann, Oxon. 1724. 8. Jackson, Lond. 1728. [Neander, l. c. ii. p. 367. 368. Lardner, iii. p. 3—20. Bennett, l. c. 47—49.]

ORIGEN, surnamed ἄσκαμματος, χαλκίγραφος, was born at Alexandria, about the year 185, a disciple of Clement, and died at Tyrus in the year 254. He is undoubtedly the most eminent writer of the whole period, and the best representative of the spiritualizing tendency. He is however not wholly free from great faults into which he was led by his talents. "According to all appearance he would have avoided most of the faults which disfigure his writings, if his reason, humour, and imagination had been equally strong. His reason frequently overcomes his imagination,—but his imagination obtains more victories over his reason." Mosheim (Translat. of the treatise against Celsius, p. 90.) Accounts of his life are given in Euseb. vi. 1—6. 8. 14—21. 23—28. 30—33. 36—39. vii. 1. Hieron. de viris illustr. c. 54. Gregory Thaumaturg. in Panegyrico. Huetuis in the Origeniana. Tillemont, mémoires, art. Origine, p. 356—76. Schröckh, iv. p. 29. [Neander, l. c. ii. p. 376—91. Lardner, ii. p. 469—486 and passim. Vaughan, R. A., Origen, his life, writings and opinions. In the Britt. Quarterly Review, No. iv. 1845. p. 491—527.] On his doctrines, and writings, comp. Schnitzer, Origenes, über die Grundlehren der Glaubenswissenschaft, Stuttg. 1835. * Thomasius (Gottf.), Origenes, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts, Nürnberg, 1837. The labours of Origen embraced a wide sphere. We merely notice his exertions for biblical criticism (Hexapla), and exegesis (σημειώσεις, τύμοι, ὁμιλίαι), as well as for homiletics which appear in his writings in their simplest forms, and name only that which is of dogmatic importance, viz his two principal works: Σνί ἀγχαν (de principiis libri iv.) edit. by Redepenning, Lips. 1836, and Schnitzer's translation before mentioned; xατα Κιλσου (contra Celsum) lib. viii. (Translated, with notes by Mosheim, Hamb. 1745.), and the minor treatises: de oratione, de exhortatione Martyrii etc. Complete editions of his works were published by Car. de la Rue, Paris, 1733. 4 vols. fol., and by Lommatzsch, Berl. 1831. The doctrinal systems of Clement and Origen together form what is called the theology of the Alexandrian school. The distinguishing characteristics of this theology, in a formal point of view, are leaning to speculation and allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures; in a material aspect they consist of an attempt to spiritualize the ideas, and idealize the doctrines.

§ 27.

THE GENERAL DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.

It was the characteristic feature of the apologetical period, that the whole system of Christianity as a religious-moral fact was considered, and defended rather, than particular doctrines. Still certain doctrines become more prominent, while others receive less attention. Investigations of a theological and christological nature are certainly more numerous, than those of an anthropological character, and the Pauline doctrine is supplanted in some degree by that of John. On this account the doctrine of human liberty is made more conspicuous in this period, than later writers approved. Next to theology and christology eschatology engaged most the attention of Christians at that time, and was more fully developed in the struggle with millennarianism on the one, and the scepticism of Grecian philosophers on the other side.
B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIRST PERIOD.

FIRST SECTION.

Apologetico-Dogmatic Prolegomena.

Evidences of Christianity.—Revelation and Sources of Revelation.—Scripture and Tradition.

§ 28.

Veracity and Divinity of the Christian Religion in General.


The principal task of this period was to prove the divine origin of Christianity as the true religion made known by revelation, and to set forth the internal, as well as external relation which it bore both to Gentiles and to Jews. This was accomplished in different ways according to the different ideas which obtained regarding the nature of the new religion. The Ebionites considered the principal object of Christianity to be the realization of the Jewish notions concerning the Messiah, the Gnostics regarded it as consisting in the separation of Christianity from its former connection with the O. Test. Between these two extremes the Catholic church endeavoured on the one hand to pre-
VERACITY AND DIVINITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

serve this connection with the old dispensation, on the other to point men to the new dispensation, and to show the superiority of the latter to the former.

(1) Here we must guard against seeking for a distinction between natural and revealed religion, or even for a precise definition of the term "religion." Such definitions of the schoolmen did not make their appearance until later, when theory and practice, science and life being separated, learned men commenced to speculate on the objects of science, and to reduce experimental truths to general ideas. With the first Christians Christianity and religion were identical; and thus again in modern times, the principal object of apologetics has become to prove that Christianity is the religion, i.e. the only one which can satisfy man, (comp. Lechler, über den Begriff der Apologetik, in den Studien und Kritiken 1839. 3) This view corresponds to the saying of Minucius Felix, Oct. c. 38. tow. the end: gloriamur non consequutos, quod illi (Philosophi) summa intentione quasiverunt nec invenire potuerunt.—Nor do we find any definitions of the nature and idea of revelation (contrasted with the truths which come to us by nature and reason), of the abstract possibility and necessity of revelation, etc., because such contrasts did not then exist. Christianity (in connection with the Old Test.) was considered as the true revelation; even the best ideas of earlier philosophers compared with it were only like the twilight which precedes the brightness of the rising sun. Comp. Justin M. Dial. c. Tr. ab initio.—Tert. apolog. c. 18. (de testim. animae c. 2.) speaks very decidedly in favour of the positive character of the Christian religion (fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani), though he also calls the human soul naturaliter christiana (Apol. c. 17.), and ascribes to it the innate power of appropriating to itself, without any supernatural aid, all that may be known of the Divine Being by the works of nature, de testim. an. 5. Clement of Alexandria also compares the attempt of philosophers to comprehend the Divine without a higher revelation, to the attempt of a man to run without feet (Cohort. p. 64); and further remarks, that without the light of revelation we should resemble hens which are fattened in a dark cage in order to die (ibid. p. 87.) We become the children of God only by the religion of Christ (p. 88. 89.) comp. Paed. i. 2. p.
100. i. 12. p. 156. and in numerous other places. Clement indeed admits that wise men before Christ had approached the truth to a certain extent, but while they sought God by their own wisdom, others (the Christians) find him (better) through the medium of the Logos. Paed. iii. 8. p. 279. Strom. i. 1. p. 319. ibid. i. 6. p. 336. The Pseudo-Clementina however depart from this idea of a positive revelation (17. 8. a. 18. 6), and represent the internal revelation of the heart as the true revelation, the external as a manifestation of the Divine ἐγκαίνια. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, ii. p. 783.

(2.) According to the Clementine Homilies there is no essential difference between the doctrine of Jesus and the doctrine of Moses. Comp. Credner, l. c. part 2. p. 254.

(3.) As most of the Gnostics looked upon the demiurgus either as a being that stood in a hostile relation to God, or as a being of inferior rank, and limited powers; as they moreover considered the entire economy of the Old Test. as a defective, and even perverse institution, we can easily conceive that in their view the blessings which have come to us as the effects of the religion of Christ, consist only in our deliverance from the bonds of the demiurgus. (Comp. the §§ on God, the fall and redemption.)

§ 29.

MODE OF ARGUMENT.

From what has been said before, it appears that the Christian apologists did not confine themselves to the N. Test., but that they also (in opposition to the Gentiles) defended the history, laws, doctrines, and prophecies of the O. Test. against the attacks of all who were not Jews. (1.) After having thus laid a foundation, they proceeded to prove the superiority of Christianity to both the Jewish and Pagan systems, by showing how all the prophecies and types of the O. Test. had been fulfilled in Christ. (2.) It must however be admitted, that they not unfrequently indulged in arbitrary and unnatural interpretations, and that some of their exposi-
tions of the types and figures of the law, are in a high degree fanciful. (3) But as the apologists found in the O. Test. a point of connection with Judaism, so they found in the Grecian philosophy a point of connection with Paganism, with this difference only, that whatever is divine in the latter, is for the greatest part derived from the O. Test. (4) corrupted by the artifices of demons, (5) and appears at all events very imperfect in comparison with Christianity, however great the analogy may be. (6) Even those writers who, like Tertullian, discarded the philosophical development of the understanding, because they perceived in it nothing but an ungodly perversity, were compelled to admit a profound psychological connection between human nature and the Christian religion, (the testimony of the soul,) (7) and to derive with others a principal argument for the divine origin of Christianity from its moral effects. (8) Thus the external argument which is founded upon the miracles of the N. Test. (9) was adduced only as a kind of auxiliary proof, and its complete validity was no longer acknowledged. (10) As auxiliary proofs we may further consider the argument derived from the Sibylline oracles, (11) the miraculous spread of Christianity in the midst of persecutions, (12) and the accomplishment of the prophecy relative to the destruction of Jerusalem. (13)

(1) This argument was founded especially upon the high antiquity of the sacred books, and the miraculous care of God for their preservation; Josephus argued in a similar manner against Apion.


(3) Ep. Barn. c. 9. The circumcision of the 318 persons by Abraham (Gen. xvii.) is represented as a mystery which was made known to him. The number three hundred and eighteen is composed of three hundred, and eight, and ten. The numeral
letters of ten and eight are I and II (ν), which are the initials of the name Ιωάννης. The numeral letter of three hundred is Π, which is the symbol of the cross. And Clement of Rome in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which is generally sober enough, says that the scarlet rope which Rahab was admonished by the spies to hang out of her house, was a type of the blood of Christ, c. 12. Likewise Justin M., dialog. cum Tryph. § 111. According to him the two wives of Jacob, Lea and Rachel, are types of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, the two goats on the day of atonement types of the two advents of Christ, the twelve bells upon the robe of the high-priest types of the twelve apostles, etc. Justin carries this mode of interpretation to an extreme length, especially with regard to the cross, which he sees everywhere, not only in the O. T. (in the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the rod of Aaron, etc.) but also in nature, in the horn of the unicorn, in the human countenance, in the posture of a man engaged in prayer, in the vessel with its sails, in the plough, in the hammer. Comp. Apol. i. c. 55. dial. cum Tryph. § 97. and elsewhere. Comp. Minuc. Felix, c. 29.; but he does not deduce any further conclusions from such figurative language. Irenæus sees in the three spies of Jericho the three persons in the Godhead, advers. Hæret. iv. 20. It would be easy to multiply these examples ad infinitum, (comp. § 33. n. 3.)


Justin M. Apol. i. c. 54. Thus the demons are said to have been present when Jacob blessed his sons. But as the heathen philosophers could not interpret the passage Gen. xlix.
11: Binding his foal unto the vine, in its true Messianic sense, they referred it to Bacchus, the inventor of the vine, and changed the foal into Pegasus (because they did not know whether the animal in question was a horse, or an ass) In a similar manner a misinterpretation of the prophecy relative to the conception of the virgin (Is. vii. 14.) gave rise to the fable of Perseus, etc., (comp. § 49.)

Justin M. calls in a certain sense Christians all those who live according to the laws of the Logos (reason) Apology, i. c. 46. The Platonic Philosophy is in his opinion not absolutely different (ἄλλοτρια) from Christianity. But before the coming of Christ there existed nothing in the world but the seeds (λόγος σπείρας) of what was manifested afterwards in Christ as absolute truth. Apol. ii. c. 13. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. c. 20. p. 376. Χριστός ο θεός ο ουρανοθεός ιησούς ηγήσθη εις τούτον αυτού τον καθημερινού ευκολατης και μεγάλος γνώσις και ἀποδίδει κυριαρχεῖ, καὶ ηδίως δυνάμει καὶ τοις ὁμοίοις. (He speaks however of philosophy as such, and not of the Stoic, Platonic, Epicurean, Aristotelian, or any other philosophy, Strom. i. 7. p. 338.) comp. Baur, p. 520 ffw. Clement involves himself in contradictions in judging of paganism more favourably at one time and less so at another; comp. Baur, p. 532. Minucius Felix, c. 16, in opposition to the scholastic wisdom of the ancient philosophers, recommends the philosophy of good sense which is accessible to all (ingenium, quod non studio paratur, sed cum ipsa mentis formatione generatur,) and despises mere reliance on authorities; nevertheless he himself appeals to the doctrines of philosophers, and their partial agreement with Christianity; c. 19. c. 21. c. 34. Such language forms a remarkable contrast with the attack he makes upon Socrates (scurrus Atticus) c. 38. to whom others would assign the highest rank among the ancient philosophers.

See the treatise: de testimonio animae and Apology c. 17. de virgin. vel. c. 5. (tacita conscientia naturae.) Neander Antignostic. p. 86—89.

Justin M. Apology, i. c. 14. οι σάλας μιαν τοσιάς χαίροντες, ἦν δὲ αὐστρούμην μόνην ἄσταζομοιον ἦν καὶ καμικαὶ τίχνης χείμαροι, ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἀγαθὴν Ἰησοῦ ιουνοῦ ἀναγιεῖταις χειματών δὲ καὶ κειματῶν οἱ σοφίας παντίς μᾶλλον στέργοντες, ἦν καὶ ἰχθυὶς κοινοὶ χαίροντες, καὶ παντὶ δεομένῳ κοιμοῦντες οἱ μιωσόληθοι δὲ καὶ ἀλληλοφήνοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς οὐχ ὁμοφύλους διὰ τὰ Θε ιστιας ιοναις μη ποιώμενοι, μιν μενα τὴν ἐφίππαιναν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμοδιάποντα γνώμαινοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰχθυῶν τοχαμοίοι καὶ τοὺς ἄδικως μνεύω.
They were in practice compelled to have recourse to this argument through the charges brought forward by the Gentiles, which they endeavoured to refute.

(9) Not only were those miracles adduced which are mentioned in Scripture, but also those which still took place. (Just. M. Dialog. c. Tryph. c. 39. 82. 88. Iren. ii. 31. 32. Orig. contra Cels. iii. 24. Opp. i. p. 461.) At the same time the Christians did not directly deny the existence of miracles in the heathen world, but ascribed them to the influence of demons (ibid. and Minucius Felix. Oct. c. 26.); the Gentiles on the other hand attributed the Christian miracles to magic. Comp. Tatian contra Graecos. c. 18. Orig. contra Cels. i. 38. 67. 68. iii. 24-33. We find however that Minucius Felix denies the reality of miracles, and myths in the pagan world, on the ground of the physical impossibility of such supernatural events; but it may be observed that that ground might have been taken with equal propriety by the opponents of Christianity. Octav. c. 20: quae si essent facta, fierent; quia fieri non possunt, ideo nec facta sunt; and c. 23: cur enim si nati sunt, non hodieque nascentur?

(10) Though Origen in speaking of the evidence derived from miracles, as compared with the evidence derived from prophecy, calls the former the evidence of power, and the latter the evidence of the spirit (contra Cels. i. 2.), yet he gives the preference to the evidence of the spirit. He was well aware that a miracle produces a strong impression upon the person we wish to convince, only when it is performed in his presence, but that it loses all its force as evidence with those whose mind is prejudiced against the veracity of the narrative, and who reject miracles as myths, comp. Comment. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 87. The Clementina also do not admit miracles as evidences, while they lay greater stress upon prophecies. (Credner, l. c. part 3. p. 278. comp. with p. 245.) Origen spoke also of spiritual and moral miracles, of which the visible miracles were the symbols; (he admitted however their importance only inasmuch as they are real facts): contra Cels. ii. p. 423. "I shall say that according to the promise of Jesus his disciples have performed
greater miracles than himself; for to the present moment they who were blind in spirit have their eyes opened, and they who were deaf to the voice of virtue, listen eagerly to the doctrine concerning God, and eternal life; many who were lame in the inner man, skip like the hart, etc. Comp. contra Cels. iii. 24, where he speaks of the healing of the sick, and of prophesying as an indifferent thing (μίσθω), which considered in itself does not possess any moral value.

(11) Theophilus ad Autolycum, ii. 31. 36. 38. Clem. Cohort. p. 86. Stromata, vi. 5. 762. (Celsius charged the Christians with having corrupted the Sibylline books. Orat. contra Cels. vii. 32. 34.) Editions of the Sibyll. oracles were published by Servatius Gallaeus, Amstel. 1689. 4. and by Angelo Majo, Mediolani, 1817. 8. On their origin and tendency, comp. Thorlacius, Libri Sibyllistarum veteris ecclesiae etc. Havniae, 1815. 8. and Bleek in the Berliner theolog. Zeitschrift, i. 120 flwg. 172 flwg. The case of the ἀνάγκη, to which Justin M. Apol. i. 20. and Clem. i. c. appeal, is similar to that of the Sibylline books. Comp. Walch, Ch. F. W., de Hystaspide in vol. i. of the Commentat. Societ. Reg. Götting.

(12) Origen contra Cels. i. p. 321. ii. 361. de princip. iv. Justin M. himself (and many others) had been converted by witnessing the firmness which many of the martyrs exhibited. Comp. his Apology, ii. p. 96. and Dialog. cum Tryph. § 121. καὶ ὁ ὅλος ὁ ἡδύτατος ἵνα ἵστω ὑπομονήν ἄνθρωπι, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τῷ ἐλεόν πίστιν ἀποταμίευται, διὰ δὲ τὸ ὕπομονα τῇ Ἑραδῷ ἐκ παντὸς γίνοντα ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑπομονήν καὶ ὑπομονήν πάντας σώζει ὕπο τὸ μὴ ἀπειλέμαχαι αὐτῷ ἵνα ἵστω κ.τ.λ.

(13) Origen contra Celsum, ii. 13. Opp. i. p. 400.

§ 30.

SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.


The original living source from whence the knowledge
of all truth was derived, was the Spirit of Christ himself who according to his promise guided the apostles, and the first teachers of Christianity, into all truth. The Catholic church therefore considered herself from the first as the bearer of this spirit, and consequently maintained that the charge of the true tradition, and the development of the doctrines which it teaches, were committed to her.\(^1\) The task of the first church was to preserve oral traditions, to collect the written apostolical documents, and to determine the Canon. It was not until this Canon was nearly completed, and about to assume its present form, that the tradition of the church, as it existed both in its oral and its written forms, was distinctly separated from, and held along with the sacred Canon, like a distinct branch of the same original source.\(^2\)

\(^1\) The doctrine concerning the Scriptures and tradition can be fully understood only, when taken in connection with the dogma concerning the church (§ 71.)

\(^2\) On this account it is quite correct, to represent Scripture and tradition as two streams which run parallel to each other. Both flow from one common source, and run in different directions only after some time.—The same term ἔκτροπος (regula scil. fidei) was first applied to either of them.—For its usage comp. Suicer (Thesaurus Ecclesiast. sub voce) and Planck, H., nonnulla de significatu canonis in ecclesia antiqua ejusque serie recte constituenda, Gött. 1820. Nitzsch, System der christlichen Lehre, § 40. 41. [Lardner, Works, v. p. 257.]

§ 31.

CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

Before the formation of the Canon of the N. Test. that of the O. Test.\(^{(1)}\) which had been previously estab-
lished, was held in high esteem in the Catholic church. The Gnostics however, and the Marcionites in particular, 
rejected the O. Test.\(^{(2)}\) A desire gradually arose in the 
Christian church to possess the writings of the apostles 
and evangelists in a collective form. These writings 
owed their origin to different causes. The apostolical 
epistles had been written as circumstances required, and 
were primarily intended to meet the exigencies of the 
times; the narratives of the so-called evangelists\(^{(3)}\) had 
likewise been composed with a view to supply present 
wants, but also with some regard to posterity. These 
testimonies of primitive Christianity would serve as an 
authoritative standard of religion and morals, and form 
an effective barrier against the introduction of all that 
was either of a heterogeneous nature, or more recent 
date (apocryphal.) *The Canon of the New Testament* 
however was only gradually formed, and some time 
elapsed before it was completed. In the course of the 
second century the four gospels were received by the 
church in the form in which we now have them.\(^{(4)}\) On 
the contrary the gospels of the heretics\(^{(5)}\) as they were 
called, were rejected. At the close of the present pe-
riod the Acts of the Apostles, the 13 Epistles of Paul, the 
Epistle to the Hebrews, which however only one part of 
the church considered as a work of Paul,\(^{(6)}\) and lastly, the 
first Epistle of John had been admitted into the Canon. 
With regard to the canonical authority of the second and 
third Epistles of John, the Epistles of James, Jude, and 
2 Peter, and lastly of the Book of Revelation, the opin-
ions were yet for some time divided.\(^{(7)}\) On the other 
hand, some other writings which are not now considered
as forming a part of the Canon, viz. the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas, were held by some (especially Clement and Origen) in equal esteem with the Scriptures, and quoted as such.(8)

(1) A difference of opinion obtained only in reference to the use of certain Greek writings of later origin (libri ecclesiastici, Apocrypha.) The Jews themselves had already made a distinction between the Canon of the Egyptian Jews, and the Canon of the Jews of Palestine, comp. Münchscher Handb. vol. i. p. 240 flwg., and the introductions to the O. Test. Melito of Sardes (in Euseb. iv. 26.) and Origen (ibid. vi. 25.) give summaries of the books of the O. Test. which do not exactly coincide. [Lardner, ii. p. 158, 159; 493—513.] The difference between what was original, and what had been added in later times, was less striking to those who being unacquainted with the Hebrew, used only the Greek version.


(3) It is well known that the words εἰςγγίλιον, εἰςγγίλιστης, had a very different meaning in primitive Christianity; comp. the lexicons to the N. Test. and Suicer Thes. pp. 1220 a. 1234. — Justus M. remarks (Apoll. i. c. 66.) that the writings which he called the ἀπομημονύματα of the apostles, were also called εἰςγγίλιμα. Concerning these ἀπομημ. and the earliest collections of the Gospel-narratives, the Diatesseron of Tatian etc. comp. the introductions to the N. Test. [Gieseler, Ueber die Entstehung und frühesten Schicksale der Evangel. 1818. Lardner, N., On the Credibility of the Gospel history. (Works, i. iv. v. to p. 251.) Norton, A., On the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. Tholuck, A., in Kitto, l. c. art. Gospel.]

(4) Irenæus adv. Haer. iii. 11. 7. attempts to explain the number four from cosmico-metaphysical reasons: ἵππος τίσαρα κλήματα τιν χορμοῦ, ἵν τις ἵππος, ἵν τίσαρα καθολικά πτύματα, κατισ-παρτι ὡς ἡ ἱερατεία ἵν τάσης τῆς γῆς. σύνολος δὲ καὶ σύνεργα ἱερατείας
CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.


The controversy on the Book of Revelation was connected with the controversy on millennarianism. Comp. Lücke, Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, und die gesammte apokryphische Litteratur. Bonn. 1832. p. 261 flwg. *Davidson, S., in Kitto, l. c. sub voce Revelation.


The principal spurious gospels are the following: The Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus; the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite; the Protoevangelion of James; the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary; the Gospel of Nicodemus, or the Acts of Pilate; the Gospel of Marcion; the Gospel of the Hebrews (most probably the same with that of the Nazarenes), and the Gospel of the Egyptians.] Comp. the introductions to the N. Test., and the treatises of Schneckenburger, Hahn, etc. Fabricius, Codex apocryph. N. Test. iii. Hamb. 1719. and Thilo, D. I. C., Cod. apocr. N. Test. Lipsiae 1832. Ullmann, historisch oder mythisch. [Lardner, Works, ii. 91—93, 256, 250, 251; iv. 97, 106, 131, 463; viii. 524—535. Norton, l. c. iii. p. 214—286. Wright, W., in Kitto, l. c. art. Gospels, spurious, where the literature is given.]

Orig. Hom. i. in Luc. Opp. T. iii. p. 933. multi conati sunt scribere evangelia, sed non omnes recepti etc. [The principal spurious gospels are the following: The Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus; the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite; the Protoevangelion of James; the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary; the Gospel of Nicodemus, or the Acts of Pilate; the Gospel of Marcion; the Gospel of the Hebrews (most probably the same with that of the Nazarenes), and the Gospel of the Egyptians.] Comp. the introductions to the N. Test., and the treatises of Schneckenburger, Hahn, etc. Fabricius, Codex apocryph. N. Test. iii. Hamb. 1719. and Thilo, D. I. C., Cod. apocr. N. Test. Lipsiae 1832. Ullmann, historisch oder mythisch. [Lardner, Works, ii. 91—93, 256, 250, 251; iv. 97, 106, 131, 463; viii. 524—535. Norton, l. c. iii. p. 214—286. Wright, W., in Kitto, l. c. art. Gospels, spurious, where the literature is given.]

§ 32.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

That the prophets and apostles taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was the general belief of the ancient church, and had its foundation in the testimony of Scripture itself. But according to this view inspiration was by no means confined to the dead letter. We find that the Jews generally believed in the verbal inspiration of their sacred writings, before the Canon of the N. Test. was completed, at a time when the living source of prophecy had ceased to operate. It is very probable that the theory of verbal inspiration was in some degree mixed up with the heathen notions concerning the μαντεία (art of soothsaying) but it did not spring from them. It developed itself in a singular form in the story of the origin of the Septuagint version, which was current even among many Christian writers. The Fathers however differed in their opinions respecting inspiration; some took it in a more restricted, others in a more comprehensive sense. But they were generally more inclined to admit verbal inspiration in the case of the Old, than of the N. Test. We find however some whose views on the inspiration of the N. Test. writings were very positive, and who in their support frequently appealed to the connection existing between the Old and the New Testaments and consequently between the writings of which they are respect-
Origen goes to the opposite extreme, and maintains that there had been no sure criterion of the inspiration of the O. Test. before the manifestation of Christ, but that this theory took its rise from the mode in which Christian writers regarded the subject in question. But all parties insisted more particularly on the practical importance of the Scriptures, the richness of Divine wisdom clothed in unadorned, beautiful simplicity, as tending to promote the edification of believers.

({1}) 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 19—21.  
({2}) Philo was the first writer who transferred the ideas of the ancients concerning the μαρτυρία to the prophets of the O. Test., de spec. legg. iii. ed. Mangey, ii. 343. quis div. rerum haer. Mangey, i. 510. 511. de praem. et poen. ii. 417. comp. Gfrörer, l. c. p. 54 flwg. Dähne, l. c. p. 58. Josephus on the other hand adopts the more limited view, or verbal inspiration, contra Apion, i. 7. 8. The idea of the μαρτυρία was carried out in all its consequences by one section of the Christian church alone, viz. the Montanists, and only some distant allusions to it, if any at all, are found in the writings of Athenagoras, Leg. c. 9: καρ' ἑνσαὺς τῶν ἐν αὐτῶς λογισμῶν κυνήσαντος αὐτῶς τοῦ βιοῦ πνεύματος.—Comp. Tert. advers. Marc. iv. c. 22.—Origen speaks very decidedly against it; contra Cels. vii. 4. Opp. i. p. 596.  
Clem. of Alex. Strom. 1.21, p. 410. Clement perceives in the Greek version of the original the hand of providence, because it prevented the Gentiles from pleading ignorance in excuse of their sins. Strom. i. 7, p. 338.

(4) The apostolical Fathers speak of inspiration in very general terms; in quoting passages from the O. Test., they use indeed the phrase: λέγει το Τειμία το άγιον, or similar expressions, but they do not give any more definite explanation regarding the manner of this inspiration. Comp. Clement of R. in several places; Ignat. ad Magn. c. 8. ad Philadelph. c. 5. etc. Sonntag, doctrina inspirationis § 16. Justin M. is the first author in whose writings we meet with a more definite, doctrinal explanation of the transaction which is thought to take place; Cohort. ad Graec. § 8.

Justin γάρ φύσιν οτι άπερωτική άνοίξεν ὁ των μυγάλα καὶ Θεία γνώσεις άπερωτικος δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ άνοιξίν ἵνα τοὺς άγίους άπερωτικος άνοιξίν την αυτήν ωφελεί, διὸ ὡς άγίους ἐσοφείς τίχης, οὐδὲ τοῦ ιεροσκυίου τι καὶ φιλοσκυίου εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ καθαροὶ ιαστοὺς τῇ τοῦ Θείου πνεύματος παρασκευήν ιερεύῃ. Υπ’ αὐτὸ τῷ Θείῳ έξ οὐρανοῦ κατόρθωτον, ἀπερείριξάν καίδαις τινές ἡ λίμναις, τοὺς δικαιοὺς άπερωτικος χρώμανεν, τῆν τῶν Θείων ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύφθη γνώσις. ἀνά τοῦτο τοῖσιν ἄπερεῖς ἐξ ιερῆς στάματος καὶ μιᾶς γλώττης καὶ περὶ Θείῳ, καὶ περὶ κόσμου κτίσισιν, καὶ περὶ πλάσμας άπερωτικος, καὶ περὶ άπερωτικης ψυχῆς; ανακαθάσιας καὶ τῆς μετὰ τῶν Θείου τοῖσι μελετήσας ἑισεδαχὴ μερίσσως καὶ περὶ πάνων δύσηγκαλομερῶν ἡμῶν ἑστησθέναι, ἀποκλίδως καὶ συμφράσιος ἀλλήλοις ιδιαίτεραι ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῦτο ἵνα διαφόρις τίποτος τι καὶ χείρως τῆν Θείαν ἡμῶν δίδασκαλίαν παρεσχετήσῃ. Does Justin maintain in this passage that the writers were altogether passive when under the influence of the Holy Spirit? We presuppose that a lyre is constructed according to the principles of acoustics, and properly tuned; for it is not likely that the plectron should produce sounds out of a mere piece of wood! From the conclusion at which he arrives, it is also apparent that he limits inspiration to what is doctrinal, to what is necessary to be known in order to be saved.—The theory proposed in the third book of Theliphilus ad Autolycum, c. 23. has more regard to external things; he ascribes the correctness of the Mosaic chronology, and subjects of a similar nature, to Divine inspiration.—Comp. also Athenag. leg. c. 7. and c. 9. (where the same figure occurs: οὐσὶ αὐληνής αὐλὰς ἐμπνεύσα.)—The views of Irenæus on inspiration were equally strict, and positive; advers. Hæret. ii. 28. Scripturae quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ, and other passages contained in the third book. Tert. de præscript. hæret. 8. 9.
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advers. Marc. iii. 6. Apol. c. 18, (comp. however, § 34.) Clement of Alexandr. calls the sacred Scriptures in different places γραφής διονυσίας, or quotes τὸ γὰς σῶμα κυζέω, τὸ ἄγιον στίγμα ἀλήτριαμα, etc. Coh. ad Gr. p. 66. 86; ibidem p. 67 he quotes Jeremias, and then corrects himself in these words: μᾶλλον δέ ἐστι τὸ ἁγιόν στίγμα, etc. and likewise Ped. i. 7. p. 134. ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωσῆς ἤδη, οὐκ ἦν τὸ Μωσείας, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ μὴν τοῦ λόγου, διὰ Μωσείας δὲ τοῦ θεραπεύτους αὐτοῦ. On the infallibility of the inspired writings: see Strom. ii. p. 432. vii. 16. p. 897. Cyprian calls all the books of the Bible divina? plenitudinis fontes, advers. Jud. præf. p. 18. and uses in his quotations the same phraseology which Clement employs, de unit. eccles. p. 111. de opere et cleem. p. 201.

The doctrine of the inspiration as set forth in the N. Test. writings, stood in close connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and his work. But the Fathers did not think so much of the exertions of the apostles as writers, as of the power which was communicated to them, to teach, and to perform miracles, and looked upon the latter as peculiarly the work of the Spirit. It was not till the writings of the N. Test. had been collected into one Codex, that they adopted concerning the N. Test. those views which had long been entertained concerning the verbal inspiration of the O. Test. Tertullian first makes mention of this Codex as Novum Instrumentum, or (quod magis usui est dicere) Novum Testamentum, adv. Marc. iv. 1., and he lays so much stress upon the reception of the entire Codex as a criterion of orthodoxy, that he denies the Holy Spirit to all who do not receive the Acts of the Apostles as canonical (de præscr. Hær. 22.) Justin M. speaks in more general terms of the Divine inspiration, and miraculous power of the apostles, Apol. i. c. 39, and the spiritual gifts of Christians, dialog. cum Tryph. § 88. Tertullian however draws a distinction between these two kinds of inspiration, viz. the apostolical, and that which is common to all believers, (de exhort. castit. c. 4.), and represents the latter as only partial; but he does not refer the former kind of inspiration to the mere art of writing.—But in the writings of Irenæus we find a more definite allusion to the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit which was granted to the Sacred penmen, with a special reference to the N. Test. writers, adv. Hær. iii. 16. § 2: Potuerat dicere Mattheus: Jesus vero generatio sic crat; sed prævidens spiritus sanctus depravatores et
præmuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthæum ait: Christi autem generatio sic erat.

(8) Iren. adv. Iær. iv. 9. p. 237. Non alterum quidem vetera, alterum vero proferentem nova docuit, sed unum et eundem. Pater familias enim Dominus est, qui universæ domi paternæ dominatur, et servis quidem et adhibe indisciplinatis condignam tradens legem; libera autem et fide justificatis congruentia dans praecpta, et filiis adaperiens suam hereditatem. . . . Ea autem, que de thesauro proferuntur nova et vetera, sine contradistione duo Testamenta dicit: vetus quidem, quod ante fuerat, legislatio; novum autem, quæ secundum Evangelium est conversatio, ostendit, de qua David ait: Cunctate Domino canticum novum etc. Comp. iii. 11. In his fragmentis he compares the two pillars of the house under the ruins of which Samson killed himself and the Philistines, to the two Testaments which overthrew paganism. Clem Al. Pæd. p. 307: ἀκμαὶ δὲ τὸ νῦν δηκόνων τῷ λόγῳ εἰς παιδαγωγίαν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ μὲν διὰ Μωσέως, ὁ δὲ ἔλευσι. Comp. Strom. i. 5. p. 331. ii. 10. p. 543.

(7) Orig. de princip. iv. c. 6. Opp. i. p. 161.; λακτίον δὲ στὶ τὸ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἐνίοτον καὶ τὸ πνευματικὸν τῶν Μωσέως νῦμον ἰλαμμένον ἐπιθημασίας Ἰησοῦ. ἡμερη δὲ τὸ παραδίγματα περί τοῦ θεοπνεύσου εἶναι τὰς παλαιὰς γραφὰς πρὸ τῆς ἐπιθημάς τῶν Χριστοῦ παραστάσεως οὐ παίνιν δυνατῶ Ἰησοῦ, ἀλλὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιθημία δυναμεῖον ὑποτεύονθαι τῶν νῦμον καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ὡς οὐ θεία, εἰς τοὺς μαθαίνει ἡγαγιν, ὡς ὑμαίαν ἠκρίβει ἅγιας ἐγκαινία. From this point of view Origen acknowledges the inspiration of both the Old and the New Testaments, de princ. proœm. c. 8. Opp. i. p. 18. lib. iv. ab init. contra Cels. v. 60. Opp. i. p. 623. Hom. in Jerem. Opp. T. iii. p. 282: Sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant, nihilque est sive in lege, sive in evangelio, sive in apostolo, quod non a plenitudine divinae majestatis descendat. Comp. Comm. in Matth. T. iii. p. 732; in reference to the different relations of the miraculous cure of the blind men, (Matth. xx. 30—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43.) he assumes that the evangelists had been preserved from any fault of memory; but in order to account for the apparent discrepancies, he is obliged to have recourse to allegorical interpretation. In the 27th Hom. in Num. Opp. T. ii.p. 365. he further maintains that (because of this inspiration) nothing superfluous could have found its way into the sacred Scriptures, and that we must seek for Divine illumination and direction, when we
meet with difficulties. Comp. Hom. in Exod. i. 4. Opp. T. ii. p 131.: Ego credens verbis Domini mei Jesu Christi, in lege et Prophetis iota quidem unum aut apicem non puto esse mysterius vacuum, nec puto aliquod horum transire posse, donec omnia fiant.—Philocalia (Cantabrig. 1658.) p. 19.: Πρύτει δι τά ἄγαν γράμματα πιστεύεις μηδεμίῳ κραίαν ἐγείνειν σοφιάς θεοῦ; ὁ γάρ ἐντελέμενος ἤμοι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ λέγων, οὐκ ὃθεν ἐνώπιον μου χιτός (Exod. xxxiv. 20.) τολῆρ πλεῖον αὐτῶς ὑδίν φεύγω ἐξα. Comp. Schnitzer, p. 286. But Origen softened the harshness of his theory partly, as has already been indicated, by allegorical interpretation, (comp. the subsequent §), partly by assuming (as was frequently done even in later times) that God, like a teacher, accommodates himself to the degree of civilization in different ages. Contra Cels. iv. 71. T. i. p. 556.

(8) Irenæus compares the sacred Scriptures to the treasure which was hid in a field, adv. Hær. iv. 25, 26, and recommends their perusal also to the laity, but under the direction of the presbyters, iv. 32. Clement of Alexandr. describes their simplicity, and the beneficial effects which they are calculated to produce, Coh. p. 66. Γραφαὶ δὴ ἀνθρώπων ἐν παντὶ μόρφω, συνετρείησασι σωτηρίας ὁδὸν, γυμνὰ καθοριστικὴς καὶ τῆς ἐκπολεμίωσης καὶ συναναλήσεως ὑπάρχουσας ἀναστάσις ἀγχόμενον ὑπὸ πάντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὑπεριδιόναι τὸν εἰδαντὸν τὸν βιαστὴν, μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ συνάκουσι, ἀποτείχουσι μὲν ἑαυτὸς τῆς ἐπίκεισθαι ἀνάγκης, προφέτουσι δὲ ἠκραίοις ἐς τρόπονων σωτηρίαν. Comp. ibid. p. 71: εἰς γὰρ ὡς ἐλθὼς τὰ ἰσαποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦσα γράμματα κ. τ. λ. Clement did not confine this sanctifying power to the mere letter of the Scriptures, but thought that the λογικὸς νόμος had been written, not only in plaçι λεπίναις, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθίσμασι ἄνθρωπων, Pud. iii. p. 307., so that at least the effects produced by the Bible depend on the susceptibility of the mind. The language of Origen is similar, contra Cels. vi. 2. p. 630: φησὶ δὲ οὗ τὸν λόγον, ὅς αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖ τὸ λεγόμενον (καὶ καθ' αὐτό ἄλλης καὶ πιστικῶτατούς φής τὸ καθισκέσθαι ἄνθρωπος ψυχῆς, ἐὰν ἰδίᾳ καὶ δύναμις τῆς θεώδους τῷ λέγοντι, καὶ χάρις ἐπαινῆθη τῷ λεγόμενος, καὶ αὐτῇ ὡς ἀδεῖ ἀγνόησαὶ τοῖς ἀνασίμαις λέγουσι.

§ 33.

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

Olshausen, über tiefern Schriftsinr, Königsberg 1824. Rosenmüller, historia interpretat. N. Test. T. iii. Ernesti, J. A. de Origine interpre-
The tendency to allegorical interpretation was connected in a twofold manner with the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Some writers endeavoured to bring as much as possible into the letter of the sacred writings, either on mystico-speculative, or on practico-religious grounds; others from a rationalistico-apologetical tendency were anxious to explain away all that might lead to conclusions alike offensive to human reason, and unworthy of the Deity, if taken in their literal sense. This may be best seen in the works of Origen, who, after the example of Philo, and of several of the Fathers, especially of Clement, adopted three modes of interpretation, the grammatical, analogical, and allegorical. The simple and modest mode of interpretation, adopted by Irenaeus, who defers to God all that is above human understanding, forms a striking contrast with the allegorizing tendency, which can find everything in the Scriptures.

(1.) "Considering the high opinion regarding the inspiration of the sacred writings, and the dignity of what is revealed in them, we should expect as a matter of course, to meet with careful interpreters who would diligently investigate the exact meaning of every part of Holy Writ. But the very opposite has taken place. Inspiration is done away with by that most arbitrary of all modes of interpretation, the allegorical, of which we may consider Philo the best representative." (Gfrörer, Geschichte des Urchristenthums, i. p. 69, in reference to Philo.) However much this may surprise us at first sight, we shall find that the connection between the theory of inspiration, and the mode of interpretation which accompanies it, is by no means unnatural; both have one common source, viz. the assumption that there is...
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a very great difference between the Bible, and other books. That which has come down from heaven, must be interpreted according to its heavenly origin; must be looked upon with other eyes, and touched with other hands than profane. Comp. Dähne, über Philo, p. 60. In this period we observe something similar relative to the Word to what took place afterwards with regard to the Sacraments. As baptismal water was thought to possess more excellent qualities than common water, and the bread used in the Lord’s supper to be different from common bread, so the letter of the Bible, once encircled by the magic ring of inspiration, became itself a magic hieroglyphic, to decipher which a magic key was needed.

(2) Comp. Gfrörer and Dähne, 1. c. and Conybeare, J. J. The Bampton Lecture for the year 1824, being an attempt to trace the history and to ascertain the limits of the secondary, and spiritual interpret. of Script. Oxf. 1824. Davidson, Sacred Hermeneutics, pp. 63. 64.

Examples of allegorical and typical interpretation abound in the writings of the apostolic, and earlier Fathers, see § 29. 3. [Comp. Davidson, Sacred Hermen. p. 71 flwg. Barnabas, 1. 7. The two goats (Levit. xvi.) were to be fair and perfectly alike; both therefore typified the one Jesus, who was to suffer for us. The circumstance of one being driven forth into the wilderness, the congregation spitting upon it and pricking it; whilst the other, instead of being accursed, was offered upon the altar to God, symbolised the death and sufferings of Jesus. The washing of the entrails with vinegar, denoted the vinegar mixed with gall which was given to Jesus on the cross. The scarlet wool, put about the head of one of the goats, signified the scarlet robe put upon Christ before his crucifixion. The taking off the scarlet wool, and placing it on a thorn-bush, refers to the fate of Christ’s church. Clement of Alex. lib. v. p. 557. “The candlestick situated south of the altar of incense signified the movements of the seven stars making circuits southward. From each side of the candlestick projected three branches with lights in them, because the sun placed in the midst of the other planets gives light both to those above and under him by a kind of divine music. The golden candlestick has also another enigma, not only in being a figure of the sign of Christ, but also in the circumstance of giving light in many ways and parts to such as believe and hope in him, by the instrumentality of the things at first
created." Comp. also pp. 74, 75, 79, 80.] In order to form a correct estimate of this mode of interpretation comp. Möhler, Patrologie, i. p. 64.: "It may be, that the system of interpretation adopted by the earlier Fathers in many respects is not agreeable to our notions of interpretation; but we should remember that our mode of looking at things differs from theirs in more than one point. They knew nothing, thought of nothing, felt nothing, but Christ—is it then surprising, that they met him everywhere, even without seeking him? In the present high state of civilization we are scarcely able to form a correct idea of the mind of those times, in which the great object of commentators was, to show the connection between the Old and the New Covenant in the most satisfactory manner, and in the most vivid colours."

The earlier Fathers indulged almost unconsciously in this mode of interpreting; but Clement of Alex. attempts to establish a theory asserting that the Mosaic laws have a threefold, or even a fourfold sense, τιτραγώς δι ημίν ἐκλεπτικον τοῦ νόμου τήν βούλησιν. Strom. i. 28. (some read τεχνές instead of τεταχώς.) [Comp. Davidson, l. c. p. 79.]

(a) Origen supposes that Scripture has a threefold sense corresponding to the trichotomous division of man into body, soul, and spirit (comp. § 54.); in confirmation of this view he appeals to Prov. xxii. 20, 21; [1 Cor. ii. 6, 7 and other passages,] and the Shepherd of Hermas which he values equally with Scripture. This threefold sense may be divided into 1. the grammatical, [σωματικός] = body; 2. the moral, [νομικός] = soul; 3. the mystical, [πνευματικός] = spirit. The literal sense however, he asserts, cannot always be taken, but in certain cases it must be spiritualized by allegorical interpretation, especially in those places which contain either something indifferent in a religious aspect (genealogies, etc.), or immoral things (e. g. the account of Lot’s incest, of Abraham’s two wives, etc.), or what is unworthy of the dignity of God (the anthropomorphitic narratives in the book of Genesis, etc.); [comp. the mode in which Philo proceeded, Davidson, l. c. p. 63, 64.] But Origen found offensive things not only in the Old, but also in the New Testament. Thus he declared the narrative of the temptation of our Saviour to be a mere allegory, because he could not solve the difficulties which it presents to the historical interpreter. [The gospels also abound in expressions of this kind; as when the devil is said to have taken Jesus to a high mountain.—For who
could believe, if he read such things with the least degree of attention, that the kingdoms of the Persians, Scythians, Indians, and Parthians, were seen with the bodily eye, and with as great honour as kings are looked upon? Davidson, l. c. p. 99.]

He also thought that some precepts, as Luke x. 4. Matth. v. 39. 1 Cor. vii. 18. could be taken in their literal sense only by foolish men (ἀρετῶν).—He does not indeed deny the reality of most of the miracles, but he prizes much more highly the allegory which they include (comp. § 29. n. 10.); de princ. lib. iv. § 8—27. he gives the most complete exhibition of his theory; comp. also his exegetical works, and the above mentioned treatises.—[Davidson, l. c. p. 97—105].—Both tendencies above spoken of, that of bringing in, and that of explaining away, are obviously exhibited in the writings of Origen. Therefore, the remark of Lücke (Hermeneutik, p. 39.) “that a rationalistic tendency, of which Origen himself was not conscious, may account in part for his addiction to allegorical interpretation,” can be easily reconciled with the apparently contrary supposition, that mysticism was the cause of it. “The letter kills, but the spirit quickens; this is the principle of Origen. But who does not see that the spirit can become too powerful, kill the letter, and take its place?” Edgar Quinet on Strauss, (Revue des deux mondes 1838.)

Irenæus also proceeded on the assumption that the Scriptures throughout were full of profound meanings, adv. Haer. iv. 18.: nihil enim otiosum, nec sine signo, neque sine argumento apud eum, and made use of typical interpretation. Nevertheless he saw the errors to which allegorizing leads, and condemned it in the Gnostics, adv. Haer. i. 3. 6. We are as little able to understand the abundance of nature, as the superabundance of Scripture, ibid. ii. 28.: Nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientia mysteriorum ejus indigemus. Et non est mirum, si in spiritualibus et caelestibus et in his quæ habent revelari, hoc patimur nos: quandoquidem etiam eorum quæ ante pedes sunt (dico autem quæ sunt in hac creatura, quæ et contractantur a nobis et videntur et sunt nobiscum) multa fugerunt nostram scientiam, et Deo hæc ipsa committimus. Oportet enim eum præ omnibus præcellere......

(5)
§ 34.

TRADITION.

Notwithstanding the high esteem in which Scripture was held, the authority of tradition was not altogether disregarded. On the contrary, in the controversies with heretics, Scripture was thought to be insufficient to combat them, because it maintains its true position, and can be correctly interpreted (i.e. according to the spirit of the church) only in close connection with the tradition of the church.(1) Different opinions obtained concerning the nature of tradition: The view taken by Irenæus and Tertullian was of a positive, realistic kind; according to them the truth could not be obtained without some external historic-géographical connection with the mother churches.(2) The writers of the Alexandrian school entertained more idealistic opinions; they saw in the unhindered and more spiritual exchange of ideas the fresh and ever living source from which we must draw the wholesome water of sound doctrine.(3) It must however be acknowledged that the idea of a secret doctrine(4) which prevailed in the Alexandrian school, and was said to have been transmitted along with the publicly received truth from the times of Christ and his Apostles, betrayed a Gnostic tendency which might easily hinder the adaptation of Christianity to all classes of society. On the other hand, the new revelations of the Montanists set aside all historical tradition.(5) The view which Cyprian takes of tradition is peculiar to himself; he submits it to
the test of Scripture, and distinguishes human tradition (usage) from divine instruction.\(^{6}\)

\(^{1}\) On the necessity of tradition see Irenæus, i. 10. (p. 49. M.) ii. 35. p. 171. iii. Præf. c. 1—6. c. 21. iv. 20. 26. 32. (Orelli, i. Programme p. 20.) The remark is worthy of observation, iii. 4. that the nations had been converted to Christianity, not in the first instance by the *Scripture* (sine charta et atramento), but by means of the presence of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, and the faithfully preserved tradition. See Tert. adv. Marc. iii. 6. v. 5. and particularly de præscriptione Hæreticorum, where he denies to heretics the right of using Scripture in argument with the orthodox. Comp. c. 13. seq. c. 19.: Ergo non ad scripturas provocandum est, nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla, aut incerta victoria est, aut par (var. parum) incertæ. Nam etsi non ita evaderet consilio scripturarum, ut utramque partem parem sinteret, ordo rerum desiderabat, illud prius proponi quod nunc solum disputandum est: quibus competat fides ipsa; cujus sint scripturas; a quo et per quos et quando et quibus sit tradita disciplina, qua sunt Christiani. Ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinam et fidei Christianae, illic erit veritas scripturarum et expositionum et omnium traditionum Christianorum. Comp. c. 37: Qui estis, quando et unde venistis, quid in meo agitis, non mei? To renounce tradition is according to Tertullian the source of the mutilation, and corruption of Scripture, comp. c. 22. and 38. But even in a state of integrity Scripture is not able on its own account to overthrow heresies: on the contrary, according to God's providential arrangement, it becomes to heretics the source of new errors, comp. c. 40. 42.—Clement of Alex. expresses himself thus (Stromata, vii. 15. p. 887): It should be no more impossible for an honest man to lie, than for a believer to depart from the rule of faith which is laid down by the church; it is necessary to follow those who already possess the truth. As the companions of Ulysses, when they had been bewitched by Circe, behaved like beasts, so he who renounces tradition ceases to be a man of God. Strom. 16. p. 890.—Origen de princ. proem. i. p. 47: Servetur vero ecclesiastica prædicatione per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita usque ad præsens in ecclesiis permanens, illa sola creenda est veritas, quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat tramite.
Iren. iii. 4. 2. (p. 178 M.): Quid enim? Et si de aliqua modica quæstione disceptatia esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrenc ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt et ab iis de praeventi quæstione sumere quod certum et re liquidum est? Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquisserunt nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias? etc. Tertull. præscr. c. 20: dehinc (Apostoli) in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ ceteræ exinde ecclesias mutuatae sunt et quotidie mutuatur, ut ecclesiae flant, et per hoc et ipsæ apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necessè est. Itaque tot ac tantæ Ecclesie una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes, etc. Comp. c. 21.

Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 1. p. 323. Tā φρίασια ἡξαδιδόμενα διεισδευσεν υἱων ἀναδίδωσιν τρέπονται δι εἰς φθόγων, δικ μεταλαμβάνει τοιδ. καὶ τὸν ποιησαν ἡ χρήσις καθαρώτερον φυλάσσον, δι ἡ ἀρχηγοσια ἰδον τετριτο γεννησίκη, συνελήλυ τὰς φάσιν, ἡ συγγεγαλεία ἢ ἦν ἡμιποτ ἐγνωσίκη καὶ πνεύματα καὶ σώματα.


(5) Comp. § 24.

(6) The opinion of Cyprian was developed in the controversy with the Romish bishop Stephen, who appealed to the Romish tradition in support of his views concerning the baptism of heretics. Cyprian on the contrary returns with justice to the oldest tradition, viz. the Sacred Scriptures (divinae traditionis caput et origo), Ep. 74. p. 215. In the same place, and in the same connection he says: Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est. Comp. Ep. 71. p. 194: Non est de consuetudine praescribendum, sed ratione vincendum. We must however remember that this controversy was carried on not so much about a dogma, as about a rite, and that as yet no definite meaning
was attached to the term tradition. [Bennett, l. c. p. 105.] It is interesting to observe that, e. g. Irenæus does not as yet know any traditio humana within the church which could contradict in any way the traditio apostolica; [Bennett, l. c. p. 99.] In later times Tertullian combats the authority of custom with almost the same weapons as Cyprian; comp. de virgin. veland. 1: Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem cognominavit. Quod-cunque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit heresis, etiam vetus consuetudo. Huther, Cyprian, p. 139 flwg. Rettberg, p. 310.

It was the general opinion that faith (πίστις, fides) is the medium by which we apprehend the revelations made known to us either by Scripture or by tradition. The question however arose (especially in the Alexandrian school) in what relation the πίστις stands to the more developed γνώσις? We should mistake Clement if we were to conclude from some of his expressions, that he attaches but an inferior value to the πίστις. In a certain sense he looks upon it rather as the perfection of knowledge (τελείωσις μαθήσεως.) Ped. i. 6. p. 115. Faith does not want anything, it does not limp (as the proofs do.) It has the promise, etc. Also according to Strom. i. 1. p. 320. faith is essentially necessary to a right apprehension of knowledge. It anticipates knowledge, ii. 1. p. 432. Comp. ii. 4. p. 436.: κυριότερον είν τις ἑπόστημας η πίστις και ἵστιν αὐτῆς κρίτην. In the same place he distinguishes faith from mere conjecture, εἰκασία, which is related to faith, as a flatterer to a true friend, and a wolf to a dog.—Revelation (διδασκαλία) and faith depend on each other, as the throwing and catching of a ball in a game, Strom. ii. 6. p. 442.—On the other hand, Clement maintains the necessity of a well instructed faith (πίστις περὶ τῶν μαθημάτων), Strom. i. 6. p. 336, and insists in general on an intimate connection between πίστις and γνώσις, ii. 4. p. 436. πιστὴ τοιοῦτον η γνώσις γνωστὴ δι ὁ πίστις, ἦμερ τῇ ἀκαλολογίᾳ τι καὶ ἀνακαλολογίᾳ γίνεται. Faith is described as an imperfect knowledge of the truth, γνώσις is characterized as a "firm and stable demonstration of the things already apprehended by faith." Strom. vii. 10. p. 865. 66. From this point of view he values knowledge more highly than faith, Strom. vi. 14. p. 794: πλέον δι ἕστι τῶν πιστῶσα τῷ γνώσαι. Nevertheless he knows how to discern this true gnosis from the false gnosis of
vi. 10. p. 864. (here again faith appears as the basis of true 
knowledge.) On the different kinds of faith, see Strom. vi. 17. p. 
820. Comp. Neander, de fidei gnoseosque idea secundum Cle-
mentem Alex. Heidelberg 1811. 8. Baur, Gnosis, p. 502 
flwg. [Davidson, 1. c. p. 76. 77; p. 106—111.]—Origen, de 
princ. in procœm. 3. Opp. i. 47: Illud autem scire oportet, 
quoniam Sancti Apostoli fidem Christi prœdicantes de quibus-
dam quidem, quæcunque necessaria crediderunt, omnibus ma-
nifestissimo tradiderunt, rationem scilicet assertionis eorum 
relinquentes ab his inquirendam, qui Spiritus dona excellentia 
merèrentur: de aliis vero dixerunt quidem, quia sint; quomodo 
autem, aut unde sint, siluerunt, profecto ut studiosiores quique 
ex posteris suis, qui amatores essent sapientiae, exercitium ha-
bere possent, in quo ingenii sui fructum ostenderent, hi videlicet 
qui dignos se et capaces ad recipiendum sapientiam præpa-
rarent.
SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY.


§ 35.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

It can never be the object of any revealed religion to prove the existence of God, inasmuch as it always presupposes the conviction that there is a God. The idea of a personal God who as the creator of heaven and earth rules over the human race, who has given the law, sent the prophets, and manifested himself in these last days by his Son Jesus Christ, existed already in the O. Test., but was now purified, perfected, and extended beyond the narrow limits of national interests in the Christian religion. In consequence, the believing Christian needed as little, as his Jewish contemporary, a proof of the existence of God. But in proportion as the truth and excellency of Christianity were more fully perceived, it became necessary on the one hand, that the Christians should defend themselves (apologetically) against the charge of Atheism which was frequently brought forward. On the other hand they had to demonstrate to the heathens (polemically,) that their pagan worship was false, and consequently in its very foundation amount-
ed to a virtual denial of the living God (Atheism.)(3) When we therefore meet in the writings of the Fathers with anything like a proof of the existence of God, we must take it as the sudden utterance of an overflowing heart, which gives vent to its feelings in a rhetorico-poetical form.(4) Sometimes we find that such statements are intimately connected with other definitions of the nature of God, with the doctrine of his unity, or with the doctrine of the creation and government of the world.(5) But the Fathers of this period generally go back to the innate consciousness of the being of a God (testimonium animae, λόγος σπερματικός) which may be traced even in the heathens,(6) and on the purity of which the knowledge of God depends.(7) With this they connect, but more in a popular, than strictly scientific form, what is commonly called the physico-theological, or teleological proof, i.e. they infer the existence of a creator from the works of creation.(8) More artificial proofs, as the cosmological and the ontological, are unknown in this period. Even the more profound thinkers of the Alexandrian school frankly acknowledged the impossibility of a proper proof of the existence of God, and the necessity of a Divine revelation.(9)

(1) The distinction therefore between Theology and Christology is only relative, and made for scientific purposes. The Christian idea of God always depends on faith in the Son in whom the Father manifests himself. We find however in the writings of the first Fathers (especially of Minucius Felix) a kind of theology which bears much resemblance to what was subsequently called natural theology, inasmuch as it is more reflecting, than intuitive. Others (e.g. Clement) look at everything through the medium of the Logos; Strom. v. 12. p. 696., comp. also n. 9.

(2) Comp. e.g. Minuc. Fel. Oct. c. 8., and with it cc. 17. 18., also the Edict. Antonini in Euseb. iv. 13.; the passage: ἰδὼν κατηγοροῦσις, however, may be differently interpreted.
THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

(a) So all the apologists, each in his turn; comp. instead of all: Minuc. Fel. c. 20 flwg. Tertullian, Apol. c. 8. de idololatria. Cyprian, de idolorum vanitate etc.

(b) So the passage in Clem. of Alex. Cohort. 54: Θεὸς δὲ τῶς ἐν ἔσομαι θαλὰς τοις; ὅλων ἐδω τὸν κόσμον ἵκενον ἔγεν ἵκεν καὶ οὕραντο καὶ ἥλιος καὶ ἀγγελίας καὶ Ἀρχότοι, ἔγεν τὸν δακτύλων αὐτοῦ. *Οση γε ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἰωνικον τῶν ἀρχων, μόνων αὐτῶν τὸ βούλημα καμιαοποίημα, μόνες γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἣπιότης, ἵππει καὶ μίας ὅπως ἵππει Θεὸς. *Υὴρ τῷ βούλειμα δημιουργῆ, καὶ τῷ μόνον ἡμῖν αὐτὸν ἵππει τὸ γεγυγηθαί x. t. l. comp. Tert. Apol. c. 17. 18.

(c) Comp. the following §§.

literarum versati sunt) inostaktau tis ἀπείρων θείων, ἥδε χάριν καὶ ἀκοντις μὲν ὀμολογοῦμεν ἵνα τε εἰσι σιὼν, ἀνώλεθρον καὶ ἀγέννητον τοῦτον, ἥν ἰτο σερ τὰ ἱώτα τοῦ υἱονοῦ ἵνα ἰδέ ται καὶ εἰκὼς περισσώς ὅτως ὅτα ἀν. comp. Strom. V. 12. p. 698.: Θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐμφασις ἵνα ἐν τούτῳ παντοκράτερος παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐφεξούσις πάντοτε φυσική καὶ τῆς ἁίδου κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν πρόνοιαν εὐεργείας ἀντίλαμβανον οἱ πλήθοις, οἱ καὶ μὴ τίλον ἀπεριβεσικότες πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

(7) This is beautifully expressed by Theophilus ad Autolycum from the commencement: If thou sayest, show me thy God, I answer, show me first thy man, and I will show thee my God. Show me first, whether the eyes of thy soul see, and the ears of thy heart hear. For as the eyes of the body perceive earthly things, light and darkness, white and black, beauty and deformity, etc., so the ears of the heart, and the eyes of the soul can perceive divine things. God is seen by those who can see him, when they open the eyes of their soul. All men have eyes, but the eyes of some are blinded, that they cannot see the light of the sun. But the sun does not cease to shine, because they are blind, they must ascribe it to their blindness that they cannot see. This is thy case, O man! The eyes of thy soul are darkened by sin, even by thy sinful actions. Like a bright mirror, man must have a pure soul. If there be any rust on the mirror, man cannot see the reflection of his countenance in it; likewise if there be any sin in man, he cannot see God. Therefore first examine thyself, whether thou be not an adulterer, fornicator, thief, robber, etc., for thy crimes prevent thee from perceiving God.” Comp. Clem. of Alex. Pæd. iii. 1. p. 250.: Ἠαυτὸ γὰρ τῆς Ἰδίων γυνῆς, Θεὸν ἴσοτα. Minuc. Fel. c. 32.: Ubique non tantum nobis proximus, sed infusus est (Deus.) Non tantum sub illo agimus; sed et cum illo prope dixerim, vivimus.

(8) Theophil. ad Autol. 5.: “When we see a vessel spreading her canvas, and majestically riding on the billows of the stormy sea, we conclude that she has a pilot on board; thus from the regular course of the planets, the rich variety of creatures, we infer the existence of the Creator.” Clem. of Alex. (comp. n. 4.) Minuc. Fel. c. 32. Imo ex hoc Deum credimus, quod eum sentire possimus, videre non possimus. In operibus enim ejus et in mundi omnibus motibus virtutem ejus semper præsentem adspicimus, quum tonat, fulgarat, fulminat, quum serenat etc. Comp. c. 18: Quod si ingressus aliquam domum omnia exculta,
THE UNITY OF GOD.

Since Christianity adopted the doctrine of One God as taught in the Old Testament, it became necessary that it should defend it not only against the polytheism of heathen nations, but also against the Gnostic doctrine of two supreme beings (dualism,) and the theory of emanation.(1) Regarding the dualistic notions of the Gnostics we may remark that they were evidently borrowed from paganism. Some proved the necessity of the unity of God, though not in the abolest manner, from the relations of space, (2) or even from analogies in the rational, and irrational creations. (3) The more profound thinkers however were well aware, that it is not sufficient to de-
monstrate the mere numerical unity of the Divine Being, and accordingly placed the transcendental unity far above the mathematical monas.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Both the hypothesis of the existence of a διαμοιρατός, ἄρχων Jaldabaoth etc. who is subordinate to the Supreme God (Σε; ἀνωτάτωτος, βούς,) and the dividing of the One God into numerous aeons, are contrary to monotheism. On the more fully developed systems of Basilides and Valentine comp. Irenæus, Clem. of Alexandria, and the works quoted § 23.

(2) To this class belongs the proof adduced by Athenagoras legat. pro Christianis, c. 8: "If there had been two or three gods from the commencement, they would either be at one and the same place, or each would occupy a separate space. They cannot exist at one and the same place, for if they be gods, they cannot be equal (accordingly they must exclude each other.) Only the created is equal to its pattern, but not the uncreated, for it does not proceed from anything, neither is it formed after any model. But as the hand, the eye, and the foot are different members of one body, as they conjointly compose that body, so God is but one God. Socrates is a compound being, as he is made, and subject to change, but God who is uncreated, and can neither be divided, nor acted upon by another being, cannot consist of parts. But if each god were supposed to occupy a separate space, what place could we assign to the other god, or the other gods, seeing that God is above the world, and round about all things? For as the world is round, and God surrounds all beings, where would yet be room for any of the other gods? For such a god cannot be in the world, because it belongs to another; no more can he surround the world, for the Creator of the world, even God, surrounds it. But if he can be neither in the world, nor around it (for the true God occupies the whole space around it) where can he be? Perhaps above the world, and above God? in another world? or around another world? But if he exists in another world, and around another world, he does not exist for us, and does not govern our world, and his power therefore is not very great, for then he is confined within certain boundaries. But as he exists neither in another world (for God himself fills the whole universe;) nor around another world (for God surrounds the universe) it follows that
he does not exist at all, since there is nothing in which he could exist.”


(4) Clem. Paed. i. 8. p. 140: \(\text{εἰ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἵνα ὁ Ὀρθὸς.}\) Along with the idea of the unity of God Origen speaks of the more metaphysical idea of his simplicity, de princ. i. 1. 6. Opp. T. i. p. 51: Non ergo aut corpus aliquid, aut \(\text{ἐν κορποὶ ἐστὶ Θεὸς, sed ἑνωθεῖ ἀτομικὴ καὶ ἀναλυτικὴ καὶ ἁμαρτίας.}\) The church therefore has ever cultivated the theology.) On the other hand, the insufficiency of human ideas was always acknowledged (in opposition to the pride of speculation), and the character of the Divine Being was admitted to be past finding out; some even entertained doubts about the propriety of giving

§ 37.

GOD AS A BEING WHICH MAY BE COMPREHENDED, KNOWN, AND NAMED.

The idea of a revealed religion implied that so much of the nature of God should be made manifest to man, as would be necessary to the knowledge of salvation; the church therefore has ever cultivated the theology.) On the other hand, the insufficiency of human ideas was always acknowledged (in opposition to the pride of speculation), and the character of the Divine Being was admitted to be past finding out; some even entertained doubts about the propriety of giving
God any name. Much of what the church designated by the term mystery (sacrament), is founded partly on a sense of the insufficiency of our ideas, and the inaptitude of our language, and partly on the necessity of employing certain ideas and expressions, to communicate our religious thoughts and opinions.

When the martyr Attalus, in the persecution of the Gallican Christians under Marcus Aurelius, was asked by his judges, what the name of God was, he replied: ὁ θεὸς ὁνόμα εἷς ἵχνη ὡς ἄλφασος, Euseb. v. 1. (edit. Heinichen T. ii. p. 29, comp. the note.) Such was also the opinion of Justin M., Apology ii. 6; whatever name may be given to God, he who has given a name to a thing, must always be anterior to it. He therefore draws a distinction between apppellatives (pterocīsos) and names (ἄνώματα.) The predicates πατὴρ, θεός, κύριος, διστήπθης, are only appellatives. God is not only above all names, but also above all existence, (ἰαίκινα τῆς οὐσίας) comp. dial. cum Tryph. c. 3. in reference to Plato. Theoph. ad Autol. i. 3: ἃχοι, ὁ ἄλφασος, τὸ μὲν εἶδος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἄξιός τοι καὶ Ἀνίκηφασον, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ὑβέλαμος σαρκίνος ὑπάβησιν δεξιή γὰρ ἑστὶν ἄξιμόρητος, μεγίθυ ἀκατάλληλος, ὦ πνεῦμα ἁπειρόμενος, ἰσχύι ἁπάντερα, σοφία ἀσυμβίβαστος, ἀγαθοσύνη ἀμίμητος, καλοσύνη ἁπάνθροπος: εἰ γὰρ φῶς αὐτόν εἶσιν, σῶμα αὐτοῦ λέγων εἰ λόγον εἶσιν, ἀρχήν αὐτοῦ λέγων (comp. the note to this passage by Maran) νῦν οἶνος ἐστίν, φύσην αὐτοῦ λέγων ἐποίημα οἶνος ἐστίν, ἀναστηθή αὐτοῦ λέγων σοφίαν οἶνος ἐστίν, γίνομα αὐτοῦ λέγων ἰσχύιν οἶνος ἐστίν, κράτος αὐτοῦ λέγων πρόειναι οἶνος ἐστίν, ἀγαθοσύνη αὐτοῦ λέγων βασιλείαν οἶνος ἐστίν, δεξαί αὐτοῦ λέγων κύριον οἶνος ἐστίν, κρινήν αὐτὸν λέγων κρινεῖν οἶνος ἐστίν, δίκαιον αὐτοῦ λέγων σωτηρίαν οἶνος ἐστίν, τὰ πάντα αὐτοῦ λέγων τῷ οἶνῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχὴν ἐστίν, τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ οἴκου ἀνεκφέρασθε ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θεός, ὁ ἄλφασος τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἀντωπῆσαι:—Minuc. Fel. c. 18: Hic (Deus) nec videri potest, visu clarior est, nec comprehendi, tactu purior est, nec estimari, sensibus major est, infinitus, immensus et soli sibi tantus quantus est, notus, nobis vero ad intellectum pectus angustum est, et ideo sic eum digne estimamus, dum inestimabilem dicimus. Eloquar, quemadmodum sentio: magnitudinem Dei, qui se putat nosse, minuit, qui non vult minuere, non novit. Nec nomen Deo querras: DEUS nomen est! Illic vocabulis opus est, quum per singulos
God as a Being.

Propriis appellationum insignibus multitudo dirimenda est. Deo, qui solus est, Dei vocabulum totum est. Quem si patrem dixero, terrenum opineris; si regem, carnalem suspiceris, si dominum, intelliges utique mortalem. Aufer additamenta nominum, et perspicies ejus claritatem. Clement of Alexandria shows very distinctly, Strom. vii. p. 689, that we can attain to a clear perception of God only by laying aside di' ἄναλησαν; all finite ideas of the Divine nature, till at last nothing but the abstract idea of unity remains. But lest we should content ourselves with the mere negation, we must throw ourselves (ἀποδοθείμεθα) into the greatness of Christ, in whom the glory of God was manifest, in order to obtain thus in some way or other (ἄμυνιστ) the knowledge of God, (i.e. in a practico-religious manner, not by speculation); for even then we learn only what God is not, not what he is, (that is to say, if we speak of absolute, perfect knowledge.) Comp. also the 12th and 13th chapters of the 5th book from p. 692; in particular p. 695. and c. 1. p. 647: ἐὰν γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀναλήσαμεν παρὰ τὸν τῆς ζωῆς χρόνον τὸν θεόν ἐνεργῶς παναλῆσαν· he therefore gives the advice, ibid. p. 651: Τὸν δὲ ἄνω ζητῶν τινὶ δεόν ἂν μὴ εἰς ἑαυτόν, ἀλλὰ εἰς εὐφέρειαν τείχη, σωτηρίων ἢτι. Origen contra Celsum, vi. 65. Opp. T. i. p. 681. and de princ. i. 1. 5. p. 50: Dicimus secundum veritatem, Deum incomprehensibilem esse atque inæstimabilem. Si quid enim illud est, quod sentire vel intelligere de Deo potuerimus, multis longe modis eum meliorrem ab eo quod sensimus necesse est credere. "As much as the brightness of the sun exceeds the dim light of a lantern, so much the glory of God surpasses our idea of it." Likewise Novatian says, de trinit. c. 2: De hoc ergo ac de eis quae sunt ipsius, et in eo sunt, nec mens hominis quae sint, quanta sint et qualia sint, digne concipere potest, nec eloquentia sermonis humani equibalem majestati ejus virtutem sermonis expromit. Ad cogitandum enim et ad eloquendum illius majestatem et eloquentiam omnium merito muta est et mens omnis exigua est: major est enim mente ipsa, nec cogitari possit quantus sit: ne si potuerit cogitari, mente humana minor sit, qua concipi possit. Major est quoque omni sermone, nec edici possit: ne si potuerit edici, humanno sermone minor sit, quo quam edicitur, et circumire et colligere possit. Quidquid enim de illo cogitatum fuerit, minus ipso erit, et quidquid enunciatum fuerit, minus illo comparatum circum ipsum erit. Sentire enim illum taciti aliquatenus possemus, ut autem ipse est, sermone explicare non
possumus. Sive enim illum dixeris lucem, creaturam ipsius magis quam ipsum dixeris, etc. . . . Quidquid omnino de illo retuleris, rem aliquam ipsius magis et virtutem quam ipsum explicaveris. Quid enim de eo condigne aut dicas aut sentias, qui omnibus et sermonibus major est? etc. This Christian scholasticism which pervades the first period, forms a striking contrast with the modern confidence of old and new scholastic mode and art!

§ 38.

IDEALISM AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM.—CORPORITY OF GOD.

The educated mind, desirous of removing from the nature of God as much as possible every thing that could remind us of the finite or compound, sometimes takes offence even at the idea of the substantiality of God, from fear of reducing him to the level of created beings. At the same time it is possible, so to refine our conceptions of the Deity, as to resolve it into a mere abstract negation. In opposition to this idealizing tendency pious souls soon manifested the desire of possessing a real God for the world, for man, and for the human heart; and the bold and figurative language which they employed, as well as the symbolical and anthropomorphic expressions which they applied to the Divine Being, amply compensated for what the notion of God had lost in the way of negation. Both these tendencies, which claim alike the consideration of thinking men, and have engaged the attention of philosophers in all ages, have their respective representatives in the first period of the history of doctrines. On the one hand the Alexandrian school, and Origen in particular, endeavour to remove from God every thing that could give rise to carnal ideas concerning his nature. On the other hand Tertullian insists so much on the idea of the substantiality of God, that he confounds it with his corporeity, though it must be ad-
mitted that he does not ascribe to him a gross, material body like that of man.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) On this subject even the ancient philosophers entertained different opinions. The popular, polytheistic form of religion was founded on anthropomorphism. Xenophanes of Colophon, the founder of the Eleatic school, endeavoured to combat polytheism as well as anthropomorphism. Comp. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14. p. 714:

Еγε θεός ἐν τι θεωθεῖ καὶ ἀνθρώπως μέγιστος,
Οὖ τι δήμας Ἴητοτιν ὁμότις οὐδὲ νόημα x. τ. λ.

and Strom. vii. 4. p. 841, and the other passages in Preller, hist. phil. graeco-rom. Hamb. 1838. Ritter, i. p. 450. [English translat. by Morrison, i. p. 430.] Schleiermacher, p. 60. The Epicureans (though it is doubtful whether Epicurus himself seriously meant to teach this doctrine) imagined that the gods possessed a quasi human form, but without the wants of men, and were unconcerned about their sufferings and pleasures. Thus they retained only what is vain in anthropomorphism, and lost sight of its more profound signification (the human relation of God to man.) Comp. Cic. de Natura Deprum, i. 8—21. Reinhold, i. p. 404, note. Ritter, iii. 490. [Engl. transl. iii. 442.]—Different views were adopted by the Stoics, who represented God as the vital force and reason which govern the universe; but though they avoided anthropomorphic notions, they regarded him as clothed in an ethereal robe. Cic. de Nat. D. ii. 24. Ritter, iii. p. 576. [English translation, iii. p. 520 flwg.]

\(\alpha\) Clement opposes anthropomorphism in different places: Most men talk and judge of God from their own limited point of view, as if cockles and oysters were to reason out of their narrow shells, and the hedgehog out of his own self. Strom. v. 11. p. 687. comp. vii. 5. p. 845. c. 7. p. 852. 53: ὅλος ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ἢ τις τούτως χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίμοις, ἢ θεός, ἢ θεὸς τῶν οὐδών σωμάτων ἀνθρώπων, οὗτοι ἢ ἔννοιασ ὑμῖν ἐν λόγοις, ἄλλοι ἢν ἐν γαρ πάση ἡ δόγμας ἢ μὴ στίγματι τοῦ ὄνομας ὤμοιος, ἀλλ' ἢ τις ταπινᾶς καὶ δέχομαι ἐκτρέφομαι ἵνα οἶνος x. τ. λ. (on prayer.) Origen begins his work τις ἄγχων immediately after the proem. with objections to anthropomorphic or material ideas of God:

"I know that many appeal even to Scripture in proof of their
assertion that God is a corporeal being; because they find in
the writings of Moses that he is called a consuming fire, and
read in the gospel of John that he is a Spirit (πνεῦμα). They
cannot think of fire and spirit but as something corporeal. I
should like to ask these persons what they say of the passage in
1 John i. 5: "God is light?" He is a light to enlighten those
who seek the truth, (Ps. xxxvi. 9); for "the light of God" is
nothing more than his Divine power, by means of which he who
is enlightened perceives truth in all things, and apprehends God
himself as the truth. In this sense we must understand the
phrase: in thy light we shall see light, i.e. in the Logos, in the
wisdom which is thy Son, we see thee, the Father. Is it then
necessary to suppose that God resembles the sun-light, because
he is called light? Can any sensible meaning be attached to
the idea, that knowledge and wisdom have their source in cor-
poreal light?" But the spiritualizing tendency of Origen led
him frequently so to explain even the more profound sayings
of Scripture, as to leave nothing but a mere abstract idea. No-
vatian also expresses himself in very strong and decided terms
against anthropomorphism; de trin. c. 6: Non intra hæc nostri
corporis lineamenta modum aut figuram divinae majestatis in-
cludimus.... Ipse totus oculus, quia totus videt; totus auris,
quia totus audit. Even the definition, that God is a spirit, has
according to him only a relative validity. Illud quod dicit Do-
minus (John iv.) spiritum Deum, puto ego sic locutum Christum
de patre, ut adhuc aliquid plus intelligi velit quam spiritum
Deum. He thinks that this is only figurative language, as it is
said elsewhere, God is light, etc. omnis enim spiritus creatura
est.

(3) The first Christian writer who is said to have ascribed a
body to the Deity, is Melito of Sardis in his treatise σώματος
Σωτί which is no longer extant, comp. Orig. comment. in Genes.
Gennad. de dogm. eccles. c. 4. and Piper, ü ber Melito, in the
theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1838, i. p. 71, where a similar
view is cited from the Clementine Homilies. [Burton, E., Tes-
timonies of the Anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ,
etc. (Works, ii.) p. 64.] It is more certain that Tertullian as-
cribed to God (and so also to the soul) a body which he did not
however represent as a human body, but as the necessary form
of all existence, (comp. Schleiermacher, Geschichte der Philoso-
IDEALISM AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

phie, p. 165), de carne Christi, c. 11: Ne esse quidem potest, nisi habens per quod sit. Cum autem (anima) sit, habeat necessis est aliquid per quod sit. Si habet aliquid per quod est, hoc erit corpus ejus. Omne quod est, corpus est sui generalis. Nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est. Advers. Praxeam, c. 7: Quis enim negabit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie. Sed et invisibilia illa quaecunque sunt, habent apud Deum et suum corpus et suam formam, per quae soli Deo visibilia sunt; quanto magis quod ex ipsius substantia missum est, sine substantia non erit. Comp. Neander Antignosticus, p. 451. But Tertullian himself draws a definite distinction, which excludes all grosser forms of anthropomorphism, between the Divine and the human corpus, advers. Marc. ii. 16: Discerne substantias et suos eis distribue sensus, tam diversos, quam substantiae exigit, licet vocabulis communicare videantur. Nam et dexteram et oculos et pedes Dei legimus, nec ideo tamen humanis comparabuntur, quia de appellazionee sociantur. Quanta erit diversitas divini corporis et humani, sub eisdem nominibus membrorum, tanta erit et animi divini et humani differentia, sub eisdem licet vocabulis sensuum, quos tam corruptorios efficit in homine corruptibilitas substantiae humanae, quam incorruptorius in Deo efficit incorruptibilitas substantiae divinae. On the anthropomorphism of Cyprian see Rettberg, p. 300.

* Münsscher ed. by Cölln, i. p. 134, adduces this passage to show that Tertullian is justly chargeable with real anthropomorphism. It rather proves the contrary. It must also be borne in mind that the corporeity of God and anthropomorphism are by no means synonymous terms. It is possible to represent God by way of anthropomorphism as a Spirit of very limited expanse, and bearing resemblance to the spirit of man, without ascribing to him a body. On the other hand the substantiality of God may be taken in so abstract a manner, as not to confound it with humanity and personality, (so the Stoics.) Tertullian combines both these modes of representation, but after all that has been said, it is the awkwardness of his style rather than his manner of thinking, that has brought him into disrepute. [This may be clearly seen from the following passage: "Divine affections are ascribed to the Deity by means of figures borrowed from the human form, not as if he were indued with corporeal qualities: when eyes are ascribed to him, it denotes that he sees all things; when ears, that he hears all things; the speech denotes the will; nostrils, the perception of prayer; hands, creation; arms, power; feet, immensity; for he has no members, and performs no office for which they are required, but executes all things by the sole act of his will.

How can he require eyer, who is light itself? or feet, who is omnipresent? How can he require hands, who is the silent creator of all things? or a
Neither the existence of God, as we have already seen, nor his attributes were from the first defined with scientific precision. The catholic church rather adopted the concrete idea of a personal God as propounded in the Old Test., though in a somewhat modified form. But in course of time metaphysical ideas were borrowed from the schools of philosophers, and transferred to the God of the Christians, and it is not difficult to perceive how the views entertained on this subject by different writers would be more or less influenced by the different tendencies of these schools. Some connected their notions of the omnipresence of God with their conceptions of his corporeity, which fills the universe and displaces all other bodies; others maintained that he was exalted above space, or that having destroyed space, he put himself in its room. The doctrine of omniscience was to some extent mixed up with anthropomorphic ideas, and Origen himself limited this attribute of God, as well as that of his omnipotence. According to the spirit of Christianity, particular mention was made of the love and mercy of God, along with his justice. But it was to be expected that at times difficulties would arise respecting apparent contradictions which could be removed only by the taking of more comprehensive and elevated views. Thus it became possible, to reconcile on the one side the omniscience, (especially the foreknowledge) of God with his omnipotence and goodness, and on the other side his justice with his love and mercy.

tongue, to whom to think is to command? Those members are necessary to men, but not to God, inasmuch as the councils of men would be inefficacious unless his thoughts put his members in motion; but not to God, whose operations follow his will without effort. Comp. Wright, W., in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literat. art. Anthropomorphism.
The catholic church preserved a right medium between the antijudaizing tendency of the Gnostics, who spoke of the demiurgus as a being that was either subordinate to the Supreme God, or stood in a hostile relation to him; and the judaizing tendency of the Ebionites, who retaining the rigid system of Judaism mistook the universal design of the Christian doctrine of God. But here, as elsewhere, we observe a wide difference between the theological opinions of the North-African, and those of the Alexandrian school.

Comp. (§ 36. n. 2.) the passage cited from Athenagoras on the unity of God. Cyprian, de idol. vanit. p. 15, finds fault with the heathen because they attempt to confine the infinite God within the narrow walls of a temple, whilst he ubique totus diffusus est. This expression would lead us to suppose that in his view the Deity was a kind of substance which fills space.

Philo had previously identified God with absolute space, and taught that he alone can set bounds to his own existence; comp. the passages bearing on this subject in the work of Dähne p. 281—284, and p. 193. 267 flwg.; Theophilus ad Autol. ii. 3. also calls God his own space (αὐτὸς ιαυτῶν τὸς ισόν.) He justly confines the omnipresence of God not to his mere existence at every place at one and the same time, but considers it as his uninterrupted activity which is known from his works, comp. i. 5. Clem. of Alex. Strom. ii. 2. p. 431.: οὐ γὰρ ἐν γνώφι ἡ τόπων ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἱστικὸν καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου καὶ τῆς τῶν γεγονότων ἱδιότητος ὁ δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν μέρει κακαγίνεται ποτε, οὔτε περίχων οὔτε περίχωμος ἡ κατὰ ὁμοίων τινα ἱκατὰ ἀποτομὴν.—According to Origen God sustains and fills the world (which he thought to be an animate being) with his power, but he neither fills the universe with his presence, nor does he even move in it, comp. de princ. ii. 1. Opp. i. p. 77. For an explanation of popular and figurative expressions which represent the Deity as occupying space, and convey the idea of a change of place, vide contra Cels. iv. 5. Opp. i. p. 505. and comp. also p. 686. Concerning the expression that God may be all in all, see de princ. iii. 6. Opp. i. p. 152. 153.

De princ. iii. 2. Opp. 1. p. 49. Origen proves that the world is finite, because God could not comprehend it, if it were infinite; for that only may be understood which has a beginning. But it were impious to say, that there is any thing which God does not comprehend. Comp. with this the much simpler view of Clement Strom. vi. 17. p. 821.: ὁ γὰρ τοι Θεὸς πάντα οἴνων, οὐ μόνον τὰ
Origen in his writings polemicizes against the Gnostics and orthodox Christians. He observes that the former did not know how to reconcile the equity of God which inflicts punishment, with that other attribute which passes by transgressions, and redeems from sin; on this account they thought themselves compelled to separate the just God of the Old Test. from the loving Father of the Christians (so Marcion.) In opposition to this ill-founded distinction Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen etc. insist particularly on the penal justice of God, and show that it can very well be reconciled with his love. According to Irenæus, adv. her. v. 27. penalty does not consist in anything positive which comes from God, but in the separation of the sinner from God. God does not punish ἐπομηνίκως, but ἐπικαλουμένης δι’ ἐκείνης (τῆς ἀμαρτίας) τῆς κελάσως. Tertullian on the contrary considers the penal justice of God to be based on the legal principle of the inviolableness of the law, and distinguishes between true love...
and benevolent weakness, comp. contra Marc. i. 25. 26. ii. 13. 14. 16. (negabimus Deum, in quo non omnia, quae Deo digna sint, constant); in his opinion the anger of God depends on love itself. Accordingly he draws a distinction, between malis supplicii s. peccæ and malis culpa s. peccati. God is the author only of the former; the devil is the author of the latter. To defend himself against the charge of anthropomorphism he says: Stultissimi, qui de humanis divina prejudicant, ut quoniam in homine corruptoriae conditionis habentur hujusmodi passiones, idcirco et in Deo ejusdem status existimentur, etc. Clement of Alexandria adopts partly the same view, Strom. iv. 24. p. 634.; but in enumerating the causes which induce God to inflict penalties, he speaks of the legal principle as being the last. The principal design of the divine punishments seems to him, to make men better, and to warn and restrain others from the commission of sin. Comp. Pæd. i. 8. p. 40. This is distinctly set forth Strom. vii. p. 895: 'Αλλ' ὡς σφός το͔̂ δισασκάλου ἦ το͔̂ σατρός οἱ παιδες, οὕτως ἡμεῖς σφός τῆς προσοφίας κολαζομέναι. Θεός δὲ οὐ τιμωρεῖται ἵστη γὰρ ἡ τιμωρία κακῶς ἀνταπόδοσις κολαζένει μία το͔̂ σφός το͔̂ χρει- μεν καὶ κοινό τι ἡμεῖς κολαζομένοις. Origen refutes at great length the objections of the Gnostics, de princ. ii. 5. Opp. t. i. p. 102., by proving that their distinction between "benevolent," and "just," is altogether untenable, and showing that the Divine penalties are inflicted by a kind father, and wise physician; at the same time he applies the allegorical interpretation to those passages of the Old Test. which speak by way of anthropomorphism of the wrath and vengeance of God; comp. also contra Cels. iv. 71. 72. p. 556. (comp. however § 48.)

§ 40.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS.

a. Traces of it in the period before the Christian era, and in Jewish and Gentile systems of religion and philosophy.

The difficulty which men experienced in thinking of God as a being purely spiritual and exalted above every finite object, was considerably increased when they viewed him at the same time in the relation which he sustains to the finite creation. It became necessary with the increasing culture of the human mind to form the idea of a medium (organ) by which God creates and governs the world, and manifests himself in it. This medium was supposed on the one side to have its existence in the Divine nature itself, and to stand in a most intimate connection with it, and on the other to be somehow or other distinct from it. In order to ascertain the origin of this idea, we need not go either to oriental sources, the wisdom of India and the religion of Zend,(1) or to the occidental systems of philosophy, and that of Plato in particular.(2) We may trace it in the more definite and concrete form which at the time when the apocryphal writings were composed, was given to the personifications of the Divine word, and the Divine wisdom found in the Old Test.(3) It may be further traced in the doctrine of Philo concerning the Logos,(4) and in some other notions which were then current.(5) But all these were only so many scattered seeds which Christianity was designed to quicken and make fruitful.

(1) "It is easy to see that the Christian idea cannot be explained by an appeal to the Indian religion." Dorner, p. 7, but this is more true concerning the doctrine of the Godman, than
that of the Logos in general, of which there is at least an analogy in the Trimurti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahma</th>
<th>Vishnoo</th>
<th>Seeva (Kala)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun (Light)</td>
<td>Water (Air?)</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Preserver (progressive development)</td>
<td>Destroyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comp. Bohlen and Stuhr, l. c. Among the Egyptians we find the following corresponding with these deities

Brahma = Phtha  
Vishnoo = Keph  
Seeva = Neith

The word by which Brahma created the world, is Om (Oum), s. Bohlen i. p. 159 flwg. 212. In the system of Zoroaster the word Honover is represented as that by which the world was created, and as the most immediate revelation of the god Ormuzd, s. Kleuker l. c. and Stuhr, i. p. 370. 371. [Burton, l. c. Lect. ii. p. 44-48.]

(1) The relation in which Plato (especially in Timæus) imagined God to stand to the creating ρως, presents only a remote analogy; likewise the passage bearing on the λογος from Epimomis, p. 986, which Euseb. Præp. evang. xi. 16. pretends to quote from Epimenides, given by De Wette, biblische Dogmatik § 157. Comp. Tennemann, das platonische Philosophen vom göttlichen Verstande, in Paulus Memorabilien Stück i. and in his System der platonischen Philosophy, vol. iii. p. 149 flwg. 174 flwg. and Böckh, über die Bildung der Weltseele im Timæus des Plato (in Daub und Creuzer's Studien, vol. iii. p. 1 flwg.) [Burton, l. c. Lect. vii. and note 90 in particular.]

(2) The oldest form of revelation which we find in the Old Test. is the direct Theophany, which however could suffice only for the age of childhood. In later times God speaks to his people in general, or to individuals sometimes by angels, sometimes by human mediators (Moses and the prophets.) But the intercourse of God with the prophets is carried on by the medium of the word of the Lord, Λόγος, which descends upon them. This λογος (ῥήμα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦ πατρός) is poetically personified in several places; Ps. cxlvii. 15; Is. lv. 11; in an in-
ferior degree, Ps. xxxiii. 4; cxix. 89, 104, 105: Is. xl. 8; Jer. xxiii. 29; comp. Lücke, l. c. p. 215. 216. Like the word, so the wisdom of God (Sophia) is personified: Job xxviii. 12—28, and in very significant terms, Prov. ch. viii. and ix. On (Prov. viii. 22.) and the signification of ἡ γnosis (viii. 30.) comp. Umbreit’s Comment p. 102. 106; on the personification of wisdom in the apocryphal writings (Sir. i. 4. 24; Baruch iii. 15 flwg. iv. 1; Wisdom, vi. 22 to ch. ix.) see Lücke, l. c. p. 221 flwg. and Bretschneider, systematische Darstellung der Dogmatik der Apokryphen. Leipsig 1805. p. 191 flwg. The strongest example of personification is in the Book of Wisdom, so that it is difficult to define exactly the distinction between personification and the hypostasis, properly so called, especially ch. vii. 22, flwg. On the relation of this hypostasis to that of Philo vide Lücke, l. c.

 Plato distinguishes the simple ὁ λόγος from the λόγος τοῦ ὑποτεύχην, which is superior to the δύναμις, λόγος, ἀγγελικόν. This Logos of Philo is also called ὁ ὅμοιος Ὁ λόγος, or simply Ὁ λόγος, but without the article; υἱὸς προσβάσεως, υἱὸς μονογενῆς, εἰκὼν τοῦ Ὁ λόγου, ἀρχή τοῦ Ὁ λόγου, σοφία, ἰσισθήμια τοῦ Ὁ λόγου. God created the world by the Logos, he is the mediator between God and men, the ταξιαλλότερος ἀγγελικός. Comp. the passages in De Wette, biblische Dogmatik, § 156. Dahne, p. 202 flwg. Bretschneider, l. c. p. 267. Lücke, Comment. zum Joh. i. p. 243. “Philo did not invent and first propagate either the doctrine of the Logos, or the Jewish gnosis in general. But his merit or demerit in their further development and spread, especially in the Greek language, cannot be denied.” [Burton, l. c. Lect. vii. p. 215. and note 9:1.]


§ 41.

b. The Christian doctrine of the Logos, as represented in the writings of John.

Christianity gave a new aspect to the doctrine of the
Logos; formerly it had been a purely speculative question, now it gained a practical, religious significance.\(^{(1)}\)

The evangelist John, in accordance with the spirit of the doctrine of Paul,\(^{(2)}\) though differing from him in the use of certain expressions, applied the term Logos to the incarnation of the Deity in Christ. This Logos was no longer a mere abstract idea, but the realization of a great religious truth being founded on a historical fact; in this manner it became the proper spring of all Christian theology.

\(^{(1)}\) It is true that Philo himself made use of the idea of the Logos for practical, religious purposes, inasmuch as he accommodated it to the Jewish religion by connecting it with the previously existing notions concerning the Messiah. But this connection was nevertheless very loose, and the idea of the Messiah itself was altogether abstract, and not historically realized by the Jews. On the contrary, both the Christian idea of the Logos, and the notion of the Messiah, find their realization in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; the speculative character of the former is realized in his Divine nature, the rational aspect of the latter in his humanity, (ο λόγος σαζέ ἐγίνετο.)

\(^{(2)}\) Though the term λόγος does not occur in the writings of Paul in the sense in which it is understood by John, yet the idea of the Divine pre-existence of Christ is clearly expressed by him, especially Col. i. 15—17; ii. 9. Similar expressions are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 4 f\\w. (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 47; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 29.)

\(\S\) 42.

c. The Theologumenon of the Church concerning the Logos to the times of Origen.

[Burton, E., Testimonies of the Anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, etc. (Works, ii.)]

But this practical aspect of the doctrine of the Logos was not long preserved in its original form and purity.
Even among the earlier Christians speculative notions were mixed up with it, which owed their existence to the peculiar circumstances of the age, and were strengthened by the infusion of foreign elements. Those heretics who adhered more closely to Judaism (the Ebionites), no less than the Alogi, Theodotus and Artemon, abstained most from speculations of this nature, inasmuch as they rejected the substance of the Christian gnosis, the doctrine of the Logos, by denying the divinity of Christ. The theory of the Logos was likewise abandoned by the other section of the Monarchians, Praxeas, Noetus, and Beryllus, who did away with the distinction between God the Father and the Logos, without however denying that God is in Christ. The Gnostics on the contrary connected the idea of the Logos with their fanciful doctrine of emanation and of aeons, and leaving the only safe foundation of historical truth, lost themselves in mythological speculations. Thus it became incumbent upon the Fathers to defend the speculative element in opposition to the former class of heretics, the historical in opposition to the latter, and to bring both these elements to bear upon the practico-religious interests of the church. Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus and Clement of Alexandria endeavoured to explain the existence of the Logos, and his relation to the Father, by the aid of figures and analogies which they borrowed from the visible world and the nature of man. Tertullian found himself compelled to adopt similar modes of expression, but Irenæus, who was unfavourable to all gnosis, decidedly opposed them.

(1) Compare § 23. n. 1. § 25. n. 2. and 3. The orthodox church did not separate the idea of the Logos from that of the Messiah, but the doctrinal tendency of the Ebionites, as well as of the Gnostics, took a partial direction. The former by adopting the notion of the Messiah alone, lost sight of the spiritual
import of the doctrine of the Logos; the reverse was the case with the Gnostics, who held a mere idea without substance, a shadow without body. Concerning Artemon, whose opinions rank him among the Monarchians, Schleiermacher (über die sabellianische und athanasische Vorstellung) observes, that he appears to him to have retained the doctrine of the unity of God with more seriousness, and greater desire to promote the interests of religion, than the more frivolous Theodotus; vide Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, iii. p. 303. 304. He there shows also the difference between this tendency, and that of Praxeas and Noëtus, already alluded to, § 25. 4. Comp. also § 46. 3. [Burton, l. c. Lect. viii. p. 247—249, and notes 100, 101.]

(" Even if we look merely at numbers, we perceive a considerable difference between the catholic doctrine of the Logos, and the views entertained by the Gnostic sects. Before the doctrine of the Trinity was farther developed, the Logos was considered by the orthodox church to be the only hypostasis; the Gnostics imagined heaven to be inhabited by a multitude of aeons. According to Basilides there were 365 heavens (οὐρανοί) the lowest of which is under the immediate superintendence of the ἀρχων, the God of the Jews, and the creator of the world. He assigned to the Logos an intermediate position between the Supreme God and the νοῦς, and taught that he emanated from the latter. Further emanations of the νοῦς were the φύσις, σοφία, δύναμις, δικαιοσύνη and εἰρήνη, and these five aeons together with the other two, νοῦς and λόγος, in all seven, formed along with the νεός ἄγγελος (ἀνωτέρωστος) the first ἄγγελος.—Still more ingenious is the system of Valentine. [He asserted that from the great first cause (primitive existence, βύθος, προτάτως, προαίρητος) successively emanated male and female aeons (νοῦς or μονογένης and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ζωή, ἀλήθειαν and ἰδίκησις, etc.) so that 30 aeons (divided into the ἄγγελος, ἀρχαῖς and ἀναρχαῖς) form the κλήρωμα. The vehement desire of the last of the aeons, the σοφία, to unite herself with the βύθος, gave existence to an immature being (ἡ κάρα σοφία, ἰδίκησις, ἀχαμωθ) which wandering outside the pleroma, imparted life to matter, and formed the δημιουργός who afterwards created the world. In order to restore the harmony of the pleroma, the two new aeons, χριστός and τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον were made; and last of all ἡσυχία (σωφρος) emanated from all the aeons, and as the future σύμφωνας of the achamoth was appointed.

(3) Justin follows Philo to a great extent, with this difference only, that he identifies the Logos by whom God has created the world, and manifested himself, with his incarnate Son, even Christ Jesus. Comp. Apol. ii. 6: ο δὲ υἱὸς ἦς εἰκὼν (Θεοῦ), ὁ μός λογὸς κυρίως υἱός, ο λόγος πρὸ τῶν σπειμάτων, καὶ συνών καὶ γεννώνων, οτι τὴν ἁγίην δὲ αυτοῦ πάντα ἐκτισε καὶ ἐκόμησεν. Χριστὸς μὲν κατὰ τό κυριακὸν καὶ παμπόδια τὰ πάντα δὲ αυτοῦ τὸ Θεῖον, λέγεται οὐκομα καὶ αὐτὸς περίχου ἀγνώστον σημασίαι ἐν τῷ θέσῃ καὶ τῷ Θεὶς προαγάζεσαι οὐκ ὑπάρχουσα ἀλλὰ σφάγματος θεωτῆς ἐμφανοῦς τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. Ἰκανοὶ δὲ καὶ αἰνετῶν καὶ σωτήρας ὁμα καὶ σημασίαι Ἰησοῦς, he then proceeds to the incarnation itself. Justin represents the generation of the Logos as προέχωμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός, as γενεάθαι, προβάλλεθαι, and adduces several illustrations in support of his views. (Thus man utters words without sustaining any loss; fire kindles fire without undergoing any diminution, etc.) The addition ἀλλὰ οὐ τοιοῦτον is not genuine, see the note in the edition of Maran: Si quis tamen retineat hæc verba, scribenda sunt cum interrogationis nota, ut in edit. Lond.

(4) Tatian contra Græc. c. 5, uses illustrations similar to those of Justin. The Logos was imminent (ὑπόστησις) in the Father, but derived his existence (προοπάθῃ) from his will, and became thus ἐγενεν πρωτόποτον of the Father, ἁγίητο τοῦ κόσμου. He is begotten κατὰ μεριμνῶν, not κατὰ ἀποσκοπῆν.

(5) Athen. Leg. c. 10. calls the Son of God (in opposition to the sons of the heathen gods) λόγος τοῦ πατρός ἐν ιδίῳ καὶ ἐνιγγεῖα: παρὰ αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἑγένετο, ἰδὲ ὄντος τοῦ πατρός καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. The distinction between ἰδίῳ and ἐν ἐνιγγεῖᾳ corresponds to that between λόγος ἐναδίδοτος and λόγος προφορικῆς in the following note.

(6) Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 10. treats most fully on the procession of the Logos from God: ἵκων οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐναδίδοτον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχνοις, ἑγένετο αὐτῷ μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξηρωξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ἁλών. Likewise c. 22: σοῦ ὄς ἐν τω και καὶ μεθοῆρα καὶ λύγους ὑσῶς Θεῖος ἐν κυνομαίοις γεννημένος, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀλήθεια ἐκήρυξεν τὸν λόγον, τὸν ὀντα ἀναπτυκτος ἐναδίδοτον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. σοῦ γὰρ τι γείνεται, τούτων ἑκεί σώματοι, ἑαυτοῦ τοῖς καὶ σφόνευν ὄντα ὀπότι δὲ ἐδίδησεν ὁ Θεὸς ποιήσαι δὺς
In the writings of Clement the doctrine of the Logos forms the central point of his whole system of theology, and the mainspring of his religious feelings and sentiments. Without the Logos there is neither light, nor life. (Coh. p. 87.) He is the Divine instructor. (Pseudep. iii. 12. Pæd. iii. 12. p. 310: Πάντα ο λόγος καὶ ταύτα καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παιδαγωγεῖ ἵππος ἀγίας χαλκός καὶ ταύτας ἀγιάς ἤπειρος Ἕφεσι βρόχων ἀλήθειαν ὥσπερ ὁ ἄλλος μικρότερος μεγαλαύσαται λόγοι ὁ Ἑσία τιθεσθεῖται καὶ θητῶν διήλωσεν καὶ σιτῶν παρασκευάσεται κ.τ.λ. Comp. the beautiful hymn ὑς τὸν παιδαγωγὸν at the end of his work. [Bennett, l. c. app. K. p. 268, where both the original and an English translation are given.]

God has created the world by the Logos; yea the Logos is the creator himself (ὁ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἀκτήλων δημοσιογόνος), he has given the law, inspired the prophets, through him God has manifested himself. Pæd. i. 7. p. 132—134. ii. 8. p. 215. ii. 10. p. 224. 229. iii. 3. p. 264. iii. 4. p. 269. comp. p. 273. 280. 293. 297. 307. Strom. i. 23. p. 421. 422. vii. i. p. 833. In his view (and the same opinion was held by Philo) the Logos is the ἀγαθός. Strom. ii. 9. p. 433. 500. He is the image (πρόσωπον) of God, by means of which God is perceived. Pæd. i. 7. p. 132. The Logos is superior to men and angels, but subordinate to the Father; principal passage: Strom. vii. 2. p. 831. On earth the righteous man is the most excellent being; in heaven the angels, because they are yet purer and more perfect.

The true knowledge of the Logos is the privilege of the true Gnostic.) Divine worship is due to the Logos, vii. 7. p. 851. quis div. salv. p. 956. [Comp. Bennett, l. c. p. 123—126. Bur-
On the mode of generation Clement speaks less explicitly than the before mentioned writers. He also holds along with the concrete idea of the individuality of the Logos another notion of a more general import, according to which the Logos is identical with the higher spiritual life, the life of ideas in general, by which the world was moved even previous to the coming of Christ. Comp. Strom. v. p. 654. Accordingly he who studies the writings of Clement merely for the purpose of deducing a strictly doctrinal system, will not be satisfied, and like Münscber (Handbuch, i. p. 418.) he will see in the passages bearing upon this subject "nothing but declamatory expressions from which no definite idea can be derived." On the contrary, he who takes a general view of his religious opinions might feel more inclined to adopt the language of Möhler, that Clement "has treated the dogma concerning the Logos with greater clearness than all the other Fathers of this period, but especially with unusual depth of feeling and the most ardent enthusiasm." (Patrologie, p. 460. 61.)

Tert. adv. Prax. c. 2: Nos unicum quidem Dcum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam csconomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et filius scrmno ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil. c. 5: ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundus et locus et omnia. Solus autem, quia nihil alius extrinsecus præter illum. Ceterum ne tune quidem solus: habebat enim secum quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet, etc. c. 8: Protulit enim Deum sermonem sicut radicum fruticum et fons fluvium et sol radium; nam et iste species probeae sunt earum substantiarum, ex quibus prodeunt. In c. 9. the Son is called portio of the Father. Comp. Neander's Antigruosticus, p. 476 flwg. [Burton, l. c. p. 235 flwg.]

Iren. advers. här. ii. 28. p. 158: Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo filius prolatus a patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolacionem istam sive generationem sive nuncupationem sive adaptionem aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit, non Valentinus, non Marcion, neque Saturninus, neque Basilides, neque Angeli, neque Archangeli, neque Principes, neque Potestates, nisi solus qui generavit Pater et qui natus est Filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus quam sit, quicunque nituntur generationes et prolationes enarrare, non sunt compotes sui, ea, quæ
idenarrabilia sunt enarrare promittentes. Quoniam enim ex
cogitatione et sensu verbum emittitur, hoc utique omnes sciunt
homines. Non ergo magnum quid invenerunt, qui emissiones
excogitaverunt, neque absconditum mysterium, si id quod ab
omnibus intelligitur, transtulerunt in unigenitum Dei verbum, et
quem inenarrabilem et innominabilem vocant, hunc, quasi ipsi
obstetricaverint, primæ generationis ejus prolationem et gene-
rationem enuntiant, adsimilantes eum hominum verbo emissionis
(scilicet λόγῳ προφορικῷ.) On the doctrine of Irenæus concerning
the Logos, comp. ii. 13. ii. 17. iii. 6. iv. 6. and other passages.
Mohler, Patrologie, p. 357 flwg. Münscher, Handbuch, i. p. 411
flwg. [Burton, l. c. pp. 75. 77. 102. etc.]

§ 43.

d. Identification of the terms Logos and the Son of God
by Origen.

[Burton, E., Testimonies of the Antin. Fath. etc. p. 281—348.]

The idea which the earlier Fathers were accustomed
to attach to the term: "Logos," was more or less inde
finite; some understood by it a real personality (the pre-
existence of Christ), others took it in an abstract sense,
.idea, reason, word, revelation, wisdom, Divine life,
etc.) Accordingly Origen preferred deviating from
the common usage,(2) and employing more uniformly
than the former writers, the expression "Son of God;"(3)
by which the idea of personality was much more distinct-
ly set forth. But this led to new controversies, inasmuch
as many either differed from him, or misunderstood his
language.(4)

(1) Comp. what has been said in the preceding §. n. 6. con-
cerning Clement, and Pæd. i. 157: Ταύτης ἄν καὶ Σωτῆς ὁ Λόγος κύκληται,
ὁ τά λογικά ταύτα ἰξυσσών ἁδράκως εἰς εὐαίσθησιν καὶ σωτηρίαν φάρμακα.
(2) Orig. i. Tom. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 22 flwg. Comp. Schnitzer
p. 23 flwg.
(3) Concerning the Son of God Origen makes the same asser-
tions which former writers made with regard to the Logos. In his opinion the Son is the medium by which the world was created, Tom. i. in Joh. Opp. Tom. iv. p. 21. As the architect builds a house, or a vessel according to his ideas, so God created the world according to the ideas which are contained in wisdom. Comp. in Joh. Tom. xxxii. c. 18. ib. p. 449. But by this wisdom he does not understand a mere attribute or a personification of God, but a  ἰδιότητις. This view is farther developed de princ. i. 2. Opp. i. p. 53. God never existed without the Wisdom (the Son); for to maintain the contrary, would virtually amount to the assertion, that God either could not create, or would not create, either of which is absurd and impious. But the Son is not only the Wisdom, he is also the word, the image, the mirror, the brightness of God (ἡγεμωνία.) Origen too resorts to illustrations. Thus he compares God and his Son with the sun and its beams, and again with a statue and a copy of it on a reduced scale; he refers however this latter comparison to God’s incarnate Son (the man Jesus), rather than to his eternal Son (the Logos.) In respect to the act of generation, the expression “Son” is much more calculated to remind us of human analogies, than the more indefinite term “Word.” It became therefore the more necessary to oppose all anthropomorphic notions, on which account he says: Infandum autem est et illicitum, Deum patrem in generatione unigeniti Filii sui atque in substantia ejus ex æquore aliqui vel hominum vel aliorum animantium generanti, etc. and again: Observandum namque est ne quis incurrat in illas absurdas fabulas eorum, qui prolaciones quasdam sibi ipsis depingunt, ut divinam naturam in partes voce, et Deum patrem quantum in se est dividant, cum hoc de incorporea natura vel leviter suspicari, non solum extreme impetiatis sit, verum etiam ultimæ insipientiæ, nec omnino ad intelligentiam consequens, ut incorporeæ naturæ substantialis divisio possit intelligi. “The will of man proceeds from his reason, but the one cannot be separated from the other; in a similar manner we may imagine that the Son proceeds from the Father, but both are inseparable.” (This illustration, though more abstract, is less vivid than that taken from the human word, § 42. n. 3.)

(4) On the one hand the subordination of the Son to the Father was the necessary consequence of a rigid adherence to the idea of a hypostasis, (comp. § 45.) On the other the scriptural
expression ὁ τῶν Ἰησοῦ, which is applied to Christ in his human nature i. e. as the Messiah," was so confounded with the same term as used by the schoolmen, that the human and the Divine natures of the Son of God were not always distinctly separated. This gave rise to new controversies; comp. however Thomasius p. 112 flwg. and Dorner Christologie, p. 42. He thinks that the doctrine of subordination was merely resorted to, "for the purpose of substituting several Divine hypostases for the very vague and indefinite opinions which were entertained respecting the distinctive characteristics of the different persons in the Godhead."

§ 44.

THE HOLY GHOST.

The idea of the πνευμα ἁγίου is found along with that of the Logos, and frequently identified with the term Wisdom (which elsewhere denotes the Logos.) Sometimes what is determined concerning the Logos, coincides with what is said relative to the Spirit; sometimes the idea of personality is more or less lost sight of, and the Holy Ghost appears as a mere quality, or a Divine gift and effect. But the desire of bringing the doctrine of the Trinity to a conclusion, led gradually to more definite views on the personality of the Holy Ghost (along with that of the Logos.)

(1) Theoph. ad Autol. i. 7.: ὅ δέ ἢ ἢ ἢ διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σο-

* "The more I endeavour to realize the manner of thinking and speaking current in the New Testament, the more I feel myself called upon to give it as my decided opinion, that the historical Son of God as such cannot be called God, without completely destroying the monotheistical system of the Apostles," Lücke, Studien und Kritiken, 1840. i. p. 91.
five is synonymous with λόγος, or forms the second member; in the former case there would be no mention of the Spirit whatever; in the latter he would be identical with σοφία; and this agrees better with ii. 15., where ὁ θεός, λογίς and σοφία are said to compose the Trinity, comp. § 45. Iren. iv. 20. p. 253.: Adest enim ei (Deo) semper verbum et sapientia, Filius et Spiritus . . . ad quos et loquitur, dicens: faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; and again: Deus omnia verbo fecit et sapientia adornavit. [Burton, l. c. p. 49—51.] comp. iv. 7. p. 236.: Ministrat enim ei ad omnia sua progenies et figuratio sua, i. e. Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, verbum et sapientia, quibus servivint et subjecti sunt omnes angelii. Irenæus however is well acquainted with the practical importance of the doctrine of the τοιμα όγιον, and represents it in a plain, scriptural manner; the believer comes through the Spirit to the Son, through the Son to the Father, and more generally to the full apprehension of the truth as it is in Christ; iii. 17. p. 208. iii. 24. p. 222. v. 6. p. 299. v. 10. p. 304 and elsewhere (comp. the doctrine of the church.) Tert. adv. Prax. c. 6.: Nam ut primum Deus voluit ea quae cum Sophiae ratione et sermone disposuerat intra se, in substantias et species suas edere, ipsum primum protulit sermonem, habentem in se individuum suas, Rationem et Sophiam, ut per ipsum feren universa, per quem erant cogitata atque disposita, immo et facta jam, quantum in Dei sensu. Hoc enim eis decerat, ut coram quoque in suis speciebus atque substantiis cognoscencetur et teneretur. Comp. cap. 7. and de orat. i. ab initio, where it is difficult to perceive any difference between the terms Dei Spiritus, Dei sermo, Dei ratio, etc.

(2) Justin M. Apol. i. 33: το την γενεσί τη πρεσβίον τη παιδί τού θεού υἱόν εστὶ. Theoph. lib. ii. c. 10: οὗτος (ὁ λόγος) ὁ τοιμα θεοῦ και ἁγιά και σοφία και δύναμις ὑψίστου ν. τ. λ. But immediately afterwards σοφία and λόγος are connected by the particle καί, and it is doubtful, whether καί is to be taken there as a strictly speculative conjunction. It is true that the word τοιμα has in these passages a more general signification (spiritual being,) which the writer could ascribe alike to the Logos, without destroying the personality of the Holy Ghost; yet it must be admitted that there is much in this mode of expression that is indefinite and vague.
DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

§ 45.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

[Burton, E., Testimonies of the Antin. Fath. to the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, (Works, ii.) Berrimann, W., An Historical Account of the Controversies that have been in the Church concerning the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity, in eight Sermons. Lond. 1725.]

The doctrine of God the Father, God the Son, and
God the Holy Ghost, is the doctrine of primitive Christianity, but has in the New Test. a bearing only upon the Christian economy, without any pretension to speculative significance, and therefore cannot be rightly understood but in intimate connection with the history of Jesus, and the work which he accomplished. Accordingly the belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was considered as an essential part of the regula fidei, even apart from every speculative development of the doctrine of the Logos, and appears in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed in this historico-epic form without any further allusion to the unity of the Deity. The Greek word τριάς was first used by Theophilus; the Latin term trinitas, which has a more comprehensive doctrinal import, was introduced by Tertullian.

(1) Matth. xxviii. 19. (if the baptismal formula be genuine); 1 Cor. xii. 4—6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14. and elsewhere. Comp. the commentaries on these passages, de Wette's biblische Dogmatik, § 238. 267., Lücke in the Studien und Kritiken, l. c. [Pye Smith, the Script. Testim. of the Messiah, iii. p. 13 flw.; iii. p. 258 flw.; Knüppp, l. c. p. 119 flw. 132 flw.]

(2) Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 15: ιν τριάς ημέρας [τριάς] τῶν φωστήρων γεγονομένων, τῷ ιειν τῆς τρία Δός τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ. τιτάρτην δὲ τύπων [τύπων] ιστίν ἀληθώς αὐτοῦ πρόσδεσθε τοῦ φωτίς, ἡ πρὸς τοὺς λόγος, σοφία, αληθώς. Here we have indeed the word τριάς, but not in the ecclesiastical sense of the term Trinity; for as ἀληθώς is mentioned in the fourth place, it is evident that the τριάς cannot be taken here as a perfect whole consisting of three persons joined into one; besides the term σοφία is used instead of τῷ συμμα δύνα ἀγ. Comp. Suicer, thesaurus s. v. τριάς, where the passage from the (spurious) treatise of Justin de expositione fidei, p. 379. is cited (Μοιάς γὰρ ἐν τριάδι νοιταί καὶ τριάς ἐν μοιάδι γνωσίζεται x. τ. λ.); this passage however proves as little concerning the use of language during that period, as the treatise φιλόσοφως erroneously ascribed to Lucian. Clem. Strom. iv. 7. p. 588. knows a ἁγία τριάς, but in a different sense (faith, love, hope.) On the terminology of Origen, con p. Thomasius, p. 285. [Comp.
MONARCHIANISM AND SUBORDINATION.

Burton, l. c. p. 34—36, where the subject is treated at great length.]


§ 46.

MONARCHIANISM AND SUBORDINATION.

The strict distinction which was drawn between the persons in the Trinity, led in the first instance to the system of subordination, according to which the Son was thought inferior to the Father, and the Holy Spirit inferior to both the Father and the Son.(1) Such a classification gave some ground to the charge of Tritheism which was frequently made against the orthodox.(2) Accordingly they were compelled to clear themselves from all appearance of Tritheism in opposition to the Monarchians, who abandoning the said distinction, in order to hold fast the unity of the Godhead, exposed themselves to the charge of confounding the persons (Patriformism), or the imputation of that heretical tendency which denies the Divinity of Christ.(3) Origen endeavouring to define the nature of the persons, and to determine the exact relation which they maintain to each other, went to the other extreme; (4) orthodoxy was so much extended that it became heterodoxy, and thus gave rise to the Arian controversy in the following period.

(1) Justin M. Apol. i. c. 13: ως αυτω τω ις ος θεω μαθωντες (scil. τω Ιησους Χριστω) και εν δυστα χως εκεντες, πειηα τε σφοηικιν εν τινη ταξει—Tert. advers. Prax. c. 2: Tres autem non etat, sed
gradu, nec substantia, sed forma, nec potestate, sed specie: unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formae et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur. Comp. c. 4.

(5) Justin M. says, dial. cum Tryph. c. 56: The Father and the Son are distinct, not γνώμη, but ἀρίθμω; and from the proposition that, if I have a wife, it does not necessarily follow that I am the wife herself, Tertullian (adv. Prax. c. 10.) draws the conclusion, that, if God has a Son, it does not necessarily follow that he is the Son himself. Comp. also Novat. de trin. 22: Unum enim, non unus esse dicitur, quoniam nec ad numerum referunt, sed ad societatem alterius expromitur....Unum autem quod ait, ad concordiam et eandem sentientiam et ad ipsum caritas in societatem pertinet, ut merito unum sit pater et filius per concordiam et per amorem et per dilectionem. [Burton, L. c. p. 120. 121.] He also appeals to Apollos and Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 8: qui autem plantat et qui rigat, unum sunt.

(6) Concerning the different classes of Unitarians comp. § 24. n. 4 and 5. and § 42. It is self-evident, that all who held Christ to be a mere man, also rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. They may be called deistico-rationalistic Antitrinitarians: God in his abstract unity was in their view so remote from the world, and confined to his heaven, that he had no abode in Christ himself. They differ widely from those who, apprehensive of lessening the dignity of Christ, taught that God himself had assumed humanity in him, and did not think it necessary to suppose the existence of a particular hypostasis. The name modalistic Antitrinitarians would be more appropriate in their case (so Heinichen, de Alogis, p. 34); or if the relation of God to Christ be compared to that in which he stands to the world, they might be called pantheistic Antitrinitarians, for they imagined God, as it were, expanded or extended in the person of Christ. Among their number are Praxias and Beryllus, the forerunners of Sabellius, the former of whom was combated by Tertullian, the latter by Origen. The opinion of Praxias that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one and the same (ipsum eundemque esse) which virtually amounted to the later ὅμοονουσιος, was so interpreted by Tertullian, ipsum patrum passum esse, adv. Prax. c. 20. 29. whence the heretical appellation Patripassiani. [Burton, Bampton Lecture, note 103. p. 588. and Testim. of the Antinic. Fath. to the Trinity, etc. p. 68—83.
MONARCHIANISM AND SUBORDINATION.

Neander, l. c. ii. p. 260—262.] Philaстр. Hær. 65. The views of Noetus were similar, Theod. Fab. Hær. iii. 3: ἵνα φασίν ἐναι Κυρίῳ καὶ πατέραν, τοῖς ὅλως δημιουργοῦν· ἀφαίρει μήν ὅσαν Ἰησῖ, φαινόμενον δὲ ἵνα αὐτὸς διδάσχαι καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀδότατον εἶναι καὶ ἀξιωμάτως, καὶ τεθητεν καὶ ἁγιοτεν ἁγίοτητος μὴν ἵνα ἡκατέρα, γεγονὼς δὲ ὅτι ἐξ των ταυτίων γεγονήσῃ ἡμίλεως· ἀπαθὴ καὶ ἀδύατον, καὶ τάλιν αὐτὸν ταυτίνως καὶ ζητητον. ἀπαθής γὰρ ὅ, τι οὗ τοῦ σωμάτου πάθος ἐκλίποις ὑπόμενοι τοῦτον καὶ ὅσα δομάζουσιν καὶ πατέρα, σεῖς τέσσερας τοῦτο κάθειν καλοῦμεν. Comp. Epiph. Hær. vii. 1. [Burton, Bampton Lecture, note 103. p. 589, 590.] Beryllus endeavoured to evade the inferences which may be drawn alike from Patrissianism and from Pantheism, by admitting a difference after the assumption of humanity, Euseb. vi. 33: Βῆσθηλίου δὲ μικρὰς σχέσεως διδακτίως Βοστίων τῆς Αραβίας ἱδίαιτες τοις ἐκκλησιαστικῶς συμπερίστεροις κανόνες, ξενία τέκνα τῆς σύστησις συμφέρειν ἐπειδήκτου, τοῦ σωμάτου καὶ πάθους ἡμῶν λίγον τολμᾶν μὴ προ θεοστα- 

iat κατ' ἑδίαν ὑπόδεις περιγραφήν πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτού ἑπιδημίας 

μηδὲ μην εὐτέτατα ἑδίαν ἐχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐμπολεμευομένην αὐτῷ μόνην 

τῆς σαρκείας. Comp. Ullmann in the dissert. quoted § 24. 5.

(4) Comp. § 43. and contra Cels. viii. 1. also in Joh. Tom. ii. 2. Opp. T. iv. p. 50. where the distinction made by Philo between Ἰησοῦς and Ὁ Ἰησοῦς is insisted upon. How far this system of subordination was sometimes carried, may be seen from Origen de orat. c. 15. Opp. T. i. 222. where he entirely rejects the practice of prayer to Christ (the Son;) for, he argues, since the Son is a particular hypostasis, we must pray either to the Son only, or to the Father only, or to both. To pray to the Son, and not to the Father, would be most improper (ἀτοπώστατον); to pray to both, is impossible, because we should have to use the plural number: σαραγχίσθη, ἡμιεγκνησθησαί, ἡμιεχθεορμησαί, σώσατε, that which is contrary to Scripture, and the doctrine of One God: thus nothing remains but to pray to the Father alone. To pray to the Father through the Son, a prayer in an improper sense (invocatio?) is quite a different thing; contra Cels. v. 4. Opp. i. p. 579: τὸ σαν ἐν ἑν Μάρια καὶ συστοιχίαν καὶ ἐνυπηρετείας ἀναπεμφτον τῷ ἐν τῷ δικαίω τῳ ἐν τῷ πάντων ἐγγέλων συστοιχίως, ἐμφάνως λόγω καὶ Θεῷ. μηρόμενον καὶ ἀνωτέρω τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ ἐνυπηρετείας καὶ σοφοτεχνομία δι, οὔτε δοκομία καταρχείον τῆς σοφοτεχνομίας καταρχεσίων (si modo propriam precatonis possumus ab improperia sccernere notionem.) It is however remarkable that no mention is made of the Holy Spirit. If Origen had held the doctrine of the Trinity, he would have spoken not
of two, but of three, to whom prayers are to be addressed. On the subordination of the Holy Spirit, comp. § 44. 4.

§ 47.

DOCTRINE OF THE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

C. F. Rössler, Philosophia veteris ecclesiae de mundo, Tubingae 1783. 4. [Knapp, Lectures on Christ. Theology, transl. by L. Woods, p. 144—146.]

Concerning this doctrine, as well as the doctrine of God in general, the early Christians adopted the Monotheistic views of the Jews, and in the simple exercise of faith received the Mosaic account of the creation (Gen. i.) as Divine revelation. Even the definition ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς ὁ κόσμον which was not introduced into the Jewish theology until afterwards (2 Macc. vii. 28.) found its way into primitive Christianity. The orthodox firmly adhered to the doctrine that God, the Almighty Father, who is also the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, is at the same time the creator of heaven and of earth, and rejected the notion of eternal matter. They did this in opposition to the Gnostics, according to whom the creator of the world was distinct from the Supreme God, as well as to the assertion made by some of them and also by Hermogenes, that matter has existed from everlasting. But the speculative tendency of the Alexandrian school could not be satisfied with the notion of the creation having taken place in time. Accordingly Origen resorted to an allegorical interpretation of the work of the six days (Hexaemeron), and following the example of Clement (which however is doubtful, and to say the least, betrays indecision) he propounded the doctrine of an eternal creation in still more definite terms than Clement. But he did not maintain the eternity of matter as an independent power. On the contrary, Irenæus from his practical position reckoned all questions
about what God had done before the creation among the improper questions of human inquisitiveness. (8)

(1) Comp. Hebr. xi. 3. and the commentaries upon that passage. Accordingly the Shepherd of Hermas teaches, Lib. ii. Mand. 1: "πρὸ τοῦ πάντων πίστεως, ὅτι εἰς ἰστιν ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ ὅ τα πάντα κρίσεις καὶ καταργίσεις, καὶ οὐκ ἴσως ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ ἐναι τὰ πάντα, conf. Euseb. v. 8.

(2) The popular view was always, that the Father is the creator, though the creation through the Son formed a part of the orthodox faith. Clement of Alex. was only induced by his speculative tendency to call the Logos himself the creator of the world (vide § 42. n. 7.) Compare on the other hand the simple confession of Iren. iii. 11. p. 189: "Et hæc quidem sunt principia Evangelii, unum Deum fabricatorem hujus universitatis, cum qui et per prophetas sit annunciatus et qui per Moysem legis dispositionem fecerit, Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi annunciantia et praeter hunc alterum Deum nescientia, neque alterum patrem. For the various appellations τοποθητικον, κρίσις, διαμορφωθας, v. Suicer under the last mentioned word. [Burton, Bampton Lect. note 21. p. 320; n. 50. p. 410.]

(3) Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 4. says against the followers of Plato: "ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἀγάνητος καὶ ἄλη ἀγινητος, οὐκ ἐστι ο Θεὸς ποιητής τῶν ἐλλων ἐστ. Comp. Iren. fragm. sermonis ad Demetr. p. 348. [Comp. Burton, l. c. note 18.] Tert. adv. Hermogenem, espec. c. i. and Nèander Antignosticus, l. c. In reference to the objections of Hermogenes, he admits that the different names of God: Sovereign, Judge, Father, etc. are not eternal, but coeval with the subjects of dominion, etc. Yet God himself is not the less eternal.

(4) Hermogenes, a painter, lived towards the conclusion of the second century, probably at Carthage. According to Tertullian (adv. Hermog.) he maintained that God has created the world either out of himself, or out of nothing, or out of something already in existence. But he could not create the world out of himself, for he is indivisible; nor out of nothing, for as he himself is the supreme good, he would have created a perfectly good world; nothing therefore remains but that he has created the world out of matter already in existence. This matter (ὅλη) is consequently eternal like God himself; both principles were
distinctly separate from each other from the beginning, God as the creating and imparting, matter as the receiving principle. Whatever part of this matter resists the creating principle, constitutes the evil in the world. But it was only in this point that Hermogenes agreed with the Gnostics; in other respects, and especially in reference to the doctrine of emanation, he joined the orthodox in opposing them. Comp. Böhmer (Guil.) de Hermogene Africano, Sundiae 1832. and Neander, Kirchengeschichte, i. 3. p. 974 flwg. [transl. ii. p. 249—251.] Antignosticus, p. 350—355; 424—442.


(b) According to Photius Bibl. Cod. c. 9. p. 89. Clement of Alex. is said to have taught that matter had no beginning (οὐκ ἔχειν); with this statement comp. Strom. vi. 16. p. 812. 813: οὔτων ὅς τοις ὑπολαμβάνοις τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ Ζεύς πάσαιται ταῦτα ὁ Ζεύς ἄγαθός γὰς, ἵδε τούτων ὡς ἵδε τῶν ἀγαθωτών, καὶ τοῦ Ζεύς ἄντων αὐτῶν. But in other passages Clement most distinctly acknowledges that the world is a work of God; e. g. Coh. p. 54. 55: κάθος γὰς ὃς Ζεύς ἐστιν. ἵστι καὶ κάθος ὃς ὢς ὁ Ζεύς ἄγαθος ἄντων βεβληθαί λόγος, καὶ τῷ καθος ἐστίν θεοῦ καὶ φήμη θεοῦ.

(c) Origen indeed opposes the eternity of matter (in the heathen and heretical sense), de princ. ii. 4. and in other places, e. g. Comment. in Joh. xxxii. 9. Opp. T. iv. p. 429; but though from his idealistic position he denied eternity to matter, which he held to be the root of evil, he nevertheless assumed the eternal creation of innumerable ideal worlds, solely because he, as little as Clement, could conceive of God as unoccupied (οτίος εἰμι καὶ ἐμμόνος διεγερτα τόν θεόν, ἀμφοτερός καὶ ἀμφοτέρως.) De princ. iii. 5. Opp. T. i. p. 149. Schnitzer, p. 228. 229. It might be questioned whether Origen, in the use of the pronoun "nous" in the subsequent part of the passage, intended to enforce his own belief upon the church, or whether he employed the plural number merely in his character as author; comp. Rüssler, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, i. p. 177. and Schnitzler, B. c. Comp. also Thomasius, p. 153 flwg. 169 flwg.

(d) Iren. ii. 28. p. 157. (ii. 47. p. 175. Grabe): Ut putat, si quis interroget, antequam mundum faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicimus, quoniam ista responsio subjacet Deo. Quoniam autem
PROVIDENCE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Though the doctrine of the existence of the world for the sake of the human race only, may be so corrupted as to give rise to selfish principles, it is nevertheless founded upon the consciousness of a specific distinction between man and all other creatures, at least of this earth, and supported by allusions in the Sacred Scriptures. (1) Accordingly the primitive Christians considered the creation to be a voluntary act of Divine love, inasmuch as God does not stand in need of his creatures for the promotion of his own glory. (2) But man, being the end of creation, (3) is also pre-eminently the subject of Divine providence, and the whole vast economy of creation, with its laws and its miracles, is made subservient to the higher designs of the education of mankind. The Christian doctrine of providence which was received by the Fathers in opposition to the objections of ancient philosophy, (4) is remote on the one hand from Stoicism and the rigid dogma of a ἀμαρτία held by the Gnostics, (5) and on the other from the system of Epicurus, according to which it is unworthy of the Deity to concern himself about the affairs of man. (6) Here again the teachers of the Alexandrian school endeavoured to avoid as much as possible the use of anthropomorphitic language (7) in connexion with the idea that God takes care even of individuals, and attempted to reconcile the liberty of man (8) with the love and justice of God. (9)

(1) Matth. vi. 26; 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.
THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

(2) E. g. Clement of Alex. Paed. iii. 1. p. 250: ἄνευδες δέ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς καὶ χαίρει μάλιστα μίαν καθερευόντας ἡμᾶς ὁρῶν τῷ τῆς διανοίας κοσμῷ.


(4) See the objections of Cæcilius ap. Minucius Felix c. 5 flwg. and on the other hand the oration of Octavius, c. 17. and 18. c. 20. 32. and especially the beautiful passage, c. 33: Nec nobis de nostra frequentia blandiamur: multi nobis videmur, sed Deo admodum pauci sumus. Nos gentes nationesque distinguimus: Deo una domus est mundus hic totus. Reges tantum regnis sui per officia ministrorum universa novero: Deo indiciis non opus est; non solum in oculis ejsus, sed et in sinu vivimus. Comp. Athen. leg. c. 22. in calce.

(5) On the opinion of the Gnostic Bardesanes respecting the sīmāqumīn (fate), and the influence of stars, comp. Photius Bibl. Cod. 223. Euseb. Præp. vi. 10. Neander's gnostische Systeme, p. 198. [Neander, history of the Christ. Relig. and Church during the first three centuries, transl. by II. J. Rose, ii. p. 97: "He (Bardesanes) therefore, although like many of those who inclined to Gnosticism, he busied himself with astrology, contended against the doctrine of such an influence of the stars (sīmāqumīn) as should be supposed to settle the life and affairs of man by necessity. Eusebius in his great literary treasure house, the preparatio evangelica, has preserved a large fragment of this remarkable work; he here introduces among other things the Christians dispersed over so many countries, as an example of the absurdity of supposing that the stars irresistibly influenced the character of a people." Baur, Gnosis, p. 234. C. Kühner, astronomiae et astrologiae in doctrina Gnostic. vestigia, P. I. Bardesanis Gnostici numina australia. Hildburgh. 1833. [Comp. also Gieseler, l. c. i. § 46. n. 2. and Burton, Lect. on ecclesiast. hist. Lect. xx. p. 182—183.]

(6) Comp. especially the objections of Celsus in the work of Origen: God interferes as little with the affairs of man, as with those of monkeys and flies, etc., especially in lib. iv. Though
Celsus was not a disciple of Epicurus, as Origen and Lucian would have him to be, but rather a follower of Plato (according to Neander [Hist. of the Ch. transl. i. 166]), yet these expressions savour very much of Epicureanism. [Comp. Lardner, Works vii. 211—212.]

(7.) According to Clement there is no contrast between the whole and its parts in the sight of God, (comp. also Minuc. Fel. No. 5): 

\[\delta\nu\n
vol. i. p. 232 flwg.) Different reasons are adduced in vindication of the existence of evil in the word; thus it serves to exercise the ingenuity of man (power of invention, etc.); but he draws special attention to the connection between physical and moral imperfections, evil and sin. Comp. the opinion of Thomasius concerning the Theodicee of Origen, p. 57, 58.

§ 49.

ANGELOLOGY AND DEMONOLOGY.


The doctrine of Good and Evil Spirits forms an important appendix to the chapters on creation, providence, and the government of the world. Concerning angels the general opinion is, that they constitute a part of the whole creation; some however think that they took an active part in the work of creation, or consider them as the agents of special providence. The doctrine of Satan and demons stands in close connection with the doctrine of the existence of physical and moral evil in the world.

§ 50.

THE ANGELS.

Though the primitive church, as Origen asserts, did not establish any definite doctrine on this subject, we
Nevertheless meet with several declarations respecting the nature of angels. Thus many of the earlier Fathers rejected the notion, that they had taken part in the work of creation, and maintained, on the contrary, that they are created beings and ministering spirits. In opposition to the doctrine of emanation and of æons, they even ascribed bodies to them, which were however admitted to be composed of much finer substance than that belonging to human bodies. The idea of guardian angels was connected in part with the mythical notion of geniuses. But no traces are to be found during this period of a true worship of angels within the pale of the catholic church.

(1) De princ. proem. 10. Opp. i. p. 49: Est etiam illud in ecclesiastica prædicatione, esse angelos Dei quosdam et virtutes bonas, qui eō ministrant ad salutem hominum consummandam; sed quando isti creati sint, vel quales aut quomodo sint, non satis in manifesto designatur.

(2) Iren. i. 22. and 24. (against the opinions of Saturninus and Carpocrates) comp. ii. 2. p. 117: Si enim (Deus) mundi fabricator est, angelos ipse fecit, aut etiam causa creationis eorum ipse fuit.

Philohad already converted those angels who are individually mentioned, (e. g. the Cherubim) into Divine powers. See Dähne, p. 227 flwg. Justin M. also informs us that in his time some had compared the relation in which the angels stand to God, to that which exists between the sun and its beams; but he decidedly rejects this opinion. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 128. Comp. Tert. adv. Prax. c. 3. (in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity): Igitur si et monarchia divina per tot legiones et exercising angelorum administratur, sicut scriptum est. millies millia adisistebant ei, et millies centena millia apparebant ei: nec ideo unius esse desiiut, ut desinet monarchia esse, quia per tanta millia virtutum procuratur, etc.

Tert. de carne Christi, c. 6: In distinction from the earthly flesh of Christ they have a heavenly one, since they had not to come into the world, to suffer and to die. Tatian, Or. c. 15: Δαιμόνιοι δὲ πάντες σαρκίων μίαν οὐ κέχυκται, τειχωματικὸν δὲ ισιοί αὐτῶν ἡ σώματος, ὡς σφήνας, ὡς αἰείος. But these ethereal bodies of the angels can be perceived by those only in whom the Spirit of God dwells, not by the natural man. In comparison with other creatures they might be designated incorporeal beings, and Ignat. ad Trall. calls them δαιμόνια ψυχῆς. Clement also says Strom. vi. 7. p. 769. that they have neither ears, nor tongues, nor lips, nor entrails, nor organs of respiration, etc. Comp. Orig. princ. in provem. § 9.

This idea had already occurred in the Shepherd of Hermas, lib. ii. mand. vi. 2: Δύο εἶδον ἄγγελοι μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου του, ἵνα τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἵνα τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ ὅ μιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἄγγελος τεμπιφόρος ἢστι καὶ αἰχμαλωτιδας καὶ σφάος καὶ ἠδύχῃ. * * * Ουκ οὖν εὖτε ἵνα τὴν καρδίαν σου ἀνάβη, πιθίως λαλεῖ ματὰ τοῦ ἐφ οἰκείων, περιάγνεια, περιομικότητα καὶ περιομικότητα, καὶ περι σάτος ἐν Γενικῷ ἱδέζου. Ταῦτα ταῦτα ἦταν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου ἀνάβη, γιὰ τὸ ἄγγελον τῆς δικαιοσύνης μετὰ σου ἰσιν. τοῦτον οὐκ ἁπτίσαται καὶ τοῦ ἔχουσα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐγχειρίς αὐτοῦ γενού. Ὁρα οὖν καὶ τοῦ ἄγγελον τῆς σωτηρίας τά ἔργα. * * * Πάντων τῶν ἐξοχόλας ισιοί καὶ Σίφων καὶ ἄρων, καὶ τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ σωματεῖ καταστρέφονται τοῦ δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ. οὕνα αὐτὸς ἵνα τὴν καρδίαν σου ἀνάβη, γιὰ τὸ αὐτό ἵνα τοῦ ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (Fragm. ex doctr. ad Antioch.) We have already seen (n. 3.) that Clement—and also Origen—assigned to the angels the office of watching over provinces and towns, in accordance with the notion of individual guardian-angels; comp. Clem. Strom. v. p. 700. and vii. p. 833. and the passage quoted above from Origen.
SATAN ANDDEMONS.

Col. ii. 18. mention is made of a ἀγγέλιον which the apostle disapproves. Justin M. Apol. i. c. 6. speaks of the heavenly hosts immediately after the Son, and makes the Spirit to follow them; this arrangement might induce some persons to believe that the angels were an object of worship; but comp. the aforesaid treatise of Georgii, and Mühler Patrologie, p. 240. n. 1. The latter however finds in this passage as well as in Athen. Leg. 10. a proof of the Romish adoration of angels and saints. But Athenagoras (c. 16.) rejects this doctrine very decidedly in the following words: ὰν τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ Άνω σάγαντις ἥρθιον, ἀλλὰ τὸν πνεύμα αὐτῶν καὶ διαστήμην. Comp. Clem. Strom. vi. 5. p. 760. Orig. contra Cels. v. 4. 5. Opp. i. p. 580. and viii. 13. ib. p. 751. [Comp. Knapp, l. c. p. 190. Gieseler, i. § 99. and n. 33. *Burton, Testimonies of the Antin. Fath. to the Trinity, etc. p. 15—23. On the Gnostic worship of angels, comp. Burton, Bampton Lect. note 52.]

§ 51.

SATAN AND DEMONS.

The Bible does not represent the prince of darkness, or the wicked one (Devil, Satan) as an evil principle which existed from the beginning in opposition to a good principle; but in accordance with the doctrine of One God, it speaks of him as a creature, viz. an angel who was created by God in a state of purity and innocence, but voluntarily rebelled against his maker. This was also the view taken by the orthodox Fathers. Every thing which was opposed to the light of the gospel, and its development, physical evils as well as the numerous persecutions of the Christians was thought to be a work of Satan and his agents, the demons. The entire system of paganism, of mythology and worship, and according to some even philosophy, were supposed to be subject to the influence of demons. Heresies were also ascribed to the same agency. Moreover some par-
ticular vices were considered to be the specific effects of individual evil spirits.\(^7\)

(1) Concerning the appellatives |\(\alpha\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\nu\) \(\sigma\alpha\tau\iota\upsilon\), \(\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\), \(\delta\iota\alpha\beta\iota\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\), \(\iota\ \alpha\epsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\nu\iota\omega\mu\nu\ \nu\iota\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\), etc., the origin of the doctrine and its development in the Scriptures, comp. de Wette biblische Dogmatik, § 145—150; 212—214; 236—238; Baumgarten-Crusius, biblische Theologie, p. 295; von Collin, biblische Theologie, p. 420; Hirzel, Hliob, p. 16; \([Knapp, l. c. p. 190—203.\) Storr and Flatt, biblic. Theol. transl. by Schmucker, sect. 50. 51; Lawrence, E. A., in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. sub voce.] The Fathers generally adopted the notions already existing. Athen. leg. 24: \(\omega\kappa\gamma\sigma\rho\varsigma\ \theta\iota\nu\omega\nu\ \phi\alpha\mu\iota\upsilon\nu\ \nu\iota\omega\mu\nu\ \nu\iota\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\) .... \(\iota\nu\omega\mu\nu\ \nu\iota\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\). Iren. iv. 41. p. 288: Quum igitur a Deo omnia facta sunt et diabolus sibimet ipsi et reliquis factus est abscessionis causa, justescriptura eos, qui in abscesione perseverant semper filios diaboli et angelos dixit maligni Tert. Ap. c. 22: Atque adeo dicimus, esse substantias quasdam spiritales, nec nomen novum est. Sciant daemonas philosophi, Socrate ipso ad daemonii arbitrium exspectante, quidni? cum et ipsi daemonium adhesisse a pueritia dicatur, dehortatorium plane a bono. Daemonas sciant poetae, et jam vulgus inductum in usum maledicti frequentat; nam et Satanam, principem hujus mali generis, proinde de propria conscientia animae eadem excrementi voce pronunciavit; angelos quoque etiam Plato non negavit, utriusque nominis testes esse vel magi adsunt. Sed quomodo de angelis quibusdam sua sponte corruptis corruptionem evascerat damnata a Deo cum generis auctoribus et cum eo quem diximus princep, apud litteras sanctas ordine cognoscitur. Comp. Orig. de princ. proem. 6. Opp. T. i. p. 48; according to him it is sufficient to believe that Satan and the demons really exist—quae autem sint aut quo modo sint (ecclesia) non clare exposuit. It was not until the following period that the Manichæans developed the dualistic doctrine of an evil principle in the form of a regular system, although traces of it may be found in some earlier Gnostic notions, e. g. the Jaldabaoth of the Ophites, comp. Neander's gnostische Systeme, p. 233 flwg. Baur, Gnosis, p. 173 flwg. \([Neander, hist. of the Ch. transl. ii. p. 98 flwg. comp.\)
Norton, l. c. iii. p. 57—62.] In opposition to this dualistic view Origen maintains that the devil and his angels are creatures of God, though not created as devils, but as spiritual beings. Contra Cels. iv. 65. Opp. i. p. 553.

(a) Tertullian and Origen agree in ascribing failures of crops, drought, famine, pestilence, and murrain to the influence of demons. Tert. Apol. c. 22. (operatio eorum est hominis eversio.) Orig. contra Cels. viii. 31. 32. Opp. i. p. 764, 65. He calls the evil spirits the executioners of God (δήμων.) Demoniacal possessions were still considered as a phenomenon of special importance (as in the times of the New Test.) Minuc. Fel. c. 27: irrepeneses etiam corporibus occulte, ut spiritus tenuos, morbos fingunt, terrent mentes, membra distorquent. Concerning these δαμαστικά τούτα, μακραίνει, ἵνα uημοῖναι, comp. in particular Const. apost. lib. viii. c. 7. A rationalistic explanation is given in the Clementine Hom. ix. § 12: ἕνεκα τούτων οὗ οἰκόνες τούς ἐνέχωμεν, ταῖς τῶν δαμαστικῶν πανταῖς ὑποβαλλομέναις ἐπινοίας, ὡς τῷ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν λογισμῷ συντιθέναι. Comp. moreover, Orig. ad Matth. xvii. 5. Opp. T. iii. p. 574 flwg. de princ. iii. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 138 flwg. (de contrariis potestatibus.) Schnitzer, p. 198 flwg.; Thomasius, p. 184 flwg., and the passages cited there; [Knapp, p. 201; Denham, in Kitto, l. c. sub Demoniacs.]

(a) Justin M. Apol. c. 5. 12. 14. (quoted by Usteri, l. c. p. 421.) Minuc. Fel. l. c.: Ideo inserti mentibus imperatorum odium nostri serunt occulte per timorem. Naturale est enim et odisse quem timeas et quem metuere infestare si possis. Justin M. Apol. ii. towards the commencement, and c. 6. Comp. Orig. exhort. ad Martyr. § 18. 32. 42. Opp. T. i. p. 286. 294. 302. But Justin M. Apol. i. c. 5. ascribes the procedures against Socrates also to the hatred of the demons. The observation of Justin quoted by Ireneus (advers. her. v. c. 26. p. 324. and Euseb. iv. 18.) is very remarkable: ἦτο πρὸ μὴν τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας ὁδήστω ἱππόμην ὁ Σωτηρὶς βλασφημήσαι τὸν Θεόν, ἵνα μὴδιώκειν οἰδαίς αὐτοῦ τὴν κακάρασιν; (comp. Epiph. in hær. Sethianor. p. 289), thus the efforts of the powers of darkness against the rapidly spreading Christian religion could be explained the more satisfactorily.

iv. 36. 92. v. 5. vii. 64. viii. 30. The demons are present in particular at the offering of sacrifices, and sip in the smoke of the burnt-offering, they speak out of the oracles, and rejoice in the licentiousness and excess which accompany these festivals.

(5) According to Minuc. Fel. c. 26. the demon of Socrates was one of those evil demons. Clement also says of a sect of Christians, Strom. i. 1. p. 326: οἱ δὲ καὶ πρὸς κακοῦ ἀν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν εἰςδεδωκαίνας τὸν βιον νομίζουσιν, ἵνα λύμα τῶν ἁλίκωτων, πρὸς τινος εὐφετοῦ σομηῦ, which is manifestly nothing but an euphemism for διαβόλων, comp. Strom. vi. 822: τῶς ὁν τόν ἄτομον τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἁλίκιαν προσενάμοντες τῷ διαβόλῳ, ἱναξιοῦ εὑρήκαμον τοῦτον, τῆς φιλοσοφίας, δωρῆσαι τοιοῦτοι; comp. also Strom. i. 17. p. 366. and the note in the edit. of Potter. Astrology, etc. was also ascribed to demoniacal influence: (6) Comp. Justin M. Apol. i. 56. 58. Cyprian de unitate ecclesia, p. 105: Παρασκεύειν (diabolus) et schismata, quibus subverteret fides, veritatem corrumperet, scinderet unitatem, etc.

(7) Hermas, ii. 6. 2. comp. the preceding §. Justin M. Apol. ii. c. 5. (Usteri, p. 423.)...καὶ εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ὁν, σμόλημας, μορχίς, ἀκολογίας καὶ τάσιαν κακίαν ἵππιαν. Clem. of Alex. designates as the most malicious and most pernicious of all demons the greedy belly-demon (κολυποδαίμονα λιχυτατον), who is related to the one who is effective in ventriloquists (τῷ ἐγγαρευμένῳ). Ped. ii. 1. p. 174. Origen follows Hermas in classifying the demons according to the vices which they represent, and thus prepares the way for more sober and rational views, gradually to convert the concrete ideas of devils into abstract notions. Comp. hom. 15. in Jesum Nave Opp. T. ii. p. 434: Unde mihi videtur esse infinitus quidem numerus contrariarum virtutum, pro eo quod per singulos pene homines sunt spiritus alii, diversa in iis peccatorum genera molientes. Verbi causa, est aliquis fornicationis spiritus, est ire spiritus alius, est avaritia spiritus, alius vero superbiae. Et si eveniet esse aliquid hominem, qui his omnibus malis aut etiam pluribus agitetur, omnes hos vel etiam plures in so habere inimicos putandus est spiritus. Comp. also the subsequent part, where it is said not only that every vice has its respective chief demon, but also that every vicious person is possessed with a demon who is in the service of the chief demon. Others refer both moral defects, and physical impulses, as the sexual impulse, to the devil; Origen however objects to this notion, de princ. iii. 2. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 139.
§ 52.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Fathers differ in their opinions respecting the particular sin which caused the apostacy of the demons.\(^{(1)}\) Some thought that it was envy and pride,\(^{(2)}\) others supposed lasciviousness and intemperance.\(^{(3)}\) But it is of practical importance to notice, that the church never held that the devil can compel any soul to commit sin, without its own consent.\(^{(4)}\) Origen went so far that, contrary to general opinion, he did not even take from Satan all hope of future pardon.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) The Fathers do not agree with regard to the time at which this event took place. On the supposition that the devil did seduce our first parents, it is necessary to assign an earlier date to his apostacy than the fall of man. But according to Tatian, orat. c. 11. the fall of Satan was the punishment which was inflicted upon him in consequence of the part he had taken in the first sin of man (comp. Daniel, p. 187. and 196.) From the language of Irenæus (comp. n. 2.) one might almost suspect that he entertained similar views; but it is more probable that he fixed upon the period which elapsed between the creation of man and his temptation as the time when the devil apostatized. Thus Cyprian says, de dono patient. p. 218: Diabolus hominem ad imaginem Dei factum impatietur tuli; inde et peritius et peridit.


\(^{(3)}\) The passage in Gen. vi. 2. (according to the reading ὃ ἁγγιαν τοῦ ἰδρόυ instead of ὅ ἁῦιο τοῦ ἰδρόυ) had already been applied to the demons, and their intercourse with the daughters of men. (Comp. Wernsdorf, Exercitatio de commercio Angelorum cum filiabus hominum ab Judæis et Patribus platonizantibus credito. Viteb. 1742. 4. Keil. opusc. p. 566 flwg.
Münscher edit. by Colln, p. 89. 90. Suicer s. v. ἀγγελος I. p. 36. and ἵγίθεσες p. 1003.) This however can refer only to the later demons who became subject to the devil, and not to the apostacy of Satan himself, which falls in an earlier period (n. 1.) Concerning the apparent parachronism comp. Münscher Handb. ii. p. 30. 31. In accordance with this notion Clement Strom. iii. 7. p. 538. designates the ἀξρασία and ἐπημίτα as the causes of the fall.—The before stated views on pagan worship and the temptation to sensuality (§ 51. and ibid. n. 7.) were connected with the notions respecting the intercourse of the demons with the daughters of men. The fallen angels betrayed the mysteries of revelation to them, though in an imperfect and corrupt form, and the heathen have their philosophy from these women. Comp. Clem. Strom. vi. 1. p. 650.

(4) Hermas, lib. ii. mand. 7.: Diabolum autem ne timeas, timens enim Dominum, dominaberis illius, quia virtus in illo nulla est. In quo autem virtus non est, is ne timendus quidem est; in quo vero virtus gloriosa est, is etiam timendus est. Omnis enim virtutem habens timendus est: nam qui virtutem non habet, ab omnibus contemnitur. Time plane facta Diaboli, quoniam maligna sunt: metuens enim Dominum timebiset opera Diaboli non facies, sed abstinebis te ab eis, comp. 12. 5: Potest autem Diabolus luctari, sed vincere non potest. Si enim resistitur, fugiet a vobis confusus.—[For as a man, when he fills up vessels with good wine, and among them puts a few vessels half full, and comes to try and taste of the vessels, does not try those that are full, because he knows that they are good; but tastes those that are half full, lest they should grow sour: so the devil comes to the servants of God to try them. They that are full of faith resist him stoutly, and he departs from them, because he finds no place where to enter into them: then he goes to those that are not full of faith, and because he has place of entrance, he goes into them, and does what he will with them, and they become his servants. Hermas 12. 5. Archbp. Wake's transl.] Comp. Tatian c. 16: Δαιμονες οi τοις ἀθρωποις ἐπιστατοντες, ουξ εισι αι των ἀθρωπων ζωχαι x. r. l. Iren. ii. c. 32. 4. p. 166. Tert. Apol. c. 23. Orig. de princ. iii. 2. 4. contra Cels. i. 6. and viii. 36. Opp. i. p. 769: ἀλλ' ου χριστιανός, ἦ ἀλληδως χριστιανός και ὑποδόξας ιαυτόν μόνον τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ λίγῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦται τι ἂν υπό τῶν δαιμονίων, ἄτε χριστιανὸς δαιμόνων τυχαίως, and
SATAN AND DEMONS.

in libr. Jesu Nave xv. 6. In the former passage de princ. Origen calls those weak (simpliciores) who believe that sin would not exist, if no devil existed.—Along with the moral power of faith, and the efficacy of prayer, the magic effects of the sign of the cross, etc. were relied on. But what was at first nothing more than a symbol of the power of faith itself, became afterwards a mechanical opus operatum.

(5.) Even Clement, Strom. i. 17. p. 367. says: ὅ δέ ἄνθρωπος ἀκριβώς οὐκ ἔχει μετανοήσαι ὅπως τε ἢν καὶ κλάψαι καὶ ὁ αἰτίος αὐτὸς τῆς κλοπῆς, οὗ ὁ μὴ καλύπτας κύριος; but from these words it is not quite evident, whether he means to say that the devil is yet capable of being converted. The general opinion on this point is expressed in the following passage, ἢ τῶν δαμαρίων ὑπάρχουσιν ὅιχ ἵνα μετανοήσητος; Tatian orat. c. 15. comp. also Justin dialog. c. Tryph. c. 141.—Origen himself did not very clearly propound his views. De princ. iii. c. 6. 5. Opp. i. p. 154. (Münscher ed. by Cölln, p. 97) he speaks of the last enemy, death: but it is evident from the context, that he there identifies death with the devil; he speaks of a substance which the Creator would not destroy, but heal. Thomasius, p. 187. On the possibility of the conversion of the other demons, comp. i. 6. 3. Opp. i. p. 70: Jam vero si aliqui ex his ordinibus, qui sub principatu diaboli agunt, ac malitiae ejus obtemperant, poterunt aliquando in futuris saeculis converti ad bonitatem, pro eo quod est in ipsis liberi facultas arbitrii? . . .
THIRD SECTION.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 53.

INTRODUCTION.

The material design of Christianity, and the essential condition of all further development, is to turn the attention of man to himself, and to bring him to the knowledge of his own nature. On this account the first object of Christian anthropology should be to determine not what man is in respect to his natural life, and his relation to the surrounding visible creation, but rather what he is in respect to his spiritual and moral condition, and his relation to God and Divine things. But since the higher and spiritual nature of man is intimately connected with the organism of body and soul, it was necessary that a system of theological anthropology should be constructed on the basis of physical and psychical anthropology, which forms a part of natural philosophy, and philosophy, properly speaking, rather than of theology. The history of doctrines therefore must also consider the opinions relative to the natural relations of man.

(1) Comp. Clem. Pæd. iii. i. p. 250: Ἐν οἷς οἴκες τύμπων μὴ στασάνην μονημάτων τὸ γνῶναι αὐτῶν ἵκαιον γὰρ τέλες τῆς ἱερὰς ἡγημόνια.

(2) At first sight it might appear indifferent in regard to theology, whether man consists of two or three parts, yet this distinction was intimately connected with the theological defini-
visions of liberty, immortality, etc. This is the case also with
the doctrine of pre-existence, in opposition to Traducianism and
Creationism relative to original sin, etc.

§ 54.

DIVISION OF MAN AND PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY.


That man is composed of body and soul, is a fact of
which we are conscious by experience previous to all
speculation, and before endeavouring to express it by a
more precise, scientific term. But it is more difficult to
define the relation between body and soul, and to assign
to either its particular sphere. As the Logos was
thought to be the medium by which God was connected
with the world, so some (in a similar platonizing manner)
considered the ψυχὴ as forming the medium between the
purely spiritual in man, the higher and ideal principle of
reason, and the purely animal, the grosser and sensual
principle of his carnal nature. They also imagined that
this notion of a human trias was supported by the lan-
guage of Scripture.(1) Some of the earlier Fathers,(2)
and those of the Alexandrian school in particular,(3)
adopted this trichotomistic division, while Tertullian ad-
hered to the old opinion, according to which man consists
of body and soul only.(4) Some of the Gnostic sects,
e. g. the Valentinians, so perverted the trichotomistic
division, as to divide men themselves into three classes,
the χοίξι, ψυχικοί, and πνευματικοί, according as one or the
other of the three constituents preponderated, or
prevailed to the apparent exclusion of the others.
Thus they destroyed the bond of union by which all
men were made brethren in Christ.(5)

Comp. the works on bibl. theol. and the commentaries on 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv.

(1) Ἡμῶν Βραχ" ῬΩΦΙΑ, ΣΑΣΕ, ΨΥΧΗ, ΠΝΕΟΜΑ.
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12. etc. also Ackermann, Studien und Kritiken, 1839. ii. part 4.

(2) Justin M. fragm. de resurr. § 10: οἶκος τὸ σῶμα ψυχής, σπώ-
ματος δὲ ψυχή οἶκος. Τὰ τρία ταῦτα τοῖς ινθίδα ινθερήθη καὶ πίστιν
Tatian contra Græc. or. c. 7. 12. 15. Iren. v. 6. 1. p. 299: anima
autem et spiritus pars hominum esse possunt, homo autem
nequaquam: perfectus autem homo commixtio et adunitio est
animae assumptis spiritum Patris et admixta ei carnis, quæ est
plasmata secundum imaginem Dei. Comp. v. 8. 2. Accordingly
it is not every man who is composed of three parts, but he only
who has received the gift of the Holy Spirit, as the third part.

(3) Clem. Strom. vii. 12. p. 380. where he makes a distinction
between the ψυχή λογική and the ψυχή σωματική; he mentions
besides a tenfold division of man (analogous to the decalogue.)
ibid. vi. 16. p. 808: ἵνα δὲ καὶ δικάς τις ἄρις τὸν αἰώνα αὐτόν, τὰ τι
ἀισθήσεων πιντί καὶ τὸ φυσικόν καὶ τὸ σπώματος καὶ τούτο δὲ ὑγίου τὸ
κατὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν συμματικῶν ἕνατον δὲ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ δικάς
τὸ διὰ τῆς πίστεως προσεγγίσας ἁγίου σπώματος χαρακτηριστικῶν ἰδίωμα π.τ.λ.
The more general division into body, soul, and spirit, forms how-
ever the basis of this one. Clement after the example of Plato
(comp. Justin M. Coh. ad Gr. 6.) divides the soul itself into
these three faculties: τὸ λογιστικόν (νοητόν), τὸ άνθρωπικόν, τὸ ἑπιθυμητικόν.
Pud. iii. 1. ab init. p. 250. The faculty of perception is sub-
divided into four different functions: αἰσθητική, νοητός, ἑπιθυμητική,
ὑπόληψις. Strom. ii. 4. p. 435. Clement regards body and soul
as διάφορα, but not as ἰναστικά, so that neither the soul is good as
such, nor the body is evil as such. Comp. Strom. iv. 26. p.
639. For the psychology of Origen, comp. de princ. iii. 3.
Opp. i. p. 145. (Redepenn. p. 296—306.) On the question
whether Origen did indeed believe in the existence of two souls
in man? see Schnitzer, p. 219 flwg. Thomasius, p. 190. 193—
195. In the view of Origen ψυχή as such, which he derives from
ψυχῆς ὑπάρχει, holds the medium between body and spirit. He af-
firms to have met with no passage in the Sacred Scriptures, in
which the soul as such is favourably spoken of, while on the
contrary it is frequently condemned, de princ. ii. 8. 3—5. Opp.
i. p. 95 flwg. (Redep. p. 211 flwg.) But this does not prevent
him from comparing the soul to the Son, when he draws a com-
parison between the human and the Divine trias, ibid. § 5.—
For the trichotomistic division comp. also Comment. in Matth.
ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

The inquiry into the origin of the human soul, and the mode of its union to the body, seems to belong solely to metaphysics, and to have no bearing whatever upon religion. But in a religious point of view it is always of importance, that the soul should be considered as a being which has derived its existence from God. This doctrine was maintained by the catholic church in opposition to the Gnostic theory of emanations, to which the opinion of Origen concerning the pre-existence of the soul is closely allied. On the contrary Tertullian asserted the propagation of the soul per traducem in accordance with his realistico-material conceptions of its corporeity.

Accordingly Origen says de princ. prooem. 5. Opp. i. p. 48: De anima vero utrum ex seminis traduce ducatur, ita ut ratio ipsius vel substantia inserta ipsis seminibus corporalibus habeatur, an vero aliud habeat initium, et hoc ipsum initium si genitum est aut non genitum, vel certe si extrinsecus corpori inditur, necne: non satis manifesta prædicatione distinguetur.
Traces of the theory of emanation are found in the writings of some of the earlier Fathers. Justin M. fragm. de resurr. 11: "οἱ γὰρ ζωὴν ἐστὶν ἀπόδημος, μέχρις οὐδέ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἐμφύσημα." Comp. the Clementine Homilies, Hom. xvi. 12. On the other hand Clement of Alex. adheres to the idea of a created being. Coh. p. 78: "μόνος ὁ τῶν ὄλων ἡμερομηνίας ὁ ἄξιοστάξως πατὴρ τοιοῦτον ἀγαλμα ἰμαντίων ἡμῶν, τὸν ἄμεσον ἐπάλαθιν, and Strom. ii. 16. p. 467. 468. where he rejects the phrase μέχρι Θεοῦ, which some have employed, in accordance with the principle: "Θεὸς οὐδεμίαν ἥρετο ἀπὸ ἡμῶν φυσικὴν οἰκίαν." Comp. Orig. in Joh. T. xiii. 25. Opp. T. iv. p. 235: "σφόδρα ἵνα ἀ spaced ὧν υποσχέν τῇ ἀγαπητῇ φύσει καὶ σωματικῇ ἐκκοι λήγειν τοὺς προκείμενας ἐπὶ πεπληροῦ τῷ Θεῷ." Comp. de princ. i. 7. 1.

(1) Clemens Coh. p. 6: "πρὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς ἡμῶν οἱ τῶν ἱερὰ ἱδίως ἐπὶ αὐτῷ στρέφοντο γεγονότοις τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμῶν." This perhaps should rather be understood in an ideal sense. But Origen, following the example of the Pythagorean and Platonic schools as well as of the later Jewish theology, speaks of the pre-existence of the soul as something real. (Comp. Epiph. haer. 64. 4: "τὴν ψυχὴν γὰρ τὴν ἄνθρωπίαν καίνυξε σετωμάτων.) He reconciles his doctrine with human liberty and Divine justice by maintaining that the soul entering into the bodies of men suffers punishment for former sins. Comp. de princ. i. 7. 4. Opp. i. p. 72. (Redep. p. 151. Schnitzer, p. 72.)—"If the origin of the human soul were coeval with that of the body, how could it happen that Jacob supplanted his brother in the womb, and John leaped in the womb at the salutation of Mary? etc." Comp. also T. xv. in Matth. c. 34. 35. in Matth. xx. 6. 7. Opp. T. iii. p. 703. and Comment. in Joh. T. ii. 25. Opp. iv. p. 85.

(4) De anima c. 19.: Et si ad arbores provocamus, amplementem exemplum. Si quidem et illis, necum arbusculis, sed stipitibus adiucet et surculus etiam nunc, simul de scrbibus oriantur, inest propria vis animæ . . . . . . . quo magis hominis? cuius anima, velut surculus quidam ex matrice Adam in propaginum deducta et genitalibus feminaris foveis commendata cum omni sua paratura, pullulabit tam intellectu quam sensu? Mentior, si non statim infans ut vitam vagitus salutavit, hoc ipsum se testatur sensisse atque intelligisse, quod natus est, omnes simul ibidem dedicans sensus, et luce visum et sono auditum et humo more gustum et aère odoratum et terra tactum. Ita prima illa vox de primis sensuum et de primis intellectuum pulsibus cogni-
THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Both the excellencies of the body, and the higher moral and religious nature of man which were frequently pointed out by the Fathers, are beautifully and appropriately described in the simple words of Scripture (Gen. i. 27.) "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." This expression continued to be employed by the church. But it was a point of no little difficulty precisely to determine, in what the image of God consists. The notion that even the body of man is created after the image of God arose out of the impossibility of making an exact distinction between body and soul, and was held by some in a more literal, by others in a more figurative sense, while some again rejected it altogether. All parties however admitted as a matter of course, that the image of God has a special reference to the spiritual faculties of man. But inasmuch as there is a great difference between the mere natural dispositions, and their development by the free use of the powers which have been granted to men, several writers, among whom Irenæus, and especially Clement and Origen, distinguished between the image of God, and resemblance to God. The latter can only be obtained by a mental conflict (in an ethical point of view,) or is bestowed upon man as a gift of sovereign mercy by union with Christ (in a religious aspect.)


(3) This idea was connected with another, according to which God was supposed to possess a body (see above), or with the notion that the body of Christ had been the image after which the body of man had been created. (The author of the Clementine Homilies also thought that the body in particular bore the image of God, comp. Piper on Melito, 1. c. p. 74. 75.) Tert. de carne Christi c. 6. adv. Marc. v. 8. adv. Prax. 12. Neander Antign. p. 407 flwg. The more spiritual view was, that the life of the soul, partaking of the Divine nature, shines through the physical organism, and is reflected especially on the countenance of man, in his looks, etc. Tatian Or. c. 15. (Worth. c. 24.): ψυχή μὲν οὖν ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων συλλομμένη ἵστι καὶ οὐ μονομερής. Συνείσι (al. συνείσι) according to Fronto Ducäus, comp. Daniel p. 202): γὰς ἤστιν ως εἵναι φανέρων αὐθέντι διὰ σώματος, οὖτε γὰς ἦστιν αὐθέντι φαινόμενον χωρὶς σώματος οὖτε ἀνυώτατα ἢ σάκτω χωρίς ψυχῆς. Clem. coh. p. 52. Strom. v. 14. p. 703.: ψυχῆν δὲ τὴν λογικήν ἀναλύειν ἀκατευθύνει ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς πρόσωπον. On
THE IMAGE OF GOD.

this account the Fathers of the Alexandrian school very decided-ly oppose the material conception of a bodily copy of the Divine image. Clem. Strom. ii. 19. p. 483.: τὸ γὰς κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοιωσθ., ὡς καὶ σπόδεν εἰρήκαμεν, οὐ τὸ κατὰ σῶμα μηνίσκατον οὐ γὰς Σίμων Ἡλενὸς Ἐκανάτῳ ἠξιωμοιόθεν ἄλλῃ ἡ κατὰ τοῦ καὶ λογισμὸν. On the other hand it is indeed remarkable that the same Clement, Paed. ii. 10. p. 220. should recognize the image of God in the procreative power of man, which others connect with the existence of evil spirits (§ 51.) εἰκὼν ὁ ἡμέτρως τοῦ ἡμῶν γίνεται, καὶ ἡ γίνεται ἡμέτρως σωματικός. Origen refers the Divine image exclusively to the spirit of man, c. Cels. vi. Opp. i. p. 680 and Hom. i. in Genes. Opp. T. ii. p. 57.

The tautological phrase Gen. i. 26. Χρίστος ἡς ζηλέμενος induced the Fathers to make an arbitrary distinction between δύο (εἰκών) and ἔργα (ἐμοίωσις) comp. Schott, Opusc. T. ii. p. 66 ss. Irenæus adv. Hær. v. 6. p. 299. v. 16. p. 313. : 'Ἐν τοῖς σπόδεν εἰρήκαμεν εἰκών τὸ κατὰ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ γινόμενα τὸν ἡμέτρως, οὐχ ἵδικτον δι' ἐπὶ γὰς ἀμαρτοῦ ἢ ὁ λόγος, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ ἡμέτρως εἰρήκαμεν. ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀμαρτείνει ἐπὶ κατὰ εἰκόνα ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀμαρτείνει ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν. οὕτως τοῦτο ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν. οὕτως τοῦτο ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν. οὕτως τοῦτο ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰρήκαμεν. According to some the language of Clem. Strom. ii. p. 499. (418. Sylb.) implies that the image of God is communicated to man εἰκών κατὰ τὴν γίνεσιν, and that he obtains the resemblance ὡσεὶν κατὰ τὴν τελείωσιν. According to Tert. de bapt. c. 5. man attains unto resemblance to God by baptism. According to Origen, who everywhere insists upon the spontaneity of man, the resemblance of God which is to be obtained, consists in this, ut (homo) ipse sibi cam propræ industria studiis ex Dei imitatione conscisceret, cum possibilitate sibi perfectionis in initiis data per imaginis dignitatem in fine demum per operum expletonem perfectam sibi ipse similitudinem consummaret, de princ. iii. 6. 1. Opp. T. 1. p. 152. (Red. p. 317. Schnitser p. 236.) Comp. contra Cels. iv. 20. p. 522. 23. But Origen also uses both terms without making any perceptible distinction, Hom. ii. in Jer. Opp. T. iii. p. 137.
Liberty and immortality are those qualities of the human mind in which the image of God manifests itself. This was the doctrine of the primitive church, which is confirmed by the consciousness of every Christian. All the Greek Fathers, the apologists Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the Latin Father Minucius Felix, as well as the theologians of the Alexandrian school, Clement and Origen, represent the αὐτεξούσιον of the human soul with all the early warmth and freshness of hellenistic idealism, and know nothing of imputation of sin apart from voluntary self-determination. Even Irenæus and Tertullian, although the former was opposed to speculation, and the latter possessed an austere disposition, strongly assert this liberty from a practico-moral point of view. None but heretics ventured to maintain that man is subject to the influence of a foreign power (the stars, or the ιοίκασμίνες). But it was on this very account that they met with decided opposition on the part of the whole church.

(1) Justin. Apol. i. c. 43.: Οὗ γὰρ ὁμιλεῖ τὰ ἄλλα, ὅτι δὲν ὅτι καὶ τις τράποντα μηδέν δυνάμειν στρατεύοντα, ἵπτον ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπον οὐδὲ γὰρ ἢν ἄξιος ἀμοιβής; ἐπὶ ίπτον, οὐκ ἀρ' ἅντοι ἰδώμενος τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ τῶν γενόμενος, οὖν εἰ κακὸς υπόθεκε δικαίως κολαλώντος ἵπτον, οὐκ ἀρ' ἃντοι κακοῦτος ὅτι, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν δυνάμειν οἴη ήτον παρ' ὅ ἵπτονεν.

(2) Tatian. Or. c. 7.: τοῦ ἰπάρθει τῆς ποίησις οὗτος αὐτεξοὐσιος γέγονεν, τάγαθοῦ οὕτω μὴ ἤχει, ὦ πλὴν μένον παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, τῇ δὲ ὑλονοῖᾳ τῆς συνα- φείας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἴππευθούμενον ὅταν τὸ μὲν φαύλος δικαίως κολαλήσας, ὅ τε αὐτὸς γεγονὼς μοχθήρες· τί δὲ δικαίως χάριν τῶν ἀνθρωποθμάτων ἄξιος ἴπτοναι κατὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ παραβας τὸ βούλημα. Con-
cerning the critical and exegetical difficulties connected with this passage, see Daniel, Tatian der Apologet. p. 207.

(3) Athen. leg. 31. comp. de resurr. 12. 13. 15. 18. flwg.

(4) Ad Autol. ii. 27.: έκείνος γάρ καὶ αὐτῆς ὄμως τοίοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζεται, in connection with the doctrine of immortality, of which in the next §.

(5) Octav. c. 36. 37.: Nec de fato quisquam aut solatium capter aut excuset eventum. Sit sortis fortuna, mens tamen libera est, et ideo actus hominis, non dignitas judicatur......Ita in nobis non genitura plectitur, sed ingenii natura punitur. The liberty of man gets the victory in the contest with all the adversities of destiny: Vires denique et mentis et corporis sine laboris exercitatione torpescunt; omnes adeo vestri viri fortes, quos in exemplum prædicat, ærumnis suis inclyti floruerunt. Itaque et nobis Deus nec non potest subvenire, nec despict, quum sit et omnium rector et amator suorum; sed in adversis unumque explorat et examinat; ingenium singulorum periculis pene sem, usque ad extremam mortem voluntatem hominis sciscitat, nihil sibi posse perire securus. Itaque ut aurum ignibus, sic nos discriminibus arguimur. Quam pulcrum spectaculum Deo, quum christianus cum dolore congridit, quum adversum minas et supplicia et tormenta componitur! quum strepitum mortis et horrorem carnificis irridens insultat! quum libertatem suam adversus reges et principes erigit, soli Deo, cuius est, cedit, etc. ! Nevertheless Minucius xi. 6. intimates (but as an opinion coming from his opponent,) that the Christians believed, that God judges man not so much according to his conduct, as according to his own eternal decrees. But he refutes this view as erroneous.

(6) Clem. Coh. p. 79: ἵματι ἑστιν (ἡ βασ. τῶν υἱών τῶν ὑπερασπιστῶν) ἵνα ζηλήσητε, τῶν τετελεσμένων τῆς προάρισεῖν ἐσχηκότως. He then shows (p. 80.), how man himself, and in accordance with his own nature, ought to cultivate the talents which God has given him. As the horse is not expected to plough (after the custom of the ancients), nor the ox to serve for the purpose of riding, but as none is required to do more than his nature will allow him to do, so man can only be expected to strive after holiness, because he received the power of doing it. According to Clement man is accountable for that sin alone, which proceeds from free choice, Strom. ii. p. 461; it is also frequently in our power to acquire both discernment and strength, ibid. p. 462. Clement knows
nothing of a gratia irresistibilis, Strom. viii. p. 855: οὕτω μᾶς ἄκων σωζότατι ὁ σωζομένες, οὐ γὰρ θεῖον ἄνθρωπον, ἁλλὰ σωτηρίων ἰκουσίων καὶ προαμειβομένων σωτήριας φόρος σωτηρίαν διὰ καὶ τὰς ἐνόπλις ἵλαβεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὡς ἂν εἴ φθορον ἐγγεγομένης πρὸς ὑποτέουλον ἀν καὶ βιοῦσιτοι τῶν τῆς αἰετίων καὶ τῶν φειακτῶν κ. τ. λ..

(1.) Comp. the whole of the third book of the work de princip. According to Origen there is no accountability without liberty; de princ. ii. 5. Red. p. 188: "If men were corrupt by nature, and could not possibly do good, God would appear as the judge not of actions, but of natural faculties;" (comp. what Minucius says on this point.) Comp. de princ. i. 5. 3. and contra Cels. iv. 3. Opp. i. p. 504: ἀφετέρου μὲν οὖν ἀνίκετο τὸ ἰκουσίων, ἀνίκετο αὐτὸς καὶ τῆς ὀφείλει.

(2.) Iren. iv. 4. p. 231. 32. (Gr. 281): Sed frumentum quidem et paleae, inanimalia et irrationabilia existentia, naturaliter talia facta sunt: homo vero rationabilis et secundum hoc similis Deo, liber in arbitrio factus et sua potestatis ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando autem palea fiat: Ire- næus founds also the accountability of man upon this argument. Comp. iv. 15. p. 215. (Gr. 318.) iv. 37. p. 281. 82. (Gr. 374. 75): Εἰ χύσιν οἱ μὲν φανελός, οἱ δὲ ἁγαθοὶ γεγονότα, οὐδ' ὤντο ἐπιαστήσατο, ὡς ἡ αἰτία, τοῦτον γὰρ κατεσκευάσθησαν οὔτ' ἐκεῖνοι μουστόν, οὔτως γεγονότας. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι οἱ σάμαντες τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶν χύσεως, δυναμεῖσθαι τα κατακεραυκος προδάλευε τὸ ἁγαθόν, καὶ δυνάμενοι τάλιν ἀποζαλλόν αὐτὸ καὶ μὴ τοὐχθαν δικαίως καὶ παρ' ἀλφαδόν τῆς εὐφορμόης, καὶ σολῇ πρόσεχεν παρὰ Θεῷ οἱ μὲν ἐπιαστήσατο, καὶ ἢλεξιάς τυργγάνους μαρφυγίας τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ καθέλου ἱλοφόζης καὶ ἐπιμονής: οἱ δὲ καταστικάταν καὶ ἢλεξιάς τυργγάνους ζημίας τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἅγαθοῦ ἀπο- βολῆς. Comp. also iv. 39. p. 285. (Gr. 380.) v. 27. p. 325. (Gr. 442.) But according to Irenæus the freedom of man is not only seen in his works, but also in his faith, iv. 37. p. 282. (Gr. 376 below), comp. also the fragment of the sermon de fide p. 342. (Gr. 467.)

(3.) Tertullian defended the idea of liberty especially in opposition to Marcion: "How could man who was destined to rule over the whole creation, be a slave in respect to himself, not having obtained the faculty of reigning over himself?" Advers. Marcion, ii. 8. 6. 9. comp. Neander Antignost. p. 372—373.a

a Even the opponents of the doctrine of human liberty are compelled to acknowledge this remarkable consensus Patrum of the first period, such as Calvin, but in order to account for it, they strangely enough suppose a gene-
According to the Gnostics there is a fate which stands in intimate connection with the stars, and is brought about by their instrumentality," etc. Baur, Gnosis, p. 232. But the doctrine of human freedom is of importance in the opinion of the author of the Clementine Homilies, e. g. Hom. iii. 69.: ως δι' αυτά ἑσομενοῦντας ἡμᾶς ὁ θεότης ὕπάρχῃ νοῦς. vol. ii. p. 335 and 395. 398. 99. Credner, l. c. iii. p. 283. 290. 294.

§ 58.

b. IMMORALITY.

The theologians of the primitive age did not so completely agree concerning the immortality of the soul. They were far from denying the doctrine itself, or entertaining any doubts respecting the possibility of the thing. But some of them, e. g. Justin, Tatian and Theophilus, from various reasons supposed the existence of a soul which, though mortal in itself, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality as a promised reward by its union with the spirit, or in the opposite case perishes together with the body. They laid great stress upon the liberty of man, by means of which resemblance to God was alone to be obtained. They farther imagined (in accordance with the threefold division) that the soul receives the seeds of immortal life only by becoming connected with the spirit, as the higher and less tramelled life of reason. And, lastly, they may have been induced by other philosophical hypotheses concerning the nature of the soul, to adopt the aforesaid misapprehension of this doctrine! "On this account we must always consider it a remarkable phenomenon that the very doctrines which afterwards caused disruptions in the Christian church, are scarcely ever mentioned in the primitive church." Daniel, Tatian, p. 200.
notion. On the contrary Tertullian and Origen, whose views differed on other subjects, agreed in this one point, that they, in accordance with their peculiar notions concerning the nature of the soul, looked upon its immortality as essential to it.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(2)}\) On the question whether the view advocated by the aged man in Justin dial. c. Tryph. § 4. is the opinion of the author himself, or not?—as well as on the meaning of the passage: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀπεθάνῃσιν φημῇ πᾶσας τὰς ὁψικάς ἐνώ, comp. the commentaries, Olshausen l. c., Rössler Bibl. i. p. 141. Möhler Patrologie, i. p. 242. and Daniels Tatian, p. 224. Tatian speaks more distinctly contra Graec. c. 13: ὡς ἂν εἰσὶν ἀδάνατος ἢ ὁψικὴ καὶ ἀνατηρά ἐνώ. αὐτή καὶ μὴ ἀπεθάνῃσιν. Ἰησοῦς μὲν γὰρ καὶ λέγει μὲν τὸν σώματος μὴ γινώσκεισα τὴν ἀληθείαν. αὐτὸν δέ εἰς ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖ συνελήφθη τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι, ἄνατον διὰ γενετορίας ἀλματάνεσα. τάλιν δέ οὐ Ἰησοῦς, καί τρίς καιροῖς λοιπῇ, τὴν ἑπεράσειν τοῦ θεοῦ πιστημόνιν. καὶ ἀνατηρά γὰρ σκότος ἢν καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς αὐτής φωτινόν...(Joh. i.)...

... ὁψικὴ γὰρ ὡς αὐτῆς τὸ σνεύμα ἰδανών, ἰδανών δὲ ὡς αὐτοῦ. κ. τ. λ. ἀνατηρά γίνεται δὲ κεκτηθείν ἤ τι τοῦ θεοῦ σπεύματος, ὡς ἂν εἰσὶν ἀβοηθητος, αἷσχεται δὲ πρὸς ἀτρὶ αὐτῆς ἀδημητί χρωσία τὸ σπεύμα. Theophilus (ad Aut. ii. 27.) starts the question: was Adam created with a mortal, or immortal nature? and replies: neither the one, nor the other, but he was fitted for both (δικτιὼν ἁμροτέρων), in order that he might receive immortality as a reward, and become God (γίνεσθαι θεός), if he aspired after it by rendering obedience to the Divine commandments; but that he might become the author of his own ruin, if he did the works of the devil, and disobeyd God.\(^{(b)}\)

\(^{(b)}\) The opposition which Tertullian raised to the doctrine of Theophilus, etc. was connected with his notions concerning the twofold division of the soul, that of Origen with his views on pre-existence. (For the latter would easily dispose of the objection that the soul must have an end, because it has had a beginning.) Comp. however Tert. de anima xi. xiv. xv. According to Orig. Exhort. ad Mart. 47. Opp. i. p. 307. de princ. ii. 11. 4. p. 105. and iii. 1. 13. p. 122. it is both the inherent principle of

\(^{a}\) ζαυν λαντρο is wanting in the most recent manuscripts, vide Daniel, p. 228 on this passage.

\(^{b}\) About the view of the Thnetopsychites (arabici), compare below the chapter on eschatology.
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life in the soul, and its natural relation to God, which secure its immortality; comp. Thomasius, p. 159.

The whole question however had more of a philosophical, than Christian bearing, as the idea of immortality itself is abstract-negative. On the other hand, the believer by faith lays hold of eternal life in Christ as something really existing. The Christian doctrine of immortality cannot therefore be considered apart from the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, and must rest upon Christian perceptions and promises.

§ 59.

ON SIN, THE FALL OF THE FIRST MAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

Walch, J. G., (Th. Ch. Lilienthal) de Pelagianismo ante Pelagium, Jen. 1738. 4. Eiusdem historia doctrinae de peccato originis; both in: Miscellaneis sacris, Amstel. 1744. 4. Horn, J., Commentatio de sententiis eorum patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali, Gött. 1801. 4.

However much the primitive church was inclined, as we have already seen, to look with a favourable eye at the bright side of man (his ideal nature), yet she did not endeavour to conceal his dark side, by means of false idealism. Though it cannot be said, that the doctrine of human depravity was the only principle upon which the entire theology of that time was founded, yet every Christian was convinced by his consciousness of the existence of such a universal corruption, and felt the contrast between the ideal and the real, and the effects of sin in destroying the harmony of life. Such feelings were proportionate to the notions which were entertained concerning the liberty of man.

In opposition to the opinion that conviction of sin accompanied by powerful excitement, which attains to a sense of pardon only after internal struggles, is alone the sure criterion and indispensable condition of the Christian's character, we may safely refer to the primitive
church, in which, to say the least, such a notion of sin did not prevail. On the contrary feelings of gratitude and joy on account of the finished work of the Saviour, were more universally entertained, and counterbalanced by external contests and persecutions, rather than by internal struggles. The martyrdom of so many of the early Christians may be considered as a continuation of the celebration of the passion of Christ in the church; dogmatic theology, on the contrary, celebrated Christmas and Easter. But in later times, when persecutions ceased, men had recourse to monkish ascetism and a system of self-torture, as artificial substitutes. It then became a duty imperative upon the church to cultivate the internal martyrdom in opposition to external triumphs. The former consisted in the subjection of the heart to the power of the Holy Spirit in the sense of Augustine, which prepared the way for the regeneration of the church in after ages. Here we should be on our guard against a twofold error. The one is, to look for the same disposition during the first centuries which prevailed in later times, and consequently either to assert its existence, or to speak disparagingly of primitive Christianity because of its absence. The other is, to overlook the necessity for further developements, and to maintain that everything ought to have remained in its state of comparative childhood or youth.

§ 60.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN GENERAL.


The definitions of the nature of sin were to a great extent indefinite and unsettled during this period. (1)
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Heretical sects of the Gnostics in general (and in this particular they were the forerunners of Manichaeism), starting with their dualistic notions, either ascribed the origin of evil to the demiurgus, or maintained that it was inherent in matter. (2.) On the other hand, the orthodox theologians generally speaking agreed in tracing the source of evil to human volition, and clearing God from all imputation. (3.) Such a view would easily lead to the opinion of Origen, that moral evil is something negative. (4.)

(1) A proper definition is given e. g. by Clement of Alexandria, Ped. i. 13. p. 158. 159.: πατὰ τὸ παρὰ τῶν λόγων τὸν δεινόν, τῶν αμάρτημά ίσαί. Virtue on the contrary is (ἀστή) διάώρις ψυχῆς σύμφωνος ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου σεφλὸν ὁ λίγον τὸν βίον. Hence sin is also disobedience to God: αὐτίκα γοῦν ὅτι ἡμαρτίαν ὁ σέφως ἀδεμοσίως, καὶ σαρκίζωσι τῷ Θεῷ. He further considers sin on etymological grounds as error......ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγχης ἢναι τὸ πλημμαλομένον ταῖς διὰ τῆς τοῦ λόγου διαμαρτηχθεῖν γενόμενον καὶ ἀπότους καλλιέθαι ἀμάρτημα. Tertullian from a more practical point of view ascribed the origin of sin to the impatience (inconsistency) of man, de pat. 5. (p. 143.) : Ναμ ut compendio dictum sit, omne peccatum impatienstiae adscribendum. comp. Cypr. de bono pat. p. 218. Orig. de princ. ii. 9. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 97. (Red. p. 216.) also believes, that laziness and aversion to any exertions for the purpose of persevering in good, as well as turning from the path of virtue, are the cause of sin; for going astray is nothing but becoming bad; to be bad only means not to be good, etc. comp. Schnitzer, p. 140.

(2) Now and then even orthodox theologians ascribe the origin of evil to sensuality; comp. however Clem. Strom. iv. 36. p. 638. 39.: Ὑδεικον εὐλόγως ὧν καταστρέφεισται τῆς σιλάσεως καὶ κακίας τὸ σῶμα. εὐ δισερίως τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ἄθρωπον ἔσχεν σφόδρα τῆς ὑδραγοῦ θείας γενεμένης, καὶ τῆς τῶν εἰκόνων ἰδιοτόπων σφόδρα γνώσει συντείνουσα, τὰ τε μήλη καὶ μέγας σφόδρα τὸ καλὸν, εὐ δισερίως ἐκεῖ. οἷς ἐπιδεικτικοὶ γίνεται τῆς τιμωτᾶτης τῷ Θεῷ ψυχῆς τὸ σεφλής τοῦτο, κ. τ. λ. ἀλλ' οὕτω ἄκαθην ἢ ψυχῆς φύσιν, οὕτω αὖ καθὼς ψύχει τὸ σῶμα, εὐδισερίως, ὁ μή τοῦτο χαμαβόν, τοῦτο εἰθείς καθὼς, εἰσὶ γὰρ εὕν καὶ μεσοτεύχεις τινες κ. τ. λ.

(3) Clem. Strom. vii. 2. p. 835.: κακίας δ' αὖ πάντες πάντως ἀνάστισις (ὁ Θεός.)
§ 61.

INTERPRETATION OF THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL.

The documents which have been preserved in the five books of Moses form the historical foundation not only of the doctrine of the creation of the world in general, and of man in particular, but also of the doctrine of the origin of sin, which appears realized in the history of Adam. Some writers however rejected the literal interpretation of this narrative. Thus Origen (after the example of Philo)\(^{(1)}\) regarded it as a type, historically clothed, of that which takes place in moral agents everywhere, and at all times.\(^{(2)}\) It is difficult to ascertain how far Irenæus adhered to the letter of the narrative;\(^{(3)}\) Tertullian unhesitatingly pronounced in favour of its historical interpretation.\(^{(4)}\) Both the Gnostics and the author of the Clementine Homilies rejected this view on dogmatic grounds.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Philo perceives in that narrative τὸς τῆς ψυχῆς, vide Dähne, p. 341. and his essay in the theologische Studien und Krit. 1833, 4 part.

\(^{(2)}\) Clement considers the narrative of the fall partly as fact, and partly as allegory. Strom. v. 11. p. 689. 90. (Serpent = image of voluptuousness.) On the other hand Origen regards it as purely allegorical, de princ. iv. 16. Opp. T. i. p. 174. contra Cels. iv. 40. p. 534. Adam is called man, therefore: ἐν τοῖς δοκούσιν πειρὶ τοῦ Ἄδαμ οὐναι φυσιολογεῖ Μωϋσῆς τὰ πειρὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως...οὐχ ὀὕτως πειρὶ ἐνὸς τινὸς ὡς πειρὶ ὅλου τοῦ γένους ταῦτα φάσκειν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λόγου. Concerning the further application of allegorical interpretation to the particulars of the narrative (the act of clothing our first parents in skins as a symbol of spiritual in-
vestiture) comp. Meth. in Phot. Bibl. c. 234. and 293. On the other side see Orig. Fragm. in Gen. T. ii. p. 29. where both the literal interpretation is excluded, and the allegorical exposition is called in question.

According to the fragment of Anastasius Sinaïtai in Mas- suet, p. 344. Irenæus must be understood as having explained the temptation by the serpent (in opposition to the Ophites), ψυχατριᾶς, not ἱστοριῶς, but it is not evident to what extent he did so. But Irenæus speaks elsewhere plainly enough of the fall of Adam as an historical fact, iii. 18. (Gr. 20.) p. 211. (Gr. 248.) iii. 21. (Gr. 31.) p. 218. (Gr. 259.) ss.

Tert. adv. Judæos, ii. p. 184, de virg. vel. 11. adv. Marc. ii. 2 ss. and other passages. He insists upon the literal interpretation of the particulars of the narrative, as they succeeded each other in order of time: de resurr. carn. 61: Adam ante nomina animalibus enunciavit, quam de arbore decerpsit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit.

On the Gnostic (Basilidian) doctrine of the fall (εὐγενείας ἀγαθοθύμως) comp. Clem. Strom. ii. 20. p. 488. Gieseler Studien u. Krit. 830. p. 396. Baur, p. 211. The author of the Clementine Homilies goes so far in idealizing Adam, as to convert the historical person into a purely mythical being (like the Adam-Cadmon of the Cabbalists) while he represents Eve as far inferior to him. Hence Adam could not trespass, but sin makes its first appearance in Cain; vide Credner, ii. 258. iii. 284. Baur, Gnosis, p. 339. On the other hand the Gnostic Cainites rendered homage to Cain as the representative of freedom from the thraldom of the demiurgus; the Sethites considered Cain as the representative of the hylic, Abel as that of the psychical, and Seth as that of the pneumatic principle, as the ideal of humanity. Neander Kirchengeschichte i. 2. p. 758. 59. [translat. ii. p. 105. 106.]

§ 62.

STATE OF INNOCENCE AND FALL.

The Fathers of the primitive church differed in their opinions concerning the original excellencies of the first man(1.) and the nature of his sin.(2.) But they all believ-
ed that the temptation of the serpent was a real temptation to sin, and accordingly that the transgression of the Divine commandment was to be considered as a fall from a state of innocence followed by disastrous effects upon man. The Ophites alone thought (at least in one respect) that by this event man was elevated to his proper dignity, and prepared for the enjoyment of full liberty, because the prohibition had proceeded from the jealousy of Jaldabaoth, but the act of disobedience had been brought about by the intervention of wisdom (Sophia), the symbol of which is the serpent.

(1) These were especially exaggerated by the author of the Clementine Homilies (see the preceding §.) Adam possessed prophetic gifts (Credner, ii. p. 248. and Baur, p. 363.) which however Tertullian de resurr. carn. c. 61. also ascribed to him. The Ophites taught that Adam and Eve had light and luminous bodies, see Baur, p. 187. The theologians, previous to the time of Augustine, attached less value to what was afterwards called justitia originalis. According to Theophilus of Antioch (ad Aut. ii. 24. 27.) Adam was νήπιος, and had to be treated as a child; he was neither mortal, nor immortal, but capable of either mortality or immortality. Clement of Alexandria maintains the same, Strom. vi. 12. p. 788: “They may learn from us (says he in opposition to the Gnostics), that Adam was created a perfect being, not in relation to his moral excellencies, but in respect to his capacity of choosing virtue; for there is certainly a difference between the aptitude to virtue, and the real possession of it. God will have us to be happy by our own exertions, hence it belongs to the nature of the soul to determine itself, etc.” Comp. Baur, Gnosis, p. 493. He thus limits the original excellencies, Strom. iv. p. 632. to what is purely human, viz. talents: οὕδιν γὰς τῶν χαρακτησίζοντων τὴν ἀνθρώπου ἴδιαν τι καὶ μορφὴν ἴδιον πράσαναν." Comp. Strom. iii. 17. p. 559. (470 Sylb.) Clement does not (like the Encratites whom he combats) find fault with the cohabitation of our first parents as a sinful act in itself, but he ob-
jects that it took place too soon; this is also implied in the passage Strom. ii. 19. p. 481: τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὰ οὕτως προδίως εἶλεν, ἵππιμος τῇ γυναικί.

(3) The Ophites confound their own doctrines, for at one time they render Divine homage to the serpent, at another they say, that Eve had been seduced by it. Epiph. Hær. 37. 6. Baur, p. 178 flwg.

§ 63.

THE EFFECTS OF THE FALL.

Death was the punishment which God had threatened to inflict upon the transgressors of his laws. Nevertheless the act of transgression was not immediately succeeded by death, but by a train of evils which came both upon man and woman. Accordingly both death and physical evils were considered as the effects of Adam’s sin; thus e. g. by Irenæus and others. But the opinions of the Fathers were not as yet fully developed concerning the moral depravity of every individual, and the existence of sin in mankind generally, as the effect of the sin of the first man. Many felt too much disposed to look upon sin as the voluntary act of a moral agent, to conceive of a kind of hereditary tendency transmitted from one generation to another. The sinful acts of every individual appeared to them less the necessary consequence of the first sin, than a voluntary repetition of it. In order to explain the mysterious power which almost compels men to sin, they had recourse not so much to original sin, as to a supposed influence of the demons, which however cannot constrain any man to trespass. Tertullian and Origen alike favoured the theory of original sin, but on different grounds. Origen thought that the soul of man was stained with sin even in its former state, and thus enters in a sinful condition into the world. To this idea was added another which was
allied to the notions of Gnostics and Manichæans, viz. that physical generation is in itself a sinful act. According to Tertullian the soul propagates itself with all its defects and faults, as matter is propagated. The phrase vitium originis, which was first used by him, is in perfect accordance with such a view. But both were far from considering inherent depravity as constituting accountability, and still farther from believing in the entire absence of human liberty.

1. Iren. iii. 23. (35 Gr.) p. 221. (263 Gr.): Condemnationem autem transgressionis accepit homo tædia et terrenum laborem et manducare panem in sudore vultus sui et converti in terram, ex qua assumtus est; similiter autem mulier tædia et labores et gemitus et tristitia partus et servitium, i.e. ut serviret viro suo, ut neque maledicti a Deo in totum perirent, neque sine increpatione perseverantes Deum contemnerent. (comp. c. 37. p. 264 Græc.) ib. V. 15. p. 311. (423 Græc.)...propter inobediens peccatum subsecuti sunt languores hominibus. V. 17. p. 313. (p. 426.) V. 23. p. 320. (p. 435.): Sed quoniam Deus verax est, mendax autem serpens, de effectu ostensum est, morte subsecuta eos qui mancudaverunt. Simul enim cum esca et mortem adsucerunt, quoniam inobedientes manducabant: inobediens autem Dei mortem infert et sqq. (Hence the devil is called a murderer from the beginning.) According to Cyprian de bono patiendie p. 212. even the higher physical strength of man (along with immortality) was lost by the fall; Origen also connected the existence of evil in the world with sin. Comp. above § 48.

2. Athenagoras e. g. knows so little of original sin, as to suppose, de resurr. mort. 12. that the natural birth of man gives him a title to immortality: τοις δέ αὐτῶν ἐν ἱαυτῷ ἀγαλματοφρονώσαν τὸν ποιητὴν, νοῦ τε συνεπερεμένως καὶ λογικῇς κρίσισις μεμοριαμένως τὴν εἰς ἄλλον διαμονήν ἀπεκλήρωσαν ὁ ποιητὴς, ἵνα γινώσκοντες τὸν ἱαυτῶν ποιητῆς καὶ τῇ τούτῳ ὄνωμι τα καὶ σοφίαν, νόμω τε συνεπτενέον καὶ δίκη, τούτως συναισθη-ζωσιν ἁπάνως ὃς τὴν πεσιλαβοῦσαν ἐκπάννυσαν ζωήν, καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἑν ρατάοις καὶ γνώσις ὑπὲρ σώματι x. τ. λ.—According to Clement of Alexandria man now stands in the same relation to the tempter, in which Adam stood prior to the fall, Coh. p. 7: ἐς γὰρ ὃ ἄτατον, ἄμιθον...
THE EFFECTS OF THE FALL.

Clement indeed admits the universality of sin among men, Pæd. i. 13. 158. 59. But he does not consider man as absolutely depraved, nor pass a general sweeping judgment upon the whole human race, as if all formed but one vast mass of corruption. None commits iniquity for its own sake, Strom. i. 17. p. 368. But he rejects the doctrine of original sin properly called in the strongest terms, Strom. iii. 16. p. 556. 57: λεγήτωσαν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἱπτήρεσιν τὸ γεννήθην παιδίον ἡ ἡγοῦν ὑπὸ τὴν τούτο Αδὰμ ἦσαν οὐκόπιπτως ἁμα, τὸ μηδὲν ἐνεργήσαν. He does not regard the passage Ps. li. 5. as decisive. (Comp. the above passages on liberty and sin in general.)

(1) Athen. leg. c. 25. Tatian contra Græc. c. 7. and the passage quoted § 58.

(2) On the one hand Origen, by insisting upon the freedom of the human will, forms a strong contrast with Augustine, and maintains that concupiscence in itself is not sinful, as long as it does not produce resolutions; guilt only arises when we yield to it, de princ. iii. 2. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 139. (Red. p. 279.) and iii. 4. (de humanis tentationibus.) But on the other he formally adopts the idea of original sin, by asserting that the human soul does not come into the world in a state of innocence, because it has already committed sin in its former condition; de princ. iii. 5. Opp. T. i. p. 149. 50. (Red. p. 309 flwg.) Concerning the generation of man see Tom. xv. in Matth. § 23. Opp. iii. p. 685. Hom. viii. in Lev. Opp. ii. p. 229. and xii. p. 251: Omnis qui ingreditur hunc mundum in quadam contaminatone effici dicitur (Job xiv. 4. 5.). Omnis ergo homo in patre et in mater pollutus est, solus vero Jesus Dominus meus in hanc generationem mundus ingressus est, et in mater non est pollutus. Ingressus est enim corpus incontaminatum.

(3) Tert. de anima c. 40 : Ita omnis anima eo usque in Christo recenseatur; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur. Peccatrix autem, quia immonda, recipiens ignominiam ex carnis societate. c. 41. He makes use of the phrase vitium originis, and maintains that man in his present corrupt state has got into the habit of sinning, while his true nature tends to virtue. He therefore distinguishes naturale quo-
dammodo from proprie naturale. Quod enim a Deo est, non tam extinguitur, quam obumbratur. Potest enim obumbrari, quia non est Deus, extingui non potest, quia a Deo est.

(a.) That e. g. Tertullian was far from imputing original sin to children as actual transgression, may be seen from his remarkable expression concerning the baptism of infants, de bapt. 18. comp. § 72. and Neander, Antignosticus, p. 209 flwg. 455 flwg. —His disciple Cyprian also acknowledges inherent depravity, and defends infant-baptism on that ground; but he does not go farther than asserting, that it serves to purify infants from the guilt of others which is imputed to them, but not from any guilt which is properly their own. Ep. 64. Comp. Rettberg, p. 317 flwg.
FOURTH SECTION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

§ 64.

ON CHRISTOLOGY IN GENERAL.


The incarnation of the Godman is the principal dogmatic idea of this period. The Fathers of the primitive church regarded it as a manifestation of the free grace of God, as the most glorious of all revelations and developments, and as the perfection and crown of creation, rather than as the mere effect of the sin of man. Thus the Christology of this period forms both the continuation of theology, and the supplement of anthropology.

This may be seen not only in the theologians of the Alexandrian school (comp. the passages concerning the Logos,) but also in the case of those who hold more positive views. Though Irenæus, Tertullian (comp. the subsequent §§ and Tertull. de carne Christi 6.), and Cyprian (in the passage below) intimately connect the appearance of our Lord with the existence of sin, yet the latter thinks that it behoved Christ, to come into the flesh not on account of the sin of Adam, but because of the disobedience of his descendants, on whom former revelations did not produce any effect, (in much the same manner as Heb. i. 1.) Cypr. de idol. van. p. 15.: Quod vero Christus sit, et quo modo per ipsum nobis salus venerit, sic est ordo, sic ratio. Judæis primum erat apud Deum gratia. Sic olim justi erant, sic ma-

§ 65.

THE GODMAN.

Together with indefinite and more general expressions concerning the higher nature of Jesus\(^1\) and his Messianic character,\(^2\) we find even in the primitive church allusions to the intimate connection subsisting between his Divine and human natures. But the relation in which they stand to each other, is not exactly defined, nor is the part which either takes in the composition of his person, philosophically determined.\(^3\) The earlier Fathers endeavoured on the one hand, to avoid the error of the Ebionites and Artemonites, who considered Jesus only as the son of Joseph and Mary, (while the more moderate Nazarenes, in accordance with the Catholic church, admitted the supernatural conception.)\(^4\) On the other, they combated still more decidedly the tendency of the Docetae, who rejected the true humanity of Christ.\(^5\) They also opposed the opinion of Cerinthus and Basili-
des, who asserted, that the Logos (Christ) had descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism; the still more fanciful notions of Marcion, according to which Christ appeared as Deus ex machina; and lastly, the view of Valentinus, who admitted that Christ was born of Mary, but maintained that he made use of her only as of a channel, by which he entered into this finite world. (6)

(1) Thus in the letter of Pliny to Trajan (Ep. x. 97.): carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere.—The superior excellency of his doctrines elevates Christ over the rest of mankind (according to Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 14.): βεβαιοῦτε εἰς καὶ σύντομοι σαρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγονόσαν ὦ γάρ σοφίστας ὑπῆρξεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν, and this human wisdom would be sufficient by itself (according to c. 22.), to secure to Jesus the predicate of the Son of God, even though he were nothing but a mere man. But he is more than this; ibidem. Origen also points to the extraordinary personal character of Jesus (apart from his Divine dignity) which he considers as the bloom and crown of humanity: contra Cels. i. 29. Opp. T. i. p. 347. (in relation to Plato de rep. i. p. 329. and Plutarch in vita Themistoclis.)—“Jesus, the meanest and humblest of all Seriphii, yet caused a greater commotion in the world, than either Themistocles or Pythagoras, or Plato, yea than any wise man, prince or general.” He unites in himself all human excellencies, while others have distinguished themselves by particular virtues, or particular actions; he is the miracle of the world! c. 30. (He reasons altogether like modern apologists.) Minucius Felix does not go beyond the negative definition, that Jesus was more than a mere man; generally speaking we find in his writings little or nothing of positive Christology. Octav. 29. § 2. 3. (comp. with 9. 5.): Nam quod religioni nostrae hominem noxium et crucem ejus adscribitis, longe de vicinia erratis, qui putatis Deum credit aut meruisse noxium aut potuisse terrenum. Næ ille miserabilis, cujus in homine mortali spes omnis ininititur; totum enim ejus auxilium cum extincto homine finitur. Comp. Novatian de trin. 14.: Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur spes in illum ponitur, cum spes in homine maledicta referatur?

(2) Justin. M. Apol. 5. 30 ss. dial. c. Tr. the whole context. Novatian de trin. c. 9. Orig. contra Cels. in various places.
THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

(3) Iren. iii. 16. (18 Gr.) 18. (20 Gr.) p. 211. (248 Gr.): ἅνωσιν ὑν καὶ ἡ ἄριστος τῷ ἄδρωτος τῷ Θεῷ.... Εἰ μὴ συνανθῇ ὁ ἄδρωτος τῷ Θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἤδυνητο μεταχεί�αι τῆς ἀφαίρεσις. Ἐδώ γάρ τιν μετηρὴ Θεοῦ το καὶ ἄδρωτον διὰ ἓδεις πρὸς ἴκαρτής οὐκ ἴκαρτής εἰς φίλους καὶ ἴκαρτής τοὺς ἄριστος συναγαγεῖ καὶ Θεῷ μὲν παρατασέως τῷ ἄδρωτος, ἀν ἄδρωτος δὲ γνώσεως Θεοῦ. c. 19. (21.) p. 212. 13. (250.): ὁμοια γάρ ἦν ἄδρωτος ἦ μετεχῆ, οὕτως καὶ λόγος ἦ παρασκευή· οὕτως καὶ μὲν τῷ λόγῳ ἦ παρασκεύαις οὐκ ἤτοι ἄδρωτος ἤ μετεχῆς· καὶ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν καὶ ὑπομίνης καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀνάπαντος καὶ ἐκ ἀναλαμβάνων. Comp. Novatian de trin. c. 18.: Quoniam si ad hominem veniebat, ut mediator Dei et hominum esse deberet, oportuit illum cum eo esse et verbum carnem fieri, ut in se metipsō concordiam confiularet terrenorum pariter atque celestium, dum utriusque partis in se connectens pignora, et Deum hominum et hominem Deo copularet, ut merito filius Dei per assumptionem carnis filius hominis, et filius hominis per receptionem Dei verbi filius Dei effici possit. Hoc altissimum atque reconditum sacramentum ad salutem generis humani ante secula destinatum, in Domino Jesu Christo Deo et homine inventur implieri, quo conditio generis humani ad fructum aeternae salutis posset adduci.

(4) Comp. § 23. 24. and § 42. 1. On the mild manner in which Justin M. dial. c. Tryph. § 48. and Orig. (in Matth. T. xvi. c. 12. Opp. iii. p. 732. comparison with the blind man, Mark x. 46.) judged of the view of the Ebionites, see Neander Kirchengeschichte i. p. 616. 17. [transl. ii. p. 12. 13.] But Origen expresses himself in stronger terms in Hom. xv. in Jerem. ib. p. 226: ἵνα διαφαίρεται γὰρ μετὰ τῶν πολλῶν τῶν ἀδρωτῶν κακῶν καὶ τούτο εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι οὐ ἤτοι Θεόν ὁ μονογενὴς ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ἵσπικατάζως γὰρ ἐς τὴν ἐκτίσεα ἐκ νότος ἄδρωτον. Concerning the birth from the virgin it is worthy of observation, that the primitive church had no doubts about the propriety of adducing analogies with pagan myths as a kind of evidence, though the reality of the fact was admitted. Thus Orig. contra Cels. i. 37. Opp. T. i. p. 355.* (Plato a son of Apollo and of Amphictione); at the same place an analogy is drawn from nature in opposition to the blasphemy of Celsus c. 32. p. 350. comp. however c. 67. p. 381.*

* On the different recensions of what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, comp. King, p. 145. The phrase: conceptus de Spiritu Sancto is wanting in the earlier recensions, and one reads: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virg.
(3) Against the Docetae comp. the Epistles of Ignatius, especially ad Smyrn. 2. and 3. ad Ephes. 7. 18. ad Trall. 9. also the aforesaid passage of Ireneus and with it Tert. adv. Marc. and de carne Christi; Novatian de trin. c. 10.: Neque igitur eum hereticorum agnoscimus Christum, qui in imagine (ut dicitur) fuit, non in veritate; nihil verum eorum quo gessit, fecerit, si ipse phantasma et non veritas fuit. Some have thought that there is a leaning towards Docetism in the epistle of Barnabas, c. 5. But we have there the same idea of the \( \xi \phi \nu \gamma \zeta \zeta \) which occurs in later times, e.g. in the (apocryphal) oration of Thaddæus to Abgarus apud Euseb. 1. 13.: \( \iota \varsigma \lambda \iota \kappa \iota \gamma \mu \nu \nu \varsigma \alpha \zeta \tau \delta \varsigma \sigma \tau \o\varsigma \nu \xi \rho \eta \varphi \alpha \varsigma \), and elsewhere.

(6) \( \kappa \alpha \chi \alpha \delta \alpha \zeta \zeta \iota \delta \alpha \varsigma \nu \delta \alpha \xi \gamma \zeta \varsigma \zeta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \delta \iota \}
school adopted views, which were closely allied to those of the Docetæ, although they opposed the grosser forms of Docetism. Clement maintained, that the body of Jesus was not subject to the accidents of the external world with the same physical necessity as other human bodies, and Origen went so far as to ascribe to it the property of appearing to different persons under different forms. On the other hand, he was very clear and decided on the doctrine of the human soul of Christ, and generally speaking he speculated more than his predecessors on the mystery of Christ's incarnation.

(1) Novat. de trin. c. 10.: Non est ergo in unam partem inclinandum et ab alia parte fugiendum, quoniam nec tenebit perfectam veritatem, quisquis aliquam veritatis excursionem portionem. Tam enim scriptura etiam Deum adnuntiat Christum, quam etiam ipsum hominem adnuntiat Deum etc.

(2) Tert. adv. Prax. c. 30. takes the exclamation of Christ on the cross: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me! as a vox carnis et animae, cf. de carne Christi c. 11—13.: Non poterat Christus inter homines nisi homo videri. Redde igitur Christo fidem suam, ut qui homo voluerit incedere animam quaque humanæ conditionis ostenderit, non faciens eam carneam, sed induens eam carne. Comp. de resurr. carn. c. 34. and other less definite passages (only in relation to the assuming of the flesh) which are given by Münscher v. Cölln i. p. 261—63.

(3) He indulges in harsh contrasts, such as Coh. p. 6. and p. 84.: πιστευων, ἀδραπτη, ἀδραπτη καὶ Θεῷ· πιστευων, ἀδραπτη, τῷ παθῶντι καὶ προσκυνομάντι Θεῷ· ζωντεις πιστεύσατε, οἱ δούλαι, τῷ νεκρῷ· πάντες ἀδραπτοι, πιστεύσατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀδραπτών Θεῷ· πιστεύσατε καὶ μεθύν κάκος σωτηρία· ἐκζητήσατε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ζητεῖτε ἡ ψυχή ὑμῶν. He does not make the distinction drawn by others, according to which the name Ἰησοῦς were to be used only in reference to his human nature; on the contrary Paed. i. 7. p. 131. he says: ὁ δὲ ἡμῶν ἱερός παιδαγωγὸς ἀγὼν Θεός Ἰησοῦς, ὁ πάντως τῶν ἀνθρωποτῆτος καθηγομένων λόγος. He also applies the subject ὁ λόγος to his humanity. Paed. i 6. p. 124: ὁ λόγος το αὐτώ ὑπὸ ἡμῶν ἔχειν αὐτα. comp. iii. 1. p. 251. and Gieseler 1. c. Novatian, (c. 18 flwg.) who lived towards the close of this period, separates
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... from the human nature in Christ with more distinct-... strongly opposes every attempt at idolizing his huma-... 

... 169 (Sylb. 158.) he most decidedly main-... tion to the Docetae, that Jesus ate and drank like... 

... befalls the Docetae heretics; hence the charge which... 

... Clement refines the human body of Jesus to little more than a kind of phantom, Strom. vi. 

... a Divine power, but not by meats and drinks. Clement admits that his body was bruised and died, but he main-... 

... The Saviour did not manifest himself by that beauty of the flesh which strikes the senses, but by the beauty of the soul, and the true beauty of the body, viz. immortality. The assumption of the uninterrupted virginity of Mary, Strom. vii. 16. p. 889. 890., and the (apocryphal) passage there cited: τίτονι κυαν ὁ τίτονι, may be traced to the same docetic tendency. Different views are entertained by Tertull. de carne Cristi, sub finem, who nevertheless quotes the same dictum.

(a) Gennadius de dogm. eccles. c. 2. incorrectly numbers Origen among those, qui Christum carnem de ccelo secum afferre contenderint: but his doctrine too is not quite free from Docetism. It is most fully given in the Comment. in Ep. ad Gal. preserved by Pamphilus; comp. Gieseler, 1. c. p. 16. 17. and contra Cels. i. 69. 70. Opp. i. p. 383. 84. (ibid. iii. 42. p. 474.)

(b) Comp. contra Cels. ii. 9. quoted by Münscher von Cölln i. p. 263. where he infers the human soul of the Redeemer from Matth. xxvi. 38. Origen's theory of the pre-existence of the soul would easily induce him to ask, why the Son of God assumed this very soul, and not any other? comp. contra Cels. i. 32. Opp. T. i. p. 350. de princ. ii. 6. 3. quoted by Münscher von Cölln. p. 265 flwg. According to Socr. iii. 7. the Synod at Bosstra (240) defended the proposition ἵμτρομον ἤναι τῶν ἱναθρωτῆς εντολῆς in opposition to Beryllus.

A special question arose concerning the risen body of Christ in its relation to the body which he possessed prior to the resurrection. According to Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian and Novatian, Jesus had the same body after the resurrection which he had before it. Comp. the passages in the work of C. L. Müller, de resurrectione Jesu Christi, vitam eam excipiente et ascensus in cœlum, sententiae, quæ in ecclesia christiana ad finem usque sæculi sexti viguerunt. Havnie 1836. 8. p. 77. Some expressions of Irenæus and Tertullian are somewhat modified, p. 78. But Origen taught in more definite terms, c. Cels. ii. c. 62. Opp. i. p. 434. that the body of Jesus had undergone a change, and in support of his opinion appealed to his miraculous appearance, when the doors were shut: καὶ τὸν θανατικὸν θάνατον ὑπέκειτο καὶ μικρὸν τὴν τεράτων τοῦ σποραδικοῦ ζῶντος. ὡμοίως καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν τότε εἰς ὑμᾶς ζώοτος φαίνεσθαι ψυχῆς. Comp. c. 64. 65. p. 438: τὸν μὲν τὴν ὁμοίως ὁμοιωτὴ ὄρμην ὡμοιωτή τοῖς πολλαῖς. οὕτως ἐστι τις ἄνθρωπος ὅπου ὡμοίως καὶ τῶν ἄπαντων τῶν ἄτομων πάντως ἐκεῖ λαμπροτέρων γὰρ τῇ ἑνώμονες πνεύματος ἢ ἡμέρας ἢ αὐτῶν. Müller, p. 83. Origen does not seem to have believed that the ascension of Christ had effected a further
§ 67.

THE SINLESSNESS OF CHRIST.


The intimate connection subsisting between the Divine and human natures of Christ, which was held even by the primitive church, excluded every idea of the existence of sin in him, who was the image of the Deity. Hence Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, and Origen, assert the sinlessness (anamartesy) of Jesus in the strongest terms, and even those of the Fathers who do not expressly mention it, at least presuppose it. In the scheme of the Ebionites and Artemonites, this sinlessness was not a necessary feature of his character, although we do not meet with any intimations to the contrary. On the other hand Basilides found it difficult to reconcile the sinlessness of Christ with his system, according to which every sufferer bears the punishments of his own sins, though he used every possible means to conceal this defect in his scheme.

(1) Justin M. dial. c. Tr. § 11. 17. 110. et al. Iren. in the next § Tert. de anima cap. 41: Solus enim Deus sine peccato, et solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et Deus Christus. Clem. Al. Pæd. i. 2. p. 99. where he infers the prerogative of Christ to be the judge of all men, from his sinlessness Pæd. iii. 12. p. 307. He speaks indeed of the Logos being alone ἀμαρτείαις, but as he makes no distinction between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, (comp. the preceding §), it would follow that he regarded Jesus as sinless, which is confirmed by what he says,
ON REDEMPTION AND ATONEMENT.

(The Death of Christ.)

The tendency of Christ's appearance on earth, as such, was to redeem men from sin, and to reconcile them to God, inasmuch as it destroyed the power of the devil, and restored the harmony of the human nature. But in accordance with the doctrine preached by the Apostles, the sufferings and death of Christ were from the commencement thought to be of principal importance in the work of redemption. The Fathers of the primitive church regarded his death as a sacrifice and ransom.
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(\&\lambda\kappa\pi\gamma\nu\varsigma\), and therefore ascribed to his blood the power of cleansing from sin and guilt,\(^2\) and attached a high importance, sometimes even a supernatural efficacy to the sign of the cross.\(^3\) They did not however rest satisfied with vague and indefinite ideas, but in connection with the prevailing notions of the age, they further developed the above doctrine, and represented the death of Christ as the actual victory over the devil, the restoration of the Divine image, and the source and condition of all happiness.\(^4\) But however decidedly and victoriously this enthusiastic faith in the power of the Redeemer's death manifested itself in the writings and lives of the Fathers, as well as in the persecutions and death of so many Christians, yet that theory of satisfaction had not then been formed, which represents Christ as satisfying the justice of God by suffering in the room of the sinner the punishment due to him. The term satisfactio occurs indeed in the writings of Tertullian, but in a sense essentially different from, and even opposed to the idea of a sacrifice made by a substitute.\(^5\) That the design of the death of Christ was to reconcile man to God, was an opinion held by more than one of the Fathers in connection with other doctrines. Origen himself not only developed both the notion that the devil had been outwitted, and the idea of a sacrifice founded upon the typical language of the Old Testament,\(^6\) but also decided in favour of the moral interpretation of Christ's death, which he did not hesitate to compare with the heroic death of other great men of antiquity.\(^7\) He also ascribed somewhat of the effects of an atonement to the death of the martyrs, as Clement had done before him.\(^8\) And lastly, he understood the death of Jesus in an idealistic sense, as an event which is not limited to this world, nor to one single moment of time, but which has come to pass in heaven as well as on earth, embraces all ages, and is also of infinite importance to the other world.\(^9\)
Christianity is not only the religion of redemption, inasmuch as it realizes the idea of the union of the Divine and the human in the person of the Godman, but also the religion of complete and absolute reconciliation." Baur, I. c. p. 5. Concerning the relation in which redemption stands to reconciliation, ibid. On negative and positive redemption see Neander, Kircheng. i. p. 1070. [transl. ii. p. 310.] Justin M. brings forward the negative aspect, (viz. the victory over the powers of darkness.) Dial. c. Tr. § 30: ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν δαμασμῶν, δ' ἐστίν ἀλλότρια τῆς θεωσεβείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, δε τάλαι προσακολουθεῖ χειρὶν Θεοῦ, ἀλ' ἔτι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ συνεργηθήσεις παρακαλοῦμεν, ἵνα μετὰ τὸ ἑπιστρέψας πρὸς Ἐθνὸς δ' αὐτοῦ ἀμώμης ἄμω. ἦλθεν γὰρ ἐκτίνοι καὶ λυτρωθήναι καλοῦμεν οὗ καὶ τὸν ὑπόματος Ἰσχύν καὶ τὰ δαμασμα τρέμου, x. r. λ. Irenæus speaks rather of the positive aspect, iii. 18. (20.) 20. (22.) p. 214. Filius hominis factus est, ut assuesceret hominem percipere Deum et assuesceret Deum habitare in homine, sec. placitum Patris. The work of redemption was carried on through all the stages of life which Christ represented in himself, so that death appears as the crown of the entire work, ii. 22. 4. p. 147: Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem, et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pictatis effectus et justitiae et subjectionis; in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens, et sanctificans Domino; sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed et secundum aetatem, sanctificans simul et seniores, exemplum ipsis quoque fiens; deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenitus ex mortuis, ipse primatus tenens in omnibus, princeps vitae, prior omnium et præcedens omnes. Comp. v. 16.—Comp. Tert. adv. Marc. 12. Clem. Coh. p. 6. p. 23: ἡμις δὲ οὐκ ἄργης ἢ εἴκουσα ἐν τῆς πλάνης ἡμῶν ἀπασχολώς, ἀντικειμένος δὲ ἔτι τῆς ἀλλήλων. Ἰατροὶ τοι ἡμῖν, τοι ἡς ἀνωμοί ως νος, διὰ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας τῶν λόγων τῶν οὐ μνῃ γνώρισαι τοῦ Ἐθνοῦς. Πρεσ. i. 2. p. 100: Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ παναγάγχης ἡμῶν λόγος διὰ παναγάγχης ἡμῶν τῶν παρὰ φῶς τῆς ἐν ψυχῆς ταξίδων... λόγος δὲ τὸν παρακλήτην μᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐναπεστηκόντων ἰστηρίς ἀφαίρητοις οἰκίοις καὶ βουλαν ἀγίου ἀνθρώπους ἐν ψυχῆς. Comp. i. 9. p. 147. i. 12. p. 158, quis div. saly. p. 951. 52. (Comparison with the merciful Samaritan.) Origen also (contra Cels. iii. 28. Opp. i. p. 465.) perceives in the union of the Divine and the human in
CHRIST THE COMMENCEMENT OF AN INTIMATE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE ONE AND THE OTHER, WHICH IS PROGRESSIVELY DEVELOPED IN MANKIND:

ON REDEMPTION AND ATONEMENT.

Christ the commencement of an intimate connection between the one and the other, which is progressively developed in mankind: 

..." (Mohler, P. 61.) Ign. ad Smyrn. 6: "Αυτόν τον ἁγιάσας αὐτὸν τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ εἴδωμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ τῆς θείας, αὐτὸν ὁ διὰ τὴν ἡμιτίμως σωτηρίαν ἐκχυίναν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοιαν χάριν ὑπηνεγκεῖ. comp. i. c. 2, where the παράδειγμα αὐτοῦ grammatically refer to Θεὸς.

Concerning the efficacy of his death see Strom. iv. 7. 583. and other passages. On the other hand, it is worthy of notice, that Clement, as Philo had done before him, and Origen did after him, applies the idea of the priestly office of Christ in an ideal sense to the Logos, without any reference to the death which he suffered in his human nature, comp. Bähr, p. 81.

...Inferences may be drawn from these sentiments of Origen, which are not in accordance with the simple truth of Scripture; but they may also be so interpreted as to agree with the example of wholesome doctrine. The latter is undoubtedly better and more charitable than the former. Mosheim, transl. p. 297.
The fact that the heathen charged the Christians with rendering homage to all that were crucified, (Or. c. Cels. ii 47. Opp. i. p. 422.) shows, to say the least, that the latter held the cross in high esteem. On the symbolical signification of the cross, and the earlier fanciful interpretations of the allegorists concerning the blood of Christ, comp. § 29. 3. On the effects of the cross upon the demons, see § 11.

The notion that the death of Christ represented the victory over the devil, was so agreeable to the entire circle of ideas in which these times moved, that it was very difficult to abandon it.” Baur, i. c. p. 228. He also maintains that this mode of considering the death of Christ was transferred from the Gnostics to the church by simply converting the person of the demiurgus into that of the devil. (?) It is represented in this period by Irenæus. His train of reasoning is the following: Man came under the dominion of the devil by violating the Divine commandment. This state of bondage lasted from Adam to Christ. The latter delivers men by rendering perfect obedience on the cross, and paying a ransom with his blood. God did not rescue their souls from the power of the devil by force, as the devil himself had done, but secundum suadela (that the devil might convince himself of the justice of the manner in which he was treated.) The devil had indeed employed suadela (persuasion) in relation to man, but force in relation to God. But man voluntarily abandoning the service of the devil, as he had voluntarily placed himself under his sway, the judicial relation in which God stands to man, was restored. Comp. Iren. adv. Haer. v. 1. 1. From this he infers the necessity of the Saviour’s twofold nature (the more Irenæus in this particular point departs from the prevailing notion of the age, the more his views approach those of Anselm in a later period), iii. 18. 7: “Ἡνωσεν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐπὶ Ἠρ. ἐκ γὰρ μὴ ἀνθρώπος ἐνίκησε τὸν ἀντίπαλον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐχ ἐν δικαίως ἐνίκησε ὁ Ἰησοῦς, comp. v. 21. 3. iii. 19. 3: ἐκεῖ ὡστε γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐνα παραδείγματι, οὕτως καὶ λόγος ἐνα δεκαδεύ, etc. (comp. § 65. 3.) Both the perfect obedience of Christ, and the shedding of his blood as a ransom (v. 1. 1: τῷ ἰδίῳ ὑμῶν αἰματί λυτρωσαμένω ἡμᾶς τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ δόθης τῷ ψωμίῳ υπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτῶν ψωμίων, καὶ τῷ σάρκα την ικανω τοῦ ἁμαρτῶν ἀντι τῶν ἁμαρτῶν σαρκῶν, etc.) form in the system of Irenæus the negative aspect of the doctrine of redemption, to which is added the positive one, the communication of a new principle of life, iii. 23. 7. Comp. Baur, l. c. p. 30—42. Bähr, p. 55—72.
On the peculiar usage of the term satisfactio comp. Münsscher Handb. i. p. 223. Bähr, p. 90 flwg. From Tert. de pen. 5. 7. 8. 9. 10. de pat. 13. de pud. 9. it is evident "that he applies the term satisfacere to such as make amends for their own sins by confession and repentance which shows itself by works;" but he never understands by it satisfactio vicaria in the sense which was afterwards attached to it. That Tertullian was far from entertaining such notions, may be proved from de cultu fem. i. 1., and the interpretation which he gives to Gal. iii. 13. contra Judæos 10; he there represents the crime that had been committed, as a curse, but not the hanging on the tree (for Christ was not accursed by God, but by the Jews); thus also contra Marc. v. 5. and other passages which are quoted by Bähr, p. 89 flwg. In other points his views resemble those of Irenæus, ibid. p. 100—104.

Origen held both these notions, that of Irenæus concerning the victory over the devil, which he however represented as an act of deception on the part of God, and that of a voluntary sacrifice. But the latter is not made to satisfy the claims of justice, but must be attributed to the love of God. Comp. Baur, p. 43—67. Bähr, p. 111 flwg. Thomasius, p. 214 flwg. His interpretation of Is. liii. 3. comes nearest to the view entertained in later times by Anselm, Comment. in Joh. Tom. 28. 14. Opp. iv. p. 392. Bähr, p. 151. But Origen departs from the ecclesiastical doctrine of satisfaction in the manner in which he explains e. g. the sufferings in the garden of Gethsemane, and the exclamation of Christ on the cross: My God, my God, etc. Bähr, p. 147—149.

Comp. the 19. Tom. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 286. and the passage before quoted from the 28. Tom. p. 393. contra Cels. i. 1. p. 349: δε το σταυρωθης εκων του των θανατων υπη των αδριπων γινε άνδεξατο, δηλαδη τοις απολαμασθηνυ υπη παΠαθων επι τη σφικαι λοιμηκα καταστηματα κατασυναιμας η αροειας η δυσπλειας. These human sacrifices were thought to be connected with the influence exerted by the demons, which was to be removed by them; see Baur, p. 45. and Mosheim, in a note to the translation of the passage, p. 70.—The death of Christ also gave an additional weight to his

* But it should not be overlooked that Origen immediately afterwards connects this passage with 1 Cor. iv. 13, and applies to Christ in a higher degree what is there said in reference to the Apostles.
doctrine, and was the cause of its propagation, Hom. in Jerem. 10. 2. comp. Bähr, p. 142. who observes: that no ecclesiastical writer of this period beside Origen distinctly mentions this point. This idea bears indeed the greatest resemblance to the modern rationalistic-moral notions concerning the death of Christ. He also compares the death of Jesus with that of Socrates, contra Cels. ii. 17. Opp. i. p. 403. 4. and regards it as a moral lever to strengthen the courage of his followers, ibid. 40—42. p. 418. 19.


(b) This view rests upon Col. i. 20. Comment. in Joh. i. 40. Opp. iv. p. 41. 42; οὐ μόνον ἡσαρκῶν ἀπειθαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ υἱῶν θανάτων λογίκῶν. De princ. iv. 25. Opp. i. p. 188. (Red. p. 79. and 364.) There are two altars on which sacrifice is made, an earthly and a heavenly one, Hom. in Lev. i. 3. Opp. ii. p. 186. ii. 3. ibid. p. 190. comp. Bähr, p. 119 ffwg. Baur, p. 64. Thomas. p. 214—217.

From all that has been said in reference to the subject in question, it would follow that the primitive church held the doctrine of vicarious sufferings, but not that of vicarious satisfaction. But we should not lay too much stress upon the negative aspect of this inference, so as to justify or to identify it with that later interpretation of the death of Jesus which would exclude everything that is mysterious. Comp. Bähr, p. 5—8, and 176—180.

§ 69.

DESCENSUS AD INFEROS.


We have seen that the Fathers of this period, with the
exception of Origen, limited the efficacy of Christ's death to this world. But several writers of the second and third centuries thought that it was also retrospective in its effects, and inferred from some allusions in Scripture,\(^{(1)}\) that Christ descended in the abode of the dead (Hades), to announce to the souls of the patriarchs, etc. which were there kept, the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them with him into his glorious kingdom.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Eph. iv. 9. 1 Petr. iii. 19. 20. (in connection with Psalm xvi. 10.)—On the clause descendit ad inferos in the Apostle's creed which is of later origin, see Rufin. expos. p. 22. (ed. Fell) King, p. 169 ss. Pott. l. c. p. 300. \([\text{Pearson}, l. c. p. 237.]\)

\(^{(2)}\) Apocryphal narrative in the Ev. Nic. c. 17—27. Thilo Cod. Ap. i. p. 667 ss. \(\text{Ullmann, historisch oder mythisch?}\) p. 228. An allusion is found in the Testament of the xii. patriarchs, \(\text{Grabe, Spic. PP. Sec. i. p. 250.}\) On the passage in the oration of Thaddeus quoted by Eus. i. 13: \(\text{κατίβη ἐσ τω ἁδῷ καὶ διίχοις εὐαγγελίων ἐν ἔ ἀσως μὴ σχεδόν, καὶ ἀνέση καὶ συνήγαγε νεκροὺς τοὺς ἀποκρίων τοιούτους, καὶ πῶς κατίβη μόνος, ἀνίβη δὲ μετὰ σελλοῦ ὅ χλου καὶ πατητικά αὐτοῖ,}\) comp. \(\text{Vales.}\)—The passage from the longer edition of Ign. Ep. ad Trall. c. 9. ii. p. 64. is doubtful; and that from the Shepherd of Hermas, Sim. ix. c. 16. refers more properly to the Apostles. More definite is the language of \(\text{Iren. iv. 27. (45.) p. 264. (347.) v. 31. p. 331. (451.) Tert. de an. 7. and 55. Clem. Strom. vi. 6. p. 762—67. and ii. 9. p. 452. (where he quotes the passage from Hermas); the latter is inclined to extend the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. Orig. contra Cels. ii. 43. Opp. i. p. 419. in libr. Reg. Hom. ii. Opp. ii. p. 492—98. especially towards the close.—Among the heretics we may mention the opinion of Marcion, that Christ did not deliver the patriarchs, but Cain, the people of Sodom, and all those who had been condemned by the demiurgus. \(\text{Iren. i. 27. (29.) p. 106. (Gr. 104.)}\) [On the opinions of the Fathers comp. also \(\text{Pearson, l. c. p. 239. 245 flwg. and Heylyn, l. c. p. 264 flwg.}\)
§ 70.

DOCTRINE OF THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION.

Heubner, H. L., historia antiquior dogmatis de modo salutis tenendae et justificationis, etc. Wittenb. 1805. 4.

From what has been said in the preceding section it is evident that the primitive church generally believed that Jesus Christ was the only way of salvation, and the Mediator between God and man. But all men were required to appropriate to themselves, by a free and independent act, the blessings which Christ has obtained for them, and is willing to bestow upon every one. (1) The forgiveness of sins was made dependent both on true repentance, (2) and the performance of good works. (3) It is to be regretted, that the Fathers, in treating of this subject, sometimes used language which might easily be interpreted as favourable to the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works. (4) Nevertheless all agreed in making faith (in accordance with the apostolic doctrine) the condition sine qua non of salvation, (5) and acknowledged that it alone possesses the power of making men happy by intimately uniting them to God (unio mystica). (6) Though the will of man was generally admitted to be free, yet it was also felt that it must be supported by Divine grace, (7) and thus gradually arose the idea of an eternal decree of God (predestination), which however was not yet thought to be unconditional. (8) Origen in particular endeavoured to explain the relation of predestination to the freedom of the human will in such a manner as should not endanger the latter. (9)

(1) This follows from the above passages on human liberty. Comp. Orig. contra Cels. iii. 28. Opp. i. p. 465. (in connection with what was mentioned § 68), according to which every one
who lives in compliance with the precepts of Christ, obtains through him friendship with God, and is vitally united to him.

(a) The very circumstance that in the opinion of the primitive church sins committed after baptism are less easily pardoned, (Clem. Strom. iv. 24. p. 634. Sylb. 536. C.) and the entire ecclesiastical discipline of the first ages proves this. As regards μετάνοια, Clement was aware of the distinction afterwards made between contritio and attritio, Strom. iv. 6. p. 580: τοῦ μετανοοῦντος διὰ τρόπον δύο, ὅ μεν κατοίκος, φίλος ἐστὶ τοῖς προξενίων, ὃ δὲ ἰδιαίτερος, ἡ δυσωπία ἡ χάρις ημεῖς ἡ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς εἰς συνιστάσεις. — On μετάνοια comp. also Pæd. i. 9. 146. and quis div. salv. 40. p. 957.

(b) Cypr. de opere et eleem. p. 167. (237 Bal.): Loquitur in scripturis divinis Spir. S. et dicit (Prov. xv. 29.): Eleemosynis et fide delicta purgantur. Non utique illa delicta, quae fuerunt ante contracta, nam illa Christi sanguine et sanctificatione purgantur. Item denuo dicit (Eccles. iii. 33.): Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, sic eleemosyna extinguit peccatum. Hic quoque ostenditur et probatur, quia sicut lavacro aquae salutaris gehennae ignis extinguitur, ita eleemosynis atque operationibus justis delictorum flamma sopitur. Et quia semel in baptismo remissa peccatorum datur, assidua et jugis operatio baptismi instar imitata Dei rursus indulgentiam largitur (with a further appeal to Luke xi. 41.) Tears are also of great importance, Ep. 31. p. 64. Retth. p. 323. 389. Origen, Hom. in Lev. ii. 4. Opp. ii. p. 190. 91. enumerates 7 remissiones peccatorum: 1. that which is granted in baptism; 2. that which is obtained by martyrdom; 3. by alms, (Luke xi. 41); 4. by forgiveness which we grant to those who have trespassed against us, (Matth. vi. 14); 5. by the conversion of others, (James v. 20); 6. by exceeding great love, (1 Cor. xiii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 8); 7. by penance and repentance: Est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, et flint ei lacrymæ suas panes die ac nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et querere medicinam. On the merit of the martyrs, comp. § 68. Against the intercession of confessors yet living, Tert. de pud. 22. Cyprian also limits their influence to the day of judgment, de lapsis p. 129. (187.) — Concerning a first and second penance, see Hermæ Pastor. Mand. iv. 3. Clem. Strom. ii. 13. p. 459: Καὶ οἱ οίκες ἐκθέσεων αὐτῶν χάρις τῇ εἰδώτα ἀιματάσιος ἡ μετανοήσατα ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἀφίλακτης ἡ μετανοήσατα ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἀφίλακτης. The different views of Tertullian before and after his conversion to
Montanism may be seen by comparing de pcenit. 7. with de pud. 18. On the controversy between Cyprian and the Novatians see the works on ecclesiastical history.

(4) Traces of the doctrine of supererogatory works (opera supererogatoria) are found in the Shepherd of Hermas, Simil. Lib. iii. 5. 3: Si praeter ea quae non mandavit Dominus aliquod boni adjeceris, majorem dignitatem tibi conquires et honoriator apud Dominum eris, quam eras futurus. Origen speaks in a similar manner, Ep. ad Rom. L. iii. Opp. T. iv. p 507. (he makes an acute distinction between the unprofitable servant, Luke xvii. 10, and the good and faithful servant, Matth. xxv. 21, and appeals to 1 Cor. vii. 25, concerning the virgins.)

(5) During this age, which had regard rather to theoretical knowledge, faith was for the most part considered as historicodogmatic in its relation to γνώσις, (comp. § 34.) This gave rise to the opinion that knowledge in Divine things justifies, while ignorance condemns. Minucius Fcl. 35.: Imperitia Dei sufficit ad pcenam, notitia prodest ad veniam. But though it was reserved for men of later times to investigate more profoundly the idea of justifying faith in the Pauline sense, yet correct views on this subject were not entirely wanting during this period. Tert. adv. Marc. v. 3: Ex fidei libertate justificatur homo, non ex legis servitute, quia justus ex fide vivit. According to Clement of Alexandria faith is not only the key to the knowledge of God (Coh. p. 9.), but by it we are also made the children of God, ib. p. 23. (comp. § 68.1.) p. 69. Clement accurately distinguishes between theoretical and practical unbelief, and understands by the latter the want of susceptibility of Divine impressions, a carnal mind which would have everything in a tangible shape, Strom. ii. 4. p. 436.—Orig. in. Num. Hom. xxvi. Opp. iii. p. 369: Impossible est salvari sine fide. Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. Opp. iv. p. 517: Etiam si opera quis habeat ex lege: tamen, quia non sunt edificata supra fundamentum fidei, quamvis videantur esse bona, tamen operatorem suum justificare non possunt, quod eis deest fides, quae est signaculum eorum, qui justificantur a Deo.
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Hermas represented the predestination of God as dependent on his foreknowledge, Lib. iii. Simil. 8. 6. likewise Justin M. Dial. c. Tryph. § 141. Iren. iv. 29. 2. p. 267. Minuc. Fel. c. 36. Tert. adv. Marc. ii. 23. Clem. Al. Ped. i. 6. p. 114.: ὅπερ ὁ Θεός ἡμῖν καιρὰν ἐδόθη. According to Strom. vi. p. 763. it is men's own fault if they are not elected. They resemble those who voluntarily jump out of the vessel into the sea. "Thus the practical disposition of Cyprian was opposed to the doctrine of rigid predestination, of irresistible grace; he could not so readily and so boldly admit all the consequences which are found in the stupendous fabric of Augustine's system." —" That the bishop of Hippo nevertheless thought to have discovered his own orthodoxy in the writings of Cyprian, may perhaps be ascribed to his eager desire to see the principles which he so zealously defended, confirmed by the opinions of others." Rettberg p. 321.
Origen is far from believing in the doctrine of reprobation. He calls those heterodox who adduce the passage relative to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, and other passages of the Old Test. of similar import in opposition to the σωτρεπόνον of the human soul. He explains God's dealings with Pharaoh from physical analogies: the rain falls upon different kinds of soil, and causes different plants to grow; the sun both melts wax, and hardens clay.

Even in common life it sometimes happens that a good master says to his lazy servant whom he has spoiled by indulgence: I have spoiled you. But he does not mean to say, that such was his intention. Origen (as Schleiermacher did in later times) perceives in what is called reprobatio only a longer delay of the grace of God. As a physician often employs those remedies which apparently produce bad effects, but heal the disease radically, instead of using such as would effect a speedy cure, so God acts in his dealings with men; he has prepared their souls not only for this short passing life, but for eternity, ibid. p. 121. He adduces a similar illustration from the husbandman (according to Matth. xiii. 8.), and then goes on, p. 123: ἀνυπέρ ὑμᾶς, ὡς ἂν ἐπην εἰς, αἱ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ πλοῦτος ἡ δὲ τὰ κάρπῳ καὶ αἱ προδόσιμος καὶ ἐκβολεί καὶ αἱ ὅμοι, ὅν ἦς μόνος οἰκονόμος ἀμυντος, καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς ἐπιστόμιον, καὶ τὰ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπαρκηματα καὶ τὰς ἄγων καὶ τὰς ὀδοὺς, ο τῶν ὑπὸ τοὺς κατατιθέμενως. See ibid. the interpretation of Ezek. xi. 19. and other passages.

On the connection subsisting between Origen's doctrine of predestination and his doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, comp. de princ. ii. 9. 7. Opp. i. p. 99. (Redep. p. 220.) In reference to Jacob and Esau. Origen also held, like the other Fathers prior to the time of Augustine, that predestination was dependent on foreknowledge, Philoc. c. 25. on Rom. viii. 28. 29. (quoted by Münzscher edit. by v. Cölln, i. p. 369.)
FIFTH SECTION.

THE CHURCH AND HER MEANS OF GRACE.

§ 71.

THE CHURCH.

_Henke, H. Th. C., historia antiquior dogmatis de unitate ecclesiae. Helmstedt._

A holy Catholic Christian church which is the communion of saints, was the expression used in the Christian confession of faith to denote the feeling of Christian fellowship which prevailed in the primitive church, though no distinct definitions concerning the nature of the church are found previous to the time of Cyprian. (1) Among the many images under which the church was represented, none was so frequently employed as that of a mother, or of Noah's ark. The Fathers uniformly asserted, both in opposition to heretics, and to all who were not Christians, that there is no salvation out of the church, but that all the fulness of the Divine grace is to be found in it. (2) *Clement of Alexandria* in particular, and still more strongly *Cyprian*, maintain the unity of the church. (3) The definitions of the latter, who takes a more practical position, are of great importance in the history of this doctrine. But he did not sufficiently distinguish between
186 THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

the historico-empirical, visible existence of the church, and the idea of a church which is above the change of mere forms, and gradually develops itself to a state of higher perfection. This is shown by the Novatian controversy. Thus it happened, that the apostolico-Christian doctrine of a universal priesthood was more and more superseded by the hierarchy of the bishops, and the internal was converted into the external. The false idealism of the Gnostics, and the heretical and schismatical tendencies of separate sects form a striking contrast with this false external unity of the Catholic church.

(1.) The general character of the earlier period (previous to the time of Cyprian) is that of abstract indefiniteness. What the theologians of this period say concerning the nature of the church is so frequently void of clearness and precision, that it is almost impossible fully to ascertain their real sentiments on this point; it is nothing uncommon to see the same Fathers evading, or even rejecting consequences which necessarily follow from their general reasonings. They thus evince a fickleness (? which prevents us from forming any decided and certain opinion as to their ideas of the nature of the church.” Rothe l. c. p. 575.

(2) On the term ἰξήλησια in general (corresponding to the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל) comp. Suicer thes. sub voce. Rothe, p. 74 f. The phrase ἰξήλησια καθολική first occurs in the inscription of the Ep. Smyrn. de mart. Polycarpi about the year 169, Eus. iv. 15. comp. Ign. ad Smyrn. 8.: ὅσοι δὲ εἰσὶ δὲν ἐν Ἰ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς, ἰξὴ ή καθολική ἰξήλησια. How great an importance the Fathers were accustomed to attribute to the church, may be seen from Irenæus, adv. haer. iii. 4. 1. and iii. 24. (40.) The church alone contains all the riches of truth; out of her there are nothing but thieves and robbers, pools with foul water: Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et spiritus Dei, ubi spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia, (comp. Huther l. c. p. 4. 5.) iv. 31. 3., according to which the pillar of salt into which the wife of Lot was transformed, represents the durability of the church, and other passages (comp. §. 34. 1. 2.) Clement of Alexandria derives the term and the idea of ἰξήλησια from the elect forming a society, Coh. p. 69. and Pæd. i. 6. p. 114.: ὡς γὰς τῷ Σίλημα αὐτῷ
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... Comp. Strom. vii. 5. p. 846.: οὐ γὰρ τινὶ τοις νόμοις, ἄλλα τὸ ἀδρομεία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐξ ἐκκλησίας καλῶ. Ἐκκλησίας. Clement describes the church as a mother, Paed. i. 5. p. 110. even as both a mother and a virgin, c. 6. p. 123; in speaking of this subject he indulges in allegories, p. 111 flwg. The church is the body of the Lord. Strom. vii. 14. p. 885. Comp. p. 899. 900. (765 Sylb.)

Though Clement asserts that only the true Gnostics (οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἡσυχίας) form the church, yet he does not so much contrast with them those who have only faith, as the heretics who have nothing but an opinion (ὁπισιν), and the heathen who live in total ignorance (ἀγνωσία.) Strom. vii. 16. p. 894. (760 Sylb.) Origen also, though generally speaking he judges mildly of heretical or sectarian opinions, (contra Cels. iii. § 10—13), asserts that there is no salvation out of the church, Hom. iii. in Josuam, Opp. ii. p. 404: Nemo semetipsum decipiat, extra hanc domum i. e. extra ecclesiam nemo salvetur, and Selecta in Hiob. ibid. iii. p. 501. 502. Concerning the views of Tertullian we must make a distinction between those which he held prior, and those which he entertained anterior to his conversion to Montanism. Comp. Neander, Antign. p. 264 flwg. The principal passages relative to his earlier opinions are: de praescript. c. 21 ss. 32. 35. de bapt. c. 8. de orat. c. 2, where the above images are carried out at some length. Thus Cyprian Ep. 4. p. 9; Neque enim vivere foris possunt, cum domus Dei una sit, et nemini salus esse, nisi in ecclesia possit. He too adduces a variety of similar images. Comp. note 3.

"The common opinion that the proposition: quod extra ecclesiam nulla salus, or: de ecclesia, extra quam nemo potest esse salvus, was for the first time laid down by Augustine in the Donatist controversy, is incorrect. It was only the necessary consequence and application of earlier principles, and was distinctly implied in the form which the doctrine of the church had assumed since the time of Irenaeus. Hence we find in the writings of the latter many allusions to it, though he does not make use of the somewhat harsh phrase given above. But it is almost to be regretted that both this idea and phrase have entirely disappeared in the present age, inasmuch as they express a profound truth, and might with equal propriety be used by all parties in the church. For life and happiness are only to be found in religion, and out of it there is nothing but death and misery." Marheineke (in Daub und Creuzers Studien iii. p. 187.)
(a) On the unity of the church see Clem. Al. Paed. i. 4. p. 103. c. 6. p. 123: Ο Συμβολος μυστικως εις μιν εις των διων παντις εις δε και εις των διων λογος και το πνευμα το άγιον εν και το αυτο πανταχω μη δι μοι γινεται μης σαηδιος. Strom. i. 18. p. 375. vii. 6. p. 848. and other passages. Concerning the opinion of Tertull. comp. the passages before cited. Cyprian wrote a separate work on the doctrine of the unity of the church about the year 251: de unitate ecclesiae, with which several of his extant letters (see note 5) may be compared. He adds some new images to those used by Tertullian, as illustrative of this unity: the sun which casts forth many rays, the tree with its many branches, all of which derive their nourishment and strength from the one root, the one source which gives rise to many brooks: Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte prseciderivum, prsecusus arescit. Sic ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit etc.—He also treats at great length of the image of the one mother: Illiis fetu nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu ejus animamur. He who has not the church for his mother, has no longer God for his father (de unit. eccles. 5. 6.) According to the usage of the Old Test. faithlessness towards the church is compared with adultery. The trinity itself is an image of the unity of the church (comp. Clement 1. c.), as well as the coat of Christ which was not to be rent, the passover which had to be eaten in one house, the one dove in Solomon's Song, the house of Rahab which alone was to be preserved, etc. Quite in consistence with such notions, he maintains that martyrdom out of the church, so far from being meritorious, is rather an aggravation of sin: Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est...Occiditalispotest, coronari non potest, etc. Comp Rettb. 241 flwg. p. 355 flwg p. 367 flwg. Huther p. 52—59.

(a) The phrase visible and invisible church has in modern times been objected to (Rothe, p. 99 flwg.); on this account we have endeavoured to paraphrase it, though the common term, if rightly understood, has the advantage of being brief, and forms a barrier against any confusion between the external and the internal.

(6) If the genuineness of the epistles of Ignatius (even of the shorter recension) were fully established, they would prove be-
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Beyond all dispute, that submission to the bishops was considered as a doctrine of the church at a very early period. Comp. Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 8.: πάντες τῷ ἱεροπλήκτῳ ἀκαλούχοι, ὦς ἔχουσιν Χριστὸς τῷ σαρκί etc. ad Polyc. c. 6. ad Eph. c. 4. ad Magn. c. 6. ad Philad. c. 7. ad Trall. c. 2. Comp. Rothe, p. 445 flwg. Iren. iii. 14. iv. 26. (43.) v. 20. On the succession of the bishops: iii. 3. (primacy of the Romish church); comp. with it Neander i. 3. p. 318 note. Though Tertullian appeared formerly willing, de prescr. c. 32., to concede to the church of Rome the precedence over other churches, yet after his conversion to Montanism he combated the pretensions of the Romish bishops, de pud. 21.; he there alludes particularly to the words of Christ addressed to Peter: δαβο τι βί τί εις χειρίας,— and maintains that the word τιβι refers to Peter alone, and not to the bishops. He supposed that spiritual men were the successors of Peter, and distinguished between the ecclesia spiritus per spiritales homines (in which the trinity dwells) and that ecclesia which is composed of the sum total of the bishops (numerus episcoporum.)

On this ground (but not in the purely apostolic sense) he defended the idea of a spiritual priesthood. Neander, Antignosticus, p. 258-59. and p. 272. On the contrary Cyprian conceives the true priestly dignity to consist in the very episcopal power (but not so much in that of the Romish bishops exclusively, as in that of all the bishops collectively,) and thinks that the unity of the church is represented by the successors of the apostles. Hence he who does not take the part of the bishop, no more belongs to the church. Comp. especially the following epistles: 45. 52. 55. 64. 66. 67. 69. 74. 76. (c. 2.) see Huther p. 59 flwg. Rettberg p. 367 flwg. Gess p. 150 flwg. Neander, Kirchengeschichte i. 1. p. 404—7.

Wherever the term ἱδυσία occurs e. g. in the Clementine Homilies (Hom. iii. 60. 65. 67. p. 653 ss. vii. 8. p. 680. Credner iii. p. 308. Baur, p. 373.), it is to be understood in a limited sense. Concerning the Ebionites Epiphanius observes, Har. 30. 18. p. 142: συναγωγήν δὲ σύνοι καλούσι τὴν ἱαυτῶν ἱδυσίαν καὶ οὕτω ἱδυσίαν. Comp. Credn. ii. p. 236. The Ebionitic tendency converted the idea of the church into that of a Jewish sect, the Gnostics refined it into an idealistic world of aeons (Baur, p. 172.); on the one hand we have a body without life, on the other a phantom without body.
§ 72.

BAPTISM.


The doctrine of the church stands in intimate connection with the doctrine of baptism. From the earliest times great importance was attached to the latter because of its supposed relation to the forgiveness of sin and to regeneration. Some of the Fathers, especially Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, in treating of this subject, as well as of the doctrine of the church, often indulge in exaggerated language, in fanciful and absurd allegories, and in symbolical interpretations, while Origen draws a more distinct line between the external sign, and the internal thing which it is meant to teach. Infant-baptism had not come into general use prior to the time of Tertullian. Though a strenuous advocate of the doctrine of original sin, he nevertheless opposed paedobaptism, on the ground that those who have not committed any actual transgression, need no cleansing from sin. Origen on the contrary favoured infant-baptism. In the time of Cyprian it became so general in the African church, that the African bishop Fidus, appealing to the analogous rite of circumcision under the Old Test. dispensation, proposed to delay the performance of the ceremony of baptism to the eighth day. Cyprian however did not give his consent to this innovation. The baptism of newly converted persons was yet frequently deferred till the approach of death (Baptismus Clinicorum.) During this period a question arose, which was intimately connected with the doctrine of the nature of the church, viz. whether the baptism of heretics
was to be accounted valid, or whether a heretic who returned to the Catholic church was to be rebaptized? In opposition to the usage of the Eastern and African churches, which was defended by Cyprian, the principle was established in the Romish church under Stephanus, that the rite of baptism, if duly performed, was always valid, and its repetition contrary to the tradition of the church (i.e. the Romish church.) Baptism was entirely rejected by some Gnostic sects, while it was held in high esteem by the Marcionites and Valentinus. But the mode of baptism which they adopted was altogether different from that of the Catholic church, and founded upon quite another principle. The idea of a baptism of blood originated with martyrdom, and was in accordance with the mind of the age.

(1.) Concerning the baptism of Christ and of the Apostles, comp. the works on biblical theology, and in reference to the mode of baptism (immersion, formula, etc.) see the works on archaeology. Augusti, vol. vii. On the terms: βατισμα, βαπτισμος, λοιπον, φωνεμος, σφαγις and others, comp. the Lexicons. Respecting baptism as it was practised previous to the appearance of Christ: Schneckenburger, über das Alter der jüdischen Prozelytentaufe und deren Zusammenhang mit dem johanneischen und christlichen Ritus, Berlin, 1828, where the literature is given, and [Halley, R. Lectures on the Sacraments, P. i. Baptism. p. 111—161.]

(2.) On the supernatural influence which the author of the Clementine Homilies ascribes to water, in connection with the notions widely spread in the East, comp. e. g. Hom. ix. and x. see Baur, Gnos. p. 372. Credner, l. c. ii. p. 236, and iii. p. 303. Concerning the Ebionites it is said by Epiph. Indicul. ii. p. 53: το ὅπως ἀντι Πασοῦ ἡγομένη, comp. Hær. 30. Together with the symbolical interpretation of the cross we find in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers a symbolical interpretation of water: Barn. 11. Ηermas Pastor Vis. iii. 3. Mand. iv. 3. Simil. ix. 6. Justin M. (Apol. i. 61.) contrasts baptismal regeneration with natural birth ἐξ ὕπατος σαρκάς. By the latter we become ὅπως ἁγιάζεται ἁγνοιας; by the former ὅπως λεπτότετος καὶ ἀκαμάρτως, ἀφίσιμος τι ἀμαρτίας; hence the λοιπον is also called ἀφίσιμος. Comp.
Dial. c. Tr. c. 13 and 14, where mention is made of the antithesis between baptism and Jewish lustrations. *Theoph.* ad Aut. ii. 16. interprets the blessing which God pronounced on the fifth day of the work of creation upon the creatures of the water, as referring to the water used in baptism. *Clement of Alexandria*, Pæd. i. 6. p. 113, connects the baptism of Christians with the baptism of Jesus. He became *tīlmos* only by it. And so it is with *nous* *phrōnēma* *φρονήματα*, *φρονίζω* *νοεωμοι,* *νοεωμοι* *τιλεωμοι* *τιλεωμοι* *αταλαντιζωμοι* *τιλεωμοι* *αταλαντιζωμοι*. Baptism is a *χάρισμα*. Comp. also p. 116. 117. where the baptized, in allusion to the cleansing power of water, are called *διωλιζόμενοι* (filtered.) Inasmuch as a connection is brought about between the element and the Logos, or his power and spirit, he calls baptism also ἰδωρ λογικόν. Coh. p. 79. All former lustrations are abolished by baptism, being all included in it. Strom. iii. 12. p. 548. 49. Iren. iii. 17. (19.) p. 208. (224.) As dough cannot be made of dry flour, without the addition of some fluid, so we, the many, cannot be united in one body in Christ without the connecting element of water which comes down from heaven; and as the earth is quickened and rendered fruitful by dew and rain, so Christianity by the heavenly water, etc. Tertullian has written a separate treatise on this subject, entitled : de baptismo. Though he rejects the notion of a purely supernatural and mechanical forgiveness of sins by baptism, (comp. Neander, Antign. p. 215), yet he takes occasion from the cosmical and psychical significance of water to adduce numerous analogies. Water (felix sacramentum aquae nostrae, qua abluti delictis pristina cecitatis in vitam aeternam liberamur !) is in his view the element in which Christians alone feel at home, as the small fishes which follow the great fish (*UsoU*.) Heretics, on the contrary, are the generation of vipers and snakes that cannot live in fresh water. Water is of great importance in the universe. The spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters—so upon the waters of baptism. As the church is compared with the ark, so the water of baptism is contrasted with the deluge, and the dove of Noah is a type of the dove of the Spirit." As power is

*a Concerning these manifold allegorical interpretations of fish, dove, etc. comp. *Münster*, Sinnbilder der Christen, and *Augusti* in his essay: *"Die Kirchenthiere"* in vol. xii. of his work on the Antiquities of the Christian church. But Tertullian rightly says in reference to himself: vereor ne laudes aquae potius quam baptismi rationes videar congregasse!
inherent in all water, it is indifferent what kind of water is used. The water of the Tiber possesses the same power as the water of Jordan, running produces the same effects as standing water, de bapt. 4: Omnes aquae de pristina originis prerogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supernit enim statim Spiritus de celis et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semet ipso et its sanctificatae vim sanctificandi combibunt. Cyprian spoke of the great importance of baptismal water from his own experience, de grat. ad Donat. p. 3. He does not indeed maintain that water purifies as such, (peccata enim purgare et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest, nisi habeat et Spiritum S. Ep. 74. p. 213), but his language leads us to suppose that he too believed in the supernatural efficacy of water. The devil was cast out of Pharaoh, when he and all his host were drowned in the Red Sea, (the sea is a symbol of baptism according to 1 Cor. x.); for the power of the devil does not extend itself over water. As scorpions and snakes loose their strength, and must vomit their poison when thrown into the water, so the unclean spirits. In short, whenever water is mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, the allegorical interpretation is at once applied to it—"it is therefore not at all surprising, that the rock in the wilderness, as well as the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, and many others, are regarded as types of baptism." Rettberg, p. 332.

(3) The term αὐτοῦ, itself, which Origen uses, adv. Cels. iii. Opp. i. p. 481. and Comment in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 132. indicates that he had a more or less distinct idea of the difference between the image and the thing which it represents. Nevertheless (ὁτίν' ἡστήκε) from the last mentioned passage it is evident, that he also considers baptism as something κατ' αὐτό, viz. ἄξιος καὶ σημαντικός ἐς ἐκεῖνο, because it is administered in the name of the divine Trias. Comp. Horn, in Luc. xxi. Opp. i. p. 957.

(4) The passages from Scripture which are thought to intimate that infant-baptism had come into use in the primitive church, are doubtful and prove nothing; viz. Mark x. 14. Matth. xviii. 4. 6. Act. ii. 38. 39. 41. Act. x. 48. 1 Cor. i. 16. Col. ii. 11. 12. Nor does the earliest passage occurring in the writings of the Fathers, Iren. adv. haer. ii. 22. 4. p. 147. see § 68. 1.) afford any decisive proof. It only expresses the beautiful idea
that Jesus was Redeemer in every stage of life, and for every stage of life; but it does not say that he redeemed children by the water of baptism, unless the term renascibe be interpreted by the most arbitrary petitiopri principii to refer to baptism. Nor does the passage in question go to prove the contrary. But from the opposition which Tertullian raised to infant-baptism, de bapt. 18, it may be inferred, that it was a customary practice in his times. He alleges the following reasons against it:—1. the importance of baptism; not even earthly goods are intrusted to those under age; 2. the consequent responsibility of the sponsors; 3. the innocence of children (quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissiorem peccatorum?); 4. the necessity of being previously instructed in religion (Ait quidem Dominus: nolite eos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescents, venniant dum discent, dum quo veniant docentur; fiat Christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint.); 5. the great responsibility which the subject of baptism takes upon him (Si qui pondus intelligent baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem, quam dilatationem.) From the last mentioned reason he recommends even to grown up persons, (single persons, widows, etc.) to delay baptism till they have either married, or formed the firm resolution to live a single life. Comp. Neander, Antignosticus, p. 209. 210. [Robinson, l. c. ch. xxi. p. 164 flwg.]

(5) The views of Origen, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. v. Opp. iv. p. 565. in Lev. Hom. viii. Opp. i. p. 230. in Lucam, Opp. iii. p. 948. were connected with his notions concerning the sinful element in natural generation, (comp. § 63. n. 4.) But it is worthy of notice, that in the first of the above passages he calls infant-baptism a rite derived from the Apostles.

(5) See Cypr. Ep. 59. (written in the name of 66 Occidental bishops, Ep. 64. edit. Oxon.) Cyprian maintains that infants should be baptized at the earliest convenience; but his argument in favour of infant-baptism is not founded upon the guilt of original sin, on the contrary, upon the innocent condition of infants. Tertullian, on the other hand, urges this very reason in opposition to infant-baptism. But Cyprian looks more at the beneficial effects it is designed to produce, than at the responsibility which is attached to it. As we do not hesitate to salute the new born, yet innocent babe, with the holy kiss of peace, “since he still exhibits the marks of the creative hands of

(7) On this custom, comp. the works on ecclesiastical history and antiquities. [Neander, transl. i. p. 358, 359.] Cyprian Ep. 76. (69. edit. Ox. p. 185), where some very difficult questions are raised respecting sprinkling. Against the delay: Const. apost. vi. 15. as it is done from disregard or levity. Tertullian allows even laymen, but not women, to administer the rite of baptism in cases of emergency; de bapt. c. 17. Comp. Const. apost. iii. c. 9—11.

(8) Clement of Alexandria recognizes only that baptism as valid, which is administered in the catholic church: τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ αἰεὶναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ γίνεσθαι ὕδας. Strom. i. 19. p. 375. likewise Tert. de bapt. c. 15: Unus omnino baptismus est nobis tam ex Domini evangelio, quam ex Apostoli litteris, quoniam unus Deus et unum baptisma et una ecclesia in colis......Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ discipline, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere, quod mihi est præceptum, quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis, nec unus Christus, i. e. idem; ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem. Quem quum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent. Comp. de pud. 19. de praæser. 12. The synods of Iconium and Synnada (about the year 235) pronounced the baptism of heretics invalid, see the letter of Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea to Cyprian, (Ep. 75.) Eus. vii. 7. A synod at Carthage (about the year 200), under Agrippinus had used similar language; see Cypr. Ep. 73. (ad Jubaianum p. 199. 130. Bal.) Cyprian adopted the custom of the Asiatic and African churches, and insisted that heretics should be re-baptized. But according to him this was not a repetition of the act of baptism, but the true baptism; comp. Ep. 71. where he uses baptizari, but not re-baptizari in reference to heretics. Concerning the subsequent controversy with Stephanus, comp. Neander, K. G. i. p. 563. 77. [transl. i. p. 369—377.] Rettberg, p. 156 f. The epistles 69—75 refer to this subject. Stephanus recognized as valid baptism administered by heretics, but demanded the laying on of hands as significant of penitentia. The African bishops, on the other hand, restricted this latter rite to the case of the lapsi, and appealed to the custom observed by the heretics themselves in confirmation of their view.
That the lapsi could not be re-baptized, needs no proof. The African usage was confirmed by the catholic synod, 255. and 256. (ii.) Comp. Sententiae Episcoporum lxxxii. de baptizandis haereticis in Cypr. Opp. p. 229. (Fell.)

Theod. Fab. haer. i. c. 10. On the question whether the sect of the Cajani (viper venenatissima. Tert.), to which Quintilla of Carthage, an opponent of baptism, belonged, was identical with the Gnostic Cainites: see Neander Antignosticus, p. 193. Some of the objections to baptism were the following: it is below the dignity of the Divine to be represented by anything earthly; Abraham was justified by faith alone; the apostles themselves were not baptized,* and Paul attaches little importance to the rite. (1 Cor. i. 17.) That the majority of the Gnostics held baptism in high esteem, is evident from the circumstance, that they laid great stress on the baptism of Jesus, see Baur, Gnosis, p. 224. On the threefold baptism of the Marcionites, and the further particulars, comp. the works treating of this subject; respecting the Clementine Homilies, see Credner, iii. p. 308.

Orig. exh. ad Mart. i. p. 292. with reference to Mark x. 38; Luke xii. 50. Tert. de bapt. 16: Est quidem nobis etiam secundum lavacrum, unum et ipsum, sanguinis scilicet Hos duos baptismos de vulnere perfossi lateris emisit: quatenus qui in sanguinem ejus crederent, aqua lavarentur; qui aqua lavissent, etiam sanguinem potarent. Hic est baptismus, qui lavacrum et non acceptum representat, et perditur reddit. Comp. Scorp. c. 6. Cyprian Ep. 73. and especially de exh. martyr. p. 168, 69. According to him the baptism of blood is in comparison with the baptism of water in gratia majus, in potestate sublimius, in honore pretiosius; it is baptisma, in quo angeli baptizant, b. in quo Deus et Christus ejus exultant, b. post quod nemo jam peccat, b. quod fidei nostrae incrementa consummat, b. quod nos de mundo recedentes statim Deo copulat. In aquae baptismo accipitur peccatorum remissa, in sanguinis corona virtutum. Heretics are profited neither by the baptism of blood, nor by that of water, but the former is of some service to the

* To the remark of some: tunc apostolos baptismi vicem implesse, quum in navicula fluctibus adaspersi operi sunt, ipsum quoque Petrum per mare ingredientem satis meram, Tertullian replies: de bapt. 12: alius est adaspergi vel intercipi violentia maris, alius tingui disciplina religionis.
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

§ 73.

The Christian church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper, as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ (Eucharist.) It was not the tendency of the age to dissect the symbolical in a critico-philosophical manner, and to draw metaphysical distinctions between its constituent parts, viz. the outward sign on the one hand, and the thing represented by it on the other. On the contrary, the real and the symbolical were so blended, as not to destroy each other. Thus it happens that in the writings of the Fathers of this period we meet with passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and at the same time with others which indicate belief...
in a *real participation* of the body and blood of Christ. Yet we may already discern some leading tendencies. *Ignatius*, as well as *Justin* and *Irenæus*, laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and the elements. The idea of such a connection however was sometimes misunderstood, and gave rise to superstitious views, or it was wilfully perverted, in the hope of producing supernatural effects. *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, though somewhat favourable to the supernatural, are nevertheless representatives of the symbolical aspect. The Alexandrian school too espoused the latter, but the language of *Clement* on this subject is less definite than that of *Origen*. *Clement's* notions are a mixture of symbolical interpretation and ideal mysticism. In the writings of *Justin* and *Irenæus* the idea occurs of a *sacrifice*, by which however they did not understand a daily repeated propitiatory sacrifice (in the sense of the Romish church), but a thank-offering presented by the Christians themselves. This idea, which may have had its origin in the custom of offering oblations, was brought into connection with the service for the commemoration of the dead, and thus prepared imperceptibly the way for the later doctrine of masses for the deceased. It led further to the notion of a *sacrifice* which is repeated by the priest, (but only symbolically); an idea which seems to have been first entertained by *Cyprian*. It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Ebionites celebrated the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord's Supper.

---

(1) Respecting the terms *εὐχαριστία, σῶμα, ἐνίοτος*, see Suicer and the lexicons. [Knapp, I. c. p. 437.] With the exception of the *Hydroparastates* (Aquarii, Epiph. her. 46. 2), all Christians, in accordance with its original institution, used wine and bread; the wine was generally mixed with water (*μετὰ*) and
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an allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements. [Knapp, I. c. p. 441.] The Artotyrites are said to have used cheese along with bread. (Epiph. haer. 49. 2.) Concerning the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the age of the Antonines, and the custom of administering it to the sick, &c. see Justin M. Apol. i. 65. [Neander, Hist. of the Ch. transl. i. 386.] On the liturgical part of this ordinance in general, see Augusti, vol. viii.

(a) It is only in consequence of the abstract and speculative tendency of the West and of modern times, that so many different significations have been assigned to what the early eastern church understood by the phrase τοῦ τρίτι. If we would fully enter into its original meaning, we should not separate these significations at all. To say that the words in question denote transubstantiation, would be to take them in too definite and too comprehensive a sense; the interpretation according to which they would teach an existence cum et sub specie, is too artificial; the rendering: this signifies, says too little, and is without force. In the view of the writers of the gospels, (and after their example in that of the earliest Fathers) the bread in the Lord's Supper was the body of Christ. But if they had been asked whether the bread was changed? they would have replied in the negative; if they had been told, that the communicants partook of the body with and under the form of the bread, they would not have understood it; if it had been asserted that the bread only signified the body, they would not have been satisfied.” Strauss, Leben Jesu, 1st edit. vol. ii. p. 437. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, ii. p. 1211 flw. and 1185 flw.

(b) Ignat. ad Smyrn. 7. reproaches the Docetists: Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχής ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάκχα ἵνα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν ἡμῶν παθούσαν, ἵνα τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ὁ θεός, comp. ad Trall. 8. ad Philad. 5. ad Rom. 5. Some understood the word οὕτω itself as symbolical. Comp. Münscher ed. by Cölln, i. p. 495. Justin, Apol. i. 66. after having made a strict distinction between the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper, and common bread and wine: ὁ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν σῶμα ταῦτα λαμβάνων, speaks of a change analogous to the incarnation of the Logos which takes place in us. As the Logos became flesh, so our flesh and blood are changed into his, as we are taught, that bread and wine are the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. He evidently speaks
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not of a change in the sense of the later term: transubstantiation, since the μεταβολή refers to the communicants. But on the other hand, it is no less certain that Justin calls bread and wine simply the flesh and blood of Christ, without distinctly stating the manner in which that change took place, and understands them to be more than mere symbols. *Irenæus* iv. 18. (33.) p. 250. (324. Grabe) also thinks that the common bread is changed into bread of a higher order, the earthly into the heavenly; but it does not therefore cease to be bread. He draws a parallel between this change and the transformation of the mortal body into the immortal, p. 251: ὡς γὰς ἀτὸ γῆς ἄρτος περιλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν [ἐπίκλησιν] τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐκίνη τεῖνα ἄρτος ἑος, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἵνα δό σεμαντικόν σωσικήμαν, ἵνα γιόν τε καὶ ὑματιοῦ, εὐκίνης καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, μηκέτι εἰς θαγατε, τῇ ἐπικίνθια τῆς μὲ αἰώνιας ἀναστάσεως ἱερᾶ. Comp. v. 2. p. 293. 94. (396. 97.) and Massueti Diss. iii art. 7. p. 114. *Irenæus* also defends the real presence of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper in opposition to the Docetse and Gnostics, iv. 18. § 4. 33. § 2. (Münscher von Cölln, i. p. 496.) But the reason which he argues in favour of his views, viz. that the Gnostics cannot partake of the bread and wine with thanksgiving, because they despise matter, shows that he regarded the elements as more than merely accidental things, though they are only bread and wine.

(4) The fear of spilling any part of the wine (Tert. de corona mil. 3: Calicis aut panis nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur, and Orig. in Exod. Hom. xiii. 3.) was perhaps founded on a right feeling of propriety, but it degenerated into superstitious dread. Thus the belief in an inherent vital power in the elements (φάγματιν Ἀναστασίας, ἀντίδοτον τοῦ μη ἀνασταν) was gradually converted into the belief of miraculous cures being effected by them, which would easily form the transition to gross superstition. The practice of administering the Lord's Supper to children may also be ascribed to the expectation of supernatural effects. Comp. the anecdotes of Cyprian, de lapsis, p. 132. Rottberg, p. 337.—The separation of the Lord's Supper from the agape which had become necessary, the custom of preserving the bread, the communion of the sick, etc. furthered such views.

(5) It is remarkable that Tertullian, whose views generally speaking, are realistic, shows in this instance a leaning towards
the allegorical interpretation, according to which the Lord's Supper is *figura corporis Christi*, adv. Marc. i. 14. iv. 40. In the latter place he makes use of the *symbolical* to refute the notions of Marcion: if Christ had not possessed a real body, it could not have been represented: (vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non potest.—He might as well have said: it is impossible to partake of a phantom as such!) This sentiment accords with what is said de anima, c. 17: vinum in sanguinis suí memoriam consecravit. Nevertheless Tertullian speaks in other places, de resurr. c. 8. de pud. c. 9. of the participation of the Lord's Supper as an opimitate dominici corporis vesci, as a de Deo saginari; with these expressions comp. de orat. 6: corpus ejus in pane censeetur (not est.) He also makes some mystical allusions (e. g. Gen. xlix. 11: lavavit in vino stolam suam, is in his opinion a type, etc.), and adopts the notions of his age concerning the supernatural effects of the Lord's Supper. But the existence of such notions is no proof that the doctrine of transubstantiation, or another of similar import, was known at that time, since the same efficacy was ascribed to baptismal water. Comp. Neander, Antignosticus, p. 517, and *Baur, F.*, Tertullian's Lehre vom Abendmahl, (Tübing. Zeitschr. 1839. part 2. p. 36 flwg.) in opposition to Rudelbach, who asserts (as Luther had done before him) that Tertullian took the Lutheran view of the point in question. On the other hand, Cæcolampadius and Zwingle appealed to the same Father in support of *their* opinions. *Cyprian's* doctrine of the Lord's Supper is set forth in the 63d of his epistles, where he combats the error of those who used water instead of wine (see note 1.), and proves the obligation resting upon us of employing the latter. The phrase *ostenditur* used in reference to the wine as the blood of Christ, is somewhat doubtful. But the comparison which Cyprian draws between water and people, rather intimates that he was in favour of the symbolical interpretation, though he calls in other places (like Tertullian) the Lord's Supper simply the body and blood of Christ. Ep. 57. p. 117. What he says concerning the effects of the Lord's Supper, (the blessed drunkenness of the communicants compared with the drunkenness of

* Respecting the manner in which Tertullian viewed the relation between the *sign* and the *thing signified*, comp. as a parallel-passage de resurr. carnis c. 30.
Noah), and the miracles related by him, are a sufficient answer to the charge of insipidity. But in connection with the doctrine of the unity of the church, he attaches great practical importance to the idea of a *communio*, which was afterwards abandoned by the Romish church, but on which again much stress was laid by the reformers, Ep. 63. p. 154: Quo et ipso sacramento populus noster ostenditur adunatus, ut quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta et commolita et commixta, panem unum faciunt, sic in Christo, qui est panis coelestis, unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus et adunatus. Comp. Rettberg, p. 332 flwgl.

(6) Clement adopts the mystical view of the Lord's Supper, according to which it is heavenly meat and heavenly drink; but he looks for the mystical not so much in the elements (bread and wine), as in the spiritual union of the believer with Christ, and thinks that effects are produced only upon the mind, not upon the body. Clement also considers the Lord's Supper not only as *σύμβολον*, but as *σύμβολον μυστικόν*. Pæd. ii. 2. p. 184. (156. Syllb.) Comp. Pæd. 1. 6. p. 123: ταύτας ἡμῖν οἰκίας τροφὰς ὁ Κύριος χαρηγεῖ καὶ σάρκα δέχει καὶ ἀλμα ἀκχεί καὶ οὖθιν εἰς αὐξησιν τῶν σαίδιος ἵνα τῷ ταραδίου μυστήριον κ. τ. λ. The use of the terms ἀλληγοριστα, δημιουργία, αἰνητοθετεί clearly intimates that in his view the visible elements themselves are not that mystery, but the idea represented by them. His interpretation of the symbol is somewhat peculiar: the Holy Spirit is represented by the ἁγία, the Logos by the άλμα, and the Lord himself, who unites in him the Logos and the Spirit, by the mixture of the wine and the water. A distinction between the blood once shed on the cross, and that represented in the Lord's Supper, is found in Pæd. ii. 2. p. 177. (151. Syllb.): Διευθύνε τῷ τὸ άλμα τοῦ Κυρίου τῷ μίν γάρ ἵσταν αὐτῷ σαφειχθεί, ὡ τῆς φωσφορίς λαλητρώμεθα· τῷ δὲ συμματικῶς, τούτισσον ὡ σκηνίσμα. Καὶ τούτῳ ἵσταν τῷ άλμα τοῦ Ιησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαβθήν ἀφθονίας· ἰσχύς δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ συμμα, ὡς άλμα σαφές. (Comp. Bähr, vom Tode Jesu, p. 80.) In the part which follows, the mixture of the wine and water is said to be a symbol of the union of the μυστικά with the spirit of man. Lastly, Clement also finds in the Old Test. types of the Lord's Supper, e. g. in Melchisedec. Strom. iv. 25. p. 637. (539. B. Syllb.) Among the Antinicene Fathers *Origen* is the only one who decidedly opposes those as ἀκρασιονίνως, who take the external sign for the thing itself in the xi. Tom. on Matth. Opp. iii. p.
498—500. A common meat does not defile, but rather unbelief and the impurity of the heart, so the meat which is consecrated by the Word of God and by prayer, does not by itself sanctify those who partake of it. The bread of the Lord profits only those who receive it with an undefiled heart and a pure conscience.” In connection with such views Origen (as afterwards Zwingle, and still less the Socinians) did not attach so much importance to the actual participation of the Lord’s Supper as the other Fathers: οὕτω δὲ οὕτω ἐκ τοῦ μὴ φαγών ταῦτα αὐτῷ τὸ μὴ φαγέων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγιασμὸς λόγῳ ζωῆς καὶ ἐντύμω ἄρσεν, ὑστεροῦμεν διὰ ἁγαθοῦ τιμοῦς οὕτω ἐκ τοῦ φαγείν περισσότερον ἄγαθόν πινεῖ τὸ γάς αἰτίον τῆς ὑστερίζουσας ἡ κακία ἵστη καὶ τὰ ἁμαζέματα, καὶ τὸ αἰτίον τῆς αἰτιοσύνης ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἰστι καὶ τὰ καθεξῆς ἱστατο, ib. p. 898: Non enim panem illum visiblum, quem tenebat in manibus, corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum, sed verbum, in cujus mysterio fuerat panis ille fragendus, etc. Comp. Hom. vii. 5. in Lev. Opp. ii. p. 225: Agnoscite, quia figure sunt, quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, et ideo tamquam spiritales et non tamquam carnales examinate et intelligite, quae dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnales ista suscipitis, laedunt vos et non alunt. Est enim et in evangelii littera. ......quæ occidit eum, qui non spiritu litter, quæ dicuntur, adverterit. Si enim secundum litteram sequaris hoc ipsum, quod dictum est: nisi manducaveritis car nem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit hæc littera.

(7) Concerning the oblations see the works on ecclesiastical history, and on antiquities.—Hence Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. c. 117. calls the Lord’s Supper οἰκουμενικαῖα and προσφορα, and compares it with the sacrifices under the Old Test. dispensation. He connects with this the offering of prayers (εὐχαριστία), which are also sacrifices. But the Christians themselves make the sacrifice; there is not the slightest allusion to a repeated sacrifice on the part of Christ! Irenæus, adv. hær. iv. 17. 5. p. 249. (324 Gr.), teaches with equal clearness, that Christ had commanded, not on account of God, but because of the disciples, to offer the first fruits, and thus breaking the bread and blessing the cup with thanksgiving he instituted: oblationem, quam ecclesia

* Namely “as a thankoffering for the gifts of nature, which was followed by thanksgiving for all other Divine blessings.—The primitive church had a distinct notion of this connection between the Lord’s Supper, and what might be called the natural aspect of the passover.” Baur l. c. p. 137.
Apostolici accipientes in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimienta nobis praestat; primitias suorum munera etc. The principal thing is the disposition of the person who offers. On the difficult passage, iv. 18. p. 251. (326. Gr.): Judaei autem jam non offerunt, manus enim eorum sanguine plena sunt: non enim receperunt verbum, quod [per quod ?] offertur Deo. Comp. Massuet diss. iii. in Iren. De lingii Obs. sacr. P. iv. p. 92 ss. and Neander Kirchengesch. i. 2. p. 588. [transl. i. p. 385.]

(a) Tert. de cor. mil. 3.; Oblationes pro defunctis pro natalityis annua die facimus, de exh. cast. 11: pro uxore defuncta oblationes annuas reddis, etc. where he also uses the term sacrificium; de monog. 10: where he even speaks of a refrigerium which hence accrues to the dead, comp. de orat. 14. (19.) It might here also be mentioned, that Tertullian, as the Christians in general, called prayers sacrifices; on the other hand, it should not be overlooked, that in the above passage, de monogamia, prayers and sacrifices are distinctly separated. Neander, Antignosticus, p. 155.

(b) Cyprian, in accordance with his whole hierarchical tendency, first of all the Fathers, maintained, that the sacrifice does not consist in the thankoffering of the congregation, but in the sacrifice made by the priest, in the stead of Christ: vice Christi fungitur, id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offerit in ecclesia Deo Patri. But even Cyprian does not go beyond the idea of the sacrifice being imitated, which is very different from that of its actual repetition. Comp. Rottberg, p. 334. and Neander, l. c. i. 2. p. 588 [transl. i. p. 385.]

(c) Concerning the Ebionites see Credner, l. c. iii. p. 308. on the Ophites Epiph. haer. 37. 5. Baur, Gnosis, p. 196.

If we compare the preceding observations with the doctrines afterwards set forth in the confessions of faith, we arrive at the following conclusions: 1. The Roman Catholic notion of transubstantiation is as yet altogether unknown; nevertheless the first traces of it, as well as of the theory of a sacrifice, may be found in the writings of some of the Fathers of this period; 2. the views of (Ignatius), Justin and Irenæus can be compared with those of Luther only in so far as they are alike remote from transubstantiation properly speaking, and from symbolical interpretation, and connect the real with the ideal; 3. the theologians of North Africa and Alexandria are the representatives of the reformed church. The positive tendency of the Calvinistic doctrine may be best
seen in Clement, the negative view of Zwingle is represented by Origen; and both the positive and the negative aspects of the reformed doctrine, are united in Tertullian and Cyprian. The Ebionites (if anything more were known respecting their sentiments) might probably be considered as the forerunners of the Socinians, the Gnostics as those of the Quakers.

§ 74.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM SACRAMENT.

[Halley, R., Lectures on the Sacraments, P. I. Lect. i. p. 1—14.]

The two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper existed before such a systematic definition of the term Sacrament had been formed, as to include both. The phrases μυστήριον and sacramentum are indeed used in reference to either, but they are quite as frequently applied to other religious symbols and usages founded upon some higher religious notion, and lastly, to contain more profound doctrines of the church.

(1) The word Sacrament is not used in the New Test. in the sense in which we understand it, inasmuch as baptism and the Lord's Supper are nowhere described as two associated rites which distinctly differ from other symbolical usages. But shortly afterwards greater importance was attached to the former than to the latter, notwithstanding the prevailing symbolizing tendency of the church. It therefore became necessary that the church itself should determine the idea of a sacrament, as nothing could be decided from Scripture.

(2) As Tertullian generally speaking is the author of the later dogmatic terminology (comp. the phrases: novum Testamentum, trinitas, peccatum originale, satisfactio), so he is the first writer who uses the phrase sacramentum baptismatis et eucharistiae, adv. Marc. iv. 30. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, ii. p. 1188. and the works quoted by him. The corresponding Greek term μυστήριον occurs in Justin Apol. i. 66. and Clem. Pæd. i. p. 123. (comp. Suicer, sub voce.)

(3) Tertullian also uses the word sacramentum in a more ge-
neral sense, adv. Marc. v. 18. and adv. Prax. 30. where he calls the Christian religion a sacrament. Comp. the Index latinitatis, Tertullianæ, by Semler, p. 500. [Halley, l. c. p. 9. 10.] The same may be said respecting the use of the term μυστήριον. Cy- prian employs the word sacramentum with the same latitude as Tertullian. He speaks indeed, Ep. 63. of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but also of a sacrament of the Trinity (de orat. dom. where the Lord's prayer itself is called a sacrament.) On the twofold sense of the Latin word, sometimes denoting oath, sometimes used as the translation of the Greek term μυστήριον see Rettberg, p. 324. 25.
SIXTH SECTION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.

(ESCHATOLOGY.)

§ 75.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST—MILLENNARIANISM.

(CHILIASM.)

The disciples of Christ having received from their master the promise of his second coming (παρουσία), the primitive church looked upon this event as one which would shortly come to pass, and brought it into connection with the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment. Of all the parts of the New Test. none gave rise to so many conjectures on this subject, as the book of Revelation, which some ascribed to the Apostle John, while others rejected this opinion, or even contested its canonical authority. The idea having been introduced in the 20th ch. of that book, of a millennial kingdom, together with the notion of a second resurrection, the more carnally-minded freely indulged in further developments of their millennial hopes. This was the case not only with the Judaizing Ebionites and Cerinthus (according to the testimony of some writers), but also with some orthodox Fathers, such as Papias of Hierapolis, Justin, Irenæus and Tertullian.
The millennial notions of the latter were in full accordance with his Montanist views. Cyprian adopted partly the same ideas, but only in a greatly modified form. The Gnostics were from the first unfavourable to millennial tendencies, which were also opposed by some orthodox writers, e.g. the presbyter Caius in Rome, and the theologians of the Alexandrian school, especially Origen.

(a) Comp. the works on biblical theology. The notion of the second coming of Christ in distinction from the first was found in the New Test. Justin M. Apol. i. 52: δῶρο γὰρ αὐτῶν παρουσίας προσκήρυξαν οἱ προφῆται μιᾶν μίαν τὴν ἡδή γενομένην, ὡς ἀτίμου καὶ παάθητος ἀδρέων τὴν δὲ δυνάμει διὰ μετὰ δέξης ἐξ ὁμοσπονδίας μετὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας αὐτῶν στραγγίζεις παραγενήσονται κεκάθιμον, διὸ καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνεξηγεῖς τάσις τῶν γενομένων ἀδρέων τ. Θ. λ. Cf. dial. C. Tr. 45. Iren. i. 10. (Ἰλεοὺς and παρουσία distinct from) iv. 22. 2.

(2) See above § 31. 7. esp. Euseb. vii. 25. and the introductions to the commentaries on the book of Revelation.

(3) Comp. the commentaries on this chapter.

(4) Jerome in his comment. on Is. lxvi. 20, observes that the Ebionites understand the passage, "And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts," in its literal sense, and apply it to chariots drawn by four horses and conveyances of every description. They believe, that at the last day, when Christ will reign at Jerusalem, and the temple be rebuilt, the Israelites will be gathered together from all the ends of the earth. They will have no wings to fly, but they will come in waggons of Gaul, in covered chariots of war, and on horses of Spain and Cappadocia; their wives will be carried in litters, and ride upon mules of Numidia instead of horses. Those who hold offices, dignitaries, and princes, will come in coaches from Britain, Spain, Gaul, and the regions where the river Rhine is divided in two arms; the subdued nations will hasten to meet them. But the author of the Clementine Homilies is far from adopting such gross notions. Credner, l. c. iii. p. 289. 90.

(5) Euseb. iii. 28. (from the accounts given by Caius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria.) According to Caius, Cerinthus
taught that the anástasis of the Christ would last a thousand years; according to Dionysius, this state would last a thousand years; according to Eusebius, this state would last a thousand years. Burton, Bampton Lectures, vi. lect. p. 177—179, and note 76.]

"In all these works the belief in the millennium is so evident, that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal in an age, when certainly such motives as it offered, were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity." Gieseler, Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte, i. § 50. On the millennial views of Papias see Euseb. iii. 39. :

"In all these works the belief in the millennium is so evident, that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal in an age, when certainly such motives as it offered, were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity." Gieseler, Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte, i. § 50. [translation of Cunningham, i. p. 100.] On the millennial views of Papias see Euseb. iii. 39. :

In the city of Jerusalem, which will be restored, changed and beautified, (in support of his views he appeals to Jeremiah and Ezekiel); at the same time he admits that even orthodox Christians entertain different views, comp. Apol. i. 11.; he there opposes the idea of a human political kingdom, but not that of a millennial reign of Christ.\[Comp. Semisch, C., Justin Martyr, his life, writings and opinions, transl. by J. E. Ryland. ii. 370—376.\] Irenæus adv. hær. v. 33. p. 332. (453. Gr.) defends Chiliasm especially in opposition to the Gnostics. He appeals e. g. to Matth. xxvi. 29. and Is xi. 6.—On the most sensuous and fantastical description of the

\[Various writers have endeavoured to remove the contradiction between these two sentiments, Rössler i. p. 104. interpolates: many otherwise orthodox Christians. Münchener (Handbuch ii. p. 420.) interpolates the word \"Münchener (Handbuch ii. p. 420.) interpolates the word \"and the works referred to in § 23. [Burton, Bampton Lectures, vi. lect. p. 177—179, and note 76.]

\[\text{ Various writers have endeavoured to remove the contradiction between these two sentiments, Rössler i. p. 104. interpolates: many otherwise orthodox Christians. Münchener (Handbuch ii. p. 420.) interpolates the word \"and the works referred to in § 23. [Burton, Bampton Lectures, vi. lect. p. 177—179, and note 76.}]

\[\text{b Are we at liberty to draw any certain conclusions from the silence of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Athenagoras and Theophilus on this point?}

R"
fertility of the vine and of corn, which is said to have originated with Papias and the disciples of John, see Münzscher ed. by von Cölln i. p. 44. Grabe, Spic. Sec. 2. p. 31. and 230. Corrodi ii. p. 496.

(7.) Tertullian’s view is intimately connected with his Montanist notions. His treatise De spe fidelium (Hier. de vir. illust. c. 18. and in Ezek. c. 36.) is indeed lost; but comp. adv. Marc. iii. 24. Tertullian however speaks not so much of sensual enjoyments, as of a copia omnium bonorum spiritualium, and even opposes the too sensuous interpretations of Messianic passages, de resurr. carn. c. 26., though his own exposition is not free from similar errors. Comp. Neander Antignosticus, p. 499. Kirchengeschichte i. 3. p. 1092. [transl. ii. p. 325.] On the question, how far we may implicitly rely on the assertion of Euseb. v. 16., that Montanus had fixed upon the city Pepuza in Phrygia as the seat of the millennial reign? and on the millennial notions of the Montanists in general see Gieseler l. c. i. § 48.


(9.) This is evident both from the real nature of Gnosticism itself, and the opposition which Irenæus raised to it. Some have even ascribed the origin of Marcion’s system to a millenarian controversy; comp. however Baur, Gnosis p. 295.

Though traces of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which is so ably set forth by the Apostle Paul, may be found in certain notions of earlier antiquity, yet it received its full confirmation, and was brought within the apprehension of even the uneducated only by the resurrection of Christ. During the period of Apologetics it was further developed, so as to involve the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. The objections of the opponents of this doctrine, which may be chiefly traced to that tendency of the human mind which prevents man from looking beyond what is visible and tangible, were more or less fully answered in the epistle of Clement, as well as in the writings of Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenæus, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian and others. Most of the Fathers believed in the resuscitation of the very same body which man possessed while on earth. The theologians of the Alexandrian school however, formed an exception; Origen in particular endeavoured to clear the doctrine in question from its false additions, by reducing it to the simple idea of Paul, and sought at the same time to refine and to spiritualize it after the manner of the Alexandrian school. The Gnostics on the other hand rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body entirely; the false teachers of Arabia, whom Origen combated, asserted that both soul and body fall into a sleep
of death, from which they will not awake till the last day.(a)


(2)  It must excite surprise that, while Paul represents the resurrection of Christ as the central point of the whole doctrine, the Fathers of the present period keep this fact so much in the back ground, or that at least it does not always form the foundation of their opinions concerning the resurrection of the body. Some, e. g. Athenagoras, who nevertheless composed a separate treatise on the subject in question, and Minucius Felix are entirely silent on the resurrection of Christ (see below); the others also found their arguments chiefly upon reason and analogies from nature, (the change of day and night, seed and fruit etc. Phœnix Clement of Rome c. 24 and Ep. 11. 9.)

(3)  It is well known that the New Test. does not teach ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκὸς, but ἀναστήσεται, and speaks of a revivification of the σῶμα. But the phrase resurrectio carnis came soon into use, and found also its way into what is called the Apostles’ Creed.

(4)  Clement ad Cor. c. 24. (comp. note 2.) Justin M. adopts the literal interpretation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and thinks that it will rise again with all its members, Fragm. de resurr. c. 3. (edited as a separate programme by Teller, 1766.) Even cripples will rise with the body which they possessed while on earth; it is of course to be supposed that Christ will heal them after the resurrection at his second σάρκωσις. Dial. c. Tyrph. c. 69. Justin founds his belief in the resurrection of the body chiefly upon the omnipotence and benevolence of God, as well as the resurrection of Christ, and shows in connection with it, that the body must necessarily participate in future rewards or punishments. Christianity differs from the systems of either Pythagoras or Plato, in that it teaches not only the immortality of the soul, but also the resurrection of the body. But as Justin investigated this subject more thoroughly, he was necessarily led to the discussion of certain questions which generally engaged the attention of scholastic divines alone, that e. g. relating to the sexual relations of the resurrection bodies, which he compared
with mules! The arguments which Athenagoras adduces in his treatise de resurr. (espec. c. 11.), are partly the same which were in after ages urged by natural theology in support of the doctrine of immortality: the moral nature of man, his liberty and the retributive justice of God. Concerning the resurrection of the body, he has regard to the objections which have been made to it at all times, on the ground, that it cannot be reconciled with the natural course of things, (the fact that the elements of one organism may enter into the composition of another, etc.) He is however fully satisfied in his own mind, that at the resurrection all things will be restored τοῦ τινός αὐτοῦ σώματος ἐξομοιώσαι καὶ συνάσθαι.—Theophilus ad Aut. i. 8. uses similar language.—Irenæus adv. Hær. v. 12. and 13. also asserts the identity of the future with the present body, and appeals to the analogous revivification (not new creation) of separate organs of the body in some of the miraculous cures performed by Christ, (e.g. of the blind man, the man with the withered hand). He alludes particularly to those whom Christ raised from the dead, the son of the widow at Nain, and Lazarus (but makes no mention of the body of Christ himself!)

That Tertullian, who wrote a separate work on the present subject (de resurrectione carnis), believed in the resurrection of the body, is what we might expect, especially as he made no strict distinction between the body and the soul. On the contrary, he points out the intimate connection existing between the one and the other during the present life: Nemo tam proximus tibi (animae) quem post Dominum diligas, nemo magis frater tuus, quae (sc. caro) tecum etiam in Deo nascitur (c. 63.) In his opinion the flesh participates in spiritual blessings, in the means of grace presented to us in unction, baptism and the Lord’s Supper; it even participates in martyrdom (the baptism of blood)! The body too is created after the image of God! (comp. above § 56. 3.) He uses the same illustrations of day and night, the Phœnix, etc. which we find in the writings of others, and maintains the identity of the future with the present body, c. 52.: Certe non aliud resurgit quam quod seminatur, nec aliud seminatur, quam quod dissolvitur humi, nec aliud dis-

* Irenæus takes the word “flesh” in 1 Cor. xv. 50.; which was often quoted against the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, to mean carnal sense.
He endeavours to meet the objection, that certain members will be of no use in the future life, by saying that the members of the human body are not only designed for the mean service of the visible world, but also for something higher. Even on earth the mouth serves not only for the purpose of eating, but also to speak and to praise God, etc. c. 60. and 61. *Minucius Felix* makes Caecilius bring forward the objections of the heathen to the possibility, both of the immortality of the soul, and of the resurrection of the body, c. 11.: Vellem tamen sciscitari, utrum ne sine corpore, an cum corporibus? et corporibus quibus, ipsisne an innovatis resurgatur? Sine corpore? hoc, quod sciam, neque mens, neque anima, nec vita est; ipso corpore? sed jam ante dilapsum est; alio corpore? ergo homo novus nascitur, non prior ille reparatur. Et tamen tanta ætas abiit, secula innumera fluxerunt; quis unus ab inferis vel Protesilai sorte remeavit, horarum saltem permissum commeatu, vel ut exemplo crederemus?—The arguments which he adduces c. 34. in reply to these objections, are founded upon the omnipotence of God, which created man out of nothing, which is certainly more difficult, than the mere restoration of his body; upon the above analogies (expectandum nobis etiam corporis ver est), and the necessity of a retribution which the deniers of the resurrection are anxious to escape.—The notions of *Cyprian* on this subject are formed after those of Tertullian, comp. de habitu virg. p. 100. and Rettberg p. 345.

(a) See the passages quoted in the preceding note.

(b) Clement of Alexandria had already intended to write a separate work ἀναστάσις comp. Pæd. i. 6. p. 125. (104 Sylb.); according to Euseb. vi. 24. and Hieron. apud Rufinum, *Origen* composed not only two books, but also (according to the latter) two dialogues on the present subject, comp. contra Cels. v. 20. Opp. i. p. 592. de princ. ii. 10. i. p. 100, and the fragments Opp. T. i. p. 33—37. Clement of Alexandria only touches upon the doctrine of the resurrection in such of his writings, as are yet extant, without discussing it. The passage Strom. iv. 5. p. 569. (479. S.), where he represents the future deliverance of the soul from the fetters of the body as the object of the most ardent desire of the wise man, does not give a very favourable idea of his orthodoxy in this point. But his disciple *Origen* maintains Comm. in Matth. Opp. iii. p. 811. 12. that we may put our trust
in Christ without believing the resurrection of the body, provided we hold fast the immortality of the soul. Nevertheless he defended the doctrine of the church in opposition to Celsus, but endeavoured to divest it from every thing which might give a handle to scoffers; on this account he rejected the doctrine of the identity of the bodies (which is not that of Paul.) Contra Cels. iv. 57. Opp. i. p. 548. v. 18. ibid. p. 590.: οὕτω μὲν ἐὰν ἥμεις ἄνω τὰ δίκαια γράμματα αὐτοῖς φησι σαρκί μηδεμίαν μεταβολήν ἀνεληφθείς τὴν ἵππον ζήσοντας σαλαίς ἀποθανόντας, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀναδονόντας. δε Κύλιος συνοφρατέω ἡμᾶς ταύτα λέγων. Cap. 23. p. 594: Ἡμῖν µὲν ἄνω εἰς φαμέν το διαφθείσθαι σώμα ἢ παραφθείσθαι εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς φύσιν, ὡς ἀπὸ τὸν διαφθείσθαν κόσμον τοῦ οίνου ἢ παραφθείσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οίνου. λέγων γὰρ ἄσωσθεν ἢ παραφθείσθαι σάκχρως, ὡμο λόγος τῆς ἢ παραφθείσθαι τῷ σώματι, ἀμφοτεροὶ μὴ διαφοράντων ἢ παραφθείσθαι τῷ σώματι ἡ θεοτοκία. The appeal to the omnipotence of God appeared to him as ἀποκαλύφθη, p. 595. according to the axiom εἰ γὰρ ἀσχολῶν τι ἡμῖν ἡ Θεός, εἰς ἥμεις ἀπροκαλύφθη, but the biblical doctrine of the resurrection, if rightly interpreted, includes nothing that is unworthy of God. comp. viii. 49. 50. Opp. i. p. 777. 78. Selecta in Psalm Opp. ii. p. 532—36., where he designates the literal interpretation as φυλαρίας τῶν ὑμάτων, and proves, that every body must be adapted to the surrounding world. If we would live in water, we ought to possess the nature of fish, etc. The heavenly state also demands glorified bodies, like those of Moses and Elias. In the same place Origen gives a more correct interpretation of Matth. viii. 12; Ps. iii. 7. and other passages, which were commonly applied to the resurrection of the body. Comp. de princ. ii. 10. Opp. i. p. 100. (Red. p. 223.), Schnitzer, p. 147 flwg. On the other side: Hieron. ad Pammach. ep. 38. (61.) Photius (according to Method.) Cod. 234.

77. Thus the Gnostic Apelles maintained that the work of Christ had reference only to the soul, and rejected the resurrection of the body. [That the Gnostics believed in the immortality of the soul, appears indisputably certain, but their notions concerning matter made them shrink with horror from the idea of a reunion of the body with the soul, and led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the former. But they have unjustly been charged by the Fathers with a denial of the resurrection in general. Comp. Burton, Bampton Lectures, notes 58 and 59.]

83. Respecting the error of the Thnetopsychnites (as John Da-
mascenus calls them) about the year 248. comp. Euseb. vi. 37.:

§ 77.

GENERAL JUDGMENT. — HADES. — PURGATORY. — CONFLAGRATION OF THE WORLD.


The transactions of the general judgment, which was thought to be connected with the general resurrection, were depicted in various ways. Some ascribed the office of judge to the Son, others to the Father, both in opposition to the Hellenistic myth of the judges in the under-world. The idea of a Hades, which was known both to the Hebrews and the Greeks, was transferred to Christianity, and the assumption that the true happiness, or the final misery of the departed does not commence till after the general judgment and the resurrection of the body, appeared to render necessary the belief in an intermediate state. The soul was supposed to remain there from the moment of its separation from the body to the said catastrophe. Tertullian however held that the martyrs went at once to the abode of the blessed, paradise, and thought that in this particular point they enjoyed an advantage over other Christians. Cyprian does not seem to acknowledge any intermediate state whatever. The Gnostics rejected the notion concerning the Hades together with that concerning the
resurrection of the body, and imagined that those who are spiritually minded (the pneumatic,) would immediately after death be delivered from the bondage of the demiurgus, and be elevated to the *-x>5j«/.Mt.(5-) The oriental idea of a purifying fire also occurs during this period in the writings of *Clement of Alexandria* and *Origen*. This purifying fire however is not thought to perform its work in the intermediate state, but is either taken in a comprehensive sense, or supposed to stand in some connection or other with the general conflagration of the world.(6)

(1) Just. Mart. Apol. i. 8.: Πλάτων δὲ ὠμοίως ἱρὰ 'Ραδάμανθοι καὶ Μήως κελάδος τῶν ἁδίκων παρ' αὐτῶς ἠλθόντας, ἢμεῖς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ στράμμα φαμίν γενήσονται, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Tatian contra Gr. 6.: δικάζουσι δὲ ἢμεῖς οἱ Μήως, οὐδὲ 'Ραδάμανθος... δοκιμασθής δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ Θεὸς γίνεται. Comp. c. 25.

(2) Justin dial. c. Tr. § 5. makes the souls of the pious take up their temporary abode in a better, those of the wicked in a worse place. Comp. § 80.—Iren. v. 31. p. 331. (451. Gr.): Ἀι ψυχαι ἀπηρχομοι εἰς τὸν τόπον τῶν ὁφρυμίων αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως φοιτοῦσι, περιμένουσι τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἵσταται ἀποκλαθοῦσα τὸ σώματα καὶ ὀλλοκλῆς ἀναστάσεως, τουτέστι σωματικῶς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀνάπνεσι, ἐως ἡλύσωσα εἰς τὴν ὅπν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (in connection with it the descensus Christi ad inferos and Luke xvi.22 etc.) Tertullian mentions de anima 55. a treatise in which he says he has proved omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini. The treatise itself is no longer extant, but comp. de anima c. 58. Tertullian 1. c. rejects the notion of the sleep of the soul, which is not to be confounded with the error of the Arabian false teachers § 76.; he also opposes the opinion founded upon 1 Sam. xxviii., that spirits might be conjured up from the abode of the dead, by appealing to Luke xvi. 26. (comp. Orig. Hom. ii. in 1 Reg. Opp. ii. p. 490—98.)

(3) Tert. de anim. 55. de resurr. 43.: Nemo Peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyri prærogativa, paradiso scilicet, non inferis deversurus.—On the meaning of the different terms inferi, sinus Abraham, Paradisus,
The views of Clement on this subject are expressed in still more general terms Pæd. iii. 9. towards the end, p. 282. (Sylb. p. 241.) and Strom. v. 6. p. 851. (709 S.): φαμιν δ' ἡμις ἄγιαζων το σῷο, οὐ τὰ κρία, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀμαρτωλοὺς ψυχὰς σῷο οὗ τὸ πάμφραγμα καὶ βαίνωσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ φήμων λέγοντες τὸ δικαιομένου διὰ ψυχῆς τῆς διεχόμενης το σῷο. From the whole context it appears that he speaks here of the purifying efficacy of a mystical fire even during the present life, perhaps in allusion to Matth. iii. 11. Luke iii. 16. Origen on the other hand referring to 1 Cor. iii. 12. considers the fire which will consume the world at the last day, also as a σῷο καθάζων, contra Cels. v. 15. None (not even Paul or Peter himself) can escape this fire, but it does not cause any pain to the pure (according to Is. xliii. 2.) It is a second sacramentum regenerationis; and as the baptism of blood was compared with the baptism of water (see above § 72. 10.) so Origen thought that this baptism of fire at the end of the world would be necessary in the case of those who have forfeited the baptism of the Spirit; in the case of all others it will be a fire of probation. Comp. in Exod. Hom. vi. 4. in Psalm. Hom. iii. 1. in Luc. Hom. xiv. Opp. iii. p. 948. xxiv. p. 961. in Jerem. Hom. ii. 3. in Ezech. Hom. i. 13. comp. Redepennig on p. 235. Guerike, des schola al. ii. p. 294. Thomasius, p. 250.
STATE OF THE BLESSED AND THE CONDEMNED. — RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

§ 78.

Various expressions were used to denote the state of the blessed. The idea that different degrees of blessedness are proportionate to the different degrees of virtue exhibited in this life, was in accordance with the views of most of the Fathers of this period concerning the doctrine of moral freedom. From this idea the transition was easy to another, viz. that of a further development after the present life. Origen in particular carried out this latter notion, and endeavoured to avoid as much as possible all sensuous representations of the pleasures of the future world, and to place them in purely spiritual enjoyments. Notions more or less gross prevailed concerning the punishment of the wicked, which most of the Fathers regarded as eternal. From the very nature of the thing it is evident, that purely spiritual views on this subject could not reasonably be expected. Origen himself imagined the bodies of the damned to be black. But as he looked upon evil more as the negation of good, than as something positive, he was induced by his idealistic tendency, to limit even hell, and to expect a final remission of the punishment of the wicked at the restitution of all things. But in popular discourses he retained the common idea of eternal punishment.

Different names were given even to the intermediate states before the resurrection (comp. the preceding § note 6.) This was also the case with the abode of the blessed. Thus Irenæus v. 36. p. 337. (460. Gr.) makes a distinction between ὑψωτάτης, πα-
and endeavours to prove the existence of different habitations from Matth. xiii. 8. and John xiv. 2. Clement of Alexandria also adopted the idea of different degrees of blessedness. Strom. iv. 6. p. 579. 80. (488. 89. S.) vi. 14. 793. (668. S.) and Orig. de princip. ii. 11. Opp. i. p. 104.

According to Origen, l. c. the blessed dwell in the aerial regions (1 Thess. iv. 17), and take notice of what happens in the air. Immediately after their departure from this earth, they go first to paradise (eruditionis locus, auditorium vel schola animarum); as they grow in knowledge and piety, they proceed on their journey from paradise to higher regions, and having passed through various mansions which the Scripture calls heavens, they arrive at last at the kingdom of heaven properly so called. He too appeals to John xiv. 2. and maintains that progress is possible even in the kingdom of heaven (desire and perfection.)

In the same place, de princ. ii. 11. Origen describes in strong terms the sensuous expectations of those, qui magis delectationi suæ quodammodo ac libidini indulgentes, solius littera discipuli arbitrantur repromissiones futuras in voluptate et luxuria corporis expectandas. He himself, attaching too much importance to the intellectual, supposes the principal enjoyment of the future life to consist in the gratification of the desire after knowledge, which God would not have given us, if he had not designed to satisfy it. While on earth we trace the outlines of the picture which will be finished in heaven. The objects of future knowledge are, as we might naturally expect, for the most part of a theological character; as an allegorical interpreter, he would think it of great importance, that we should then fully understand all the types of the Old Test. p. 105.: Tunc intelliget etiam de sacerdotibus et levitis et de diversis sacerdotalibus ordinibus rationem, et cujus forma erat in Moyse, et nihilominus quæ sit veritas apud Deum jubilæorum et septimanas annorum; sed et festorum dierum et feriarum rationes videbit et omnium sacrificiorum et purificationum intuebitur causas; quæ sit quoque ratio lepra purgationis et quæ lepra diverse, et quæ purgatio sit eorum qui seminis profuvium patiuntur, advertet; et agnoscer quoque quæ et quantæ qualesque virtutes sint bone, quæque nihilominus contrariae, et qui vel illis affectus sit hominibus, vel istis contentiosse simulatio; the knowledge however of metaphysics, and even of natural
philosophy is not excluded: Intuebitur quoque quae sit ratio animarum, quae diversitas animalium vel eorum, quae in aquis vivunt, vel avium, vel ferarum, quidve sit, quod in tam multas species singula genera deducuntur, qui creatoris prospectus, vel quis per haec singula sapientiae ejus tegitur sensus. Sed et agnoscat, quae ratione radicibus quibusdam vel herbis associantur quaedam virtutes, et aliis e contrario herbis vel radicibus depelluntur. We shall also have a clear insight into the destinies of man, and the dealings of providence. In a higher region we shall be instructed e.g. concerning the stars, "why a star occupies such and such a position, why it stands at such and such a distance from another," etc. But the highest and last degree is the intuitive vision of God himself, the complete elevation of the spirit above the region of sense. The blessed do not stand in need of any other food. The interpretation of Origen forms a remarkable contrast with the sensuous and rhetorical description of Cyprian, which is to be connected with his hierarchico-ascetic tendency; the latter has however more of an ecclesiastical character, and enjoys greater popularity than the former, because it has also regard to the wants of the mind (the meeting again of individuals etc.), de mortalitate, p. 166: Quis non ad suos navigare festinans, ventum prosperum cupidius optaret, ut velociter caros liceret amplecti? Patriam nostram Paradisum computemus, parentes Patriarchas habere jam coepimus: quid non properamus et currimus, ut patriam nostram videre, ut parentes salutare possimus? Magnus illic nos carorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrnum, filiorum frequentos et copiosa turba desiderat, jam de sua immortalitate secura, et adhuc de nostra salute sollicita. Ad horum conspectum et complexum venire quanta et illis et nobis in commune laetitia est? Qualis illic celestium regnorum voluptas sine timore moriendi et cum aeternitate vivendi? quam summa et perpetua felicitas? Illic apostolorum gloriouis chorus, illic prophetarum exsultantium numerus, illic martyrum innumerabilis populus ob certaminis et passionis victoriam coronatus; triumphantes illic virgines, quae concupiscientiam carnis et corporis continentiae robore subegerunt; remunerati misericordes, qui alimentis et largitionibus pauperum justitiae opera fecerunt, qui dominica praecepta servantes, ad celestes thesauros terrena patrimoniam transtulerunt. Ad hos, fratres dilectissimi, avida cupiditate
properemus, ut cum his cito esse, ut cito ad Christum venire contingat, optemus.

(c) Clement of Rome Ep. 2. c. 8. (comp. c. 9.) : μετά γὰς τὸ ἢσθανόν ἦν ἴν τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἵτι δυνάμεια ἵνα ἐξωμολογήσασθαι ἐ μετανοιῶν ἵτι. Justin M. also asserts the eternity of future punishments in opposition to Plato's doctrine, according to which they should only last a thousand years. Apol. i. 8.—Thus Minuc. Fel. c. 35: nec tormentis aut modus ullus aut terminus. Also Cyprian ad Dometr. p. 195: Cremabit addictos ardens semper gehenna, et vivacibus flammis vorax pœna, nec erit, unde habere tormenta vel requiem possint aliquando vel finem. Servabuntur cum corporibus suis animas in infinitis cruciatus ad dolorem, p. 196: Quando istinc exessuum fuerit, nullus jam pœnitentiaë locus est, nullus satisfactionis effectus: hic vita aut ammittitur, aut tenetur, hic saluti æternæ cultu Dei et fructu fidei providetur.—The idea of eternal punishments is different from that of a total annihilation, which was propounded by Arnobius at the commencement of the following period. Some are disposed to find the first traces of this doctrine in Justin M. dial. cum Tryph. c. 5., where it is said that the souls of the wicked should be punished as long as ἵον αὐτὰς καὶ ἵναι τοῦ χαλαζεθαμ ἀ Θεος Ἠλ. Comp. also Iren. ii. 34: quoadusque ea Deus et esse et perseverare voluerit, and Clement Hom. iii. 3.

(s) In accordance with the language of Scripture, fire was commonly represented as the instrument by which God executes his punishments; Clement of Alexandria Coh. 47. (35.) calls it τὸς σωρφεῖνον, Tert. Scorpi. 4. and Minuc. Fel. 35. (afterwards also Jerome and others) call it ignis sapiens. It will be sufficient here to quote the passage of Minucius: Illic sapiens ignis membra urit et reficit, carpit et nutrit, sicut ignes fulminum corpora tangunt, nec absunt, sicut ignes Ατνης et Vesuvii montis et ardentium ubique terrarum flagrant, nec e rogantur, ita pœnale illud incendium non damnis ardentium pas citur, sed in exesa corporum laceratione nutritur. Comp. also Tert. Apol. c. 48. and Cypr. ad Demetr. 1. c. who thinks, that the sight of these punishments is a kind of satisfaction to the blessed for the persecutions which they had to suffer while on earth.—As Origen imagined that spiritual enjoyments constitute the future blessedness, so he believed the misery of the wicked to consist in separation from God, the remorse of conscience, etc.
The eternal fire is neither material, nor kindled by another person, but the combustibles are our sins themselves, of which conscience reminds us; thus the fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this world. The discord between the soul and God may be compared with the pain which we suffer, when all the members of the body are torn out of their joints. By "outer darkness" Origen does not so much understand a place devoid of light, as a state of complete ignorance; he thus appears to adopt the idea of black bodies only by way of accommodation to popular notions. It should also be borne in mind, that Origen imagined, that the design of all these punishments was to heal, or to correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favour of God.

(6° De princ. i. 6. Opp. i. p. 70. 71. (quoted by Münchner von Colhn, i. p. 64. 65.) The ideas there expressed are connected with his general views on the character of God, the design of the Divine punishments, on liberty and the nature of evil, as well as with his demonology, and especially with his unwavering faith in the power of Christ's work to overcome all things (according to Ps. cx. 1. and 1 Cor. xv. 25.) At the same time he frankly confessed, that his doctrine might easily become dangerous to the unconverted, contra Celsum vi. 26. Opp. i. p. 650. He therefore speaks at the very commencement of the 19. Hom. in Jerem. Opp. T. iii. p. 241. of eternal condemnation, even of the impossibility of being converted in the world to come. Nevertheless, in the same Hom. (p. 267.) he calls the fear of eternal punishment (according to Jer. xx. 7.) ἀπάρτη, though it be beneficial in its effects, and brought about by God himself (a pedagogical artifice, as it were.) For many wise men, or such as thought themselves wise, having apprehended the (theoretical) truth respecting the Divine punishments, and rejected the delusion (beneficial in a practical point of view), gave themselves up to a vicious life, while it would have been much better for them to believe in the eternity of the punishments of hell.
SECOND PERIOD.

FROM THE DEATH OF ORIGEN TO JOHN DAMASCENUS,
FROM THE YEAR 254—730.

THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

§ 79.

INTRODUCTION.


During this considerable space of time the polemics of the church developed themselves in a much more remarkable manner than either the apologetical tendency of the preceding, or the systematic tendency of the next period. The time which elapsed from the Sabellian to the Monothelite controversy, presents the aspect of a series of contests, carried on within the church, about the most important doctrinal points. While in the preceding period all heretics separated from the church as a matter of course, we now see them striving for the victory, and it was for a long time uncertain which party would gain it. Orthodoxy however prevailed at last, partly from an internal necessity, partly through the assistance of the secular power, and the
coincidence of external circumstances. Thus it happened
that in after ages orthodoxy appeared as an obligation
which man owes to the state; heresy on the contrary,
was considered a political crime.

§ 80.

DOCTRINAL DEFINITIONS AND CONTROVERSIES.

The three main pillars of the Christian system: Theology, Christology, and Anthropology, were the principal points on which the councils had to decide, and to express their opinion in confessions of faith. The controversies which contributed to bring about this result, are the following: a. In reference to the doctrine of the Trinity (Theology): the Sabellian and the Arian controversies, with their branches, the Semiarian and the Macedonian; b. relative to the two natures of Christ, (Christology), the Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian-Monophysite, and Monothelite controversies; c. concerning Anthropology and the doctrine of the conditions of salvation, the Pelagian and Semipelagian, and in reference to the church, the Donatist controversies. The former took their rise in the East; the latter originated in the West, but both the eastern and western countries felt their effects. Hence disruptions were frequent between the eastern and western church, till at last the controversy respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost brought about a lasting breach.

Though the controversy concerning images, which principally agitated the East, and was also carried on in the West, turned in the first instance upon the form of worship, yet it exerted some indirect influence (especially in the East) upon the doctrinal definitions of the nature of God, the person of Christ, and the significance of the sacraments. But the further developement of the doctrine of the sacraments, and of eschatology was reserved for the next period. Concerning the external
history of these controversies see the works on ecclesiastical history.

§ 81.

THE DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.—THE FATE OF ORIGENISM.

The more decidedly and systematically ecclesiastical orthodoxy was established, the more individual Christians lost the right of private judgment, and the more dangerous it became to embrace heretical opinions. The more liberal tendency of former theologians, such as Origen, so far from meeting with toleration, was subsequently condemned. But notwithstanding this external condemnation, the spirit of Origen continued to animate the theologians of the East, though it was kept within narrower limits. His works were also made known in the West by Jerome and Rufinus, and exerted some influence even upon his opponents.

The principal followers of Origen were Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, Pamphilus, Gregory Thaumaturgus and others. Among his opponents Methodius occupied the most conspicuous position. On the further controversies relative to the doctrinal tenets of Origen under the Emperor Justinian I., and their condemnation brought about (A. D. 544.) by Mennas, bishop of Constantinople, see the works on ecclesiastical history.

§ 82.

THEOLOGIANS OF THIS PERIOD.

Among the number of those theologians of the eastern church, who have either exerted the greatest influence upon the development of the doctrines, or composed works on doctrinal subjects, are the following:—Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, but principally...
THEOLOGIANS OF THIS PERIOD.
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Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzum (the last three of Cappadocia); then: Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Ephraim the Syrian, Nemesius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus; in the West: Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Ambrose, and above all Augustine. These are followed by some others of greater or less importance: John Cassian, Vincentius Lerinensis, Salvian, Leo I. surnamed the Great, Prosper of Aquitania, Gennadius, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Boethius, Gregory the Great, and Isidore Hispalensis. The last is of importance, inasmuch as he collected the materials already in existence, and may be considered the forerunner of John Damascenus (in the East.)

(1) Eusebius (Pamphilus) bishop of Cæsarea, (author of the ecclesiastical history), was born about the year 261, and died 340. Of his dogmatical works the following may be mentioned (in addition to the prologue to his ecclesiastical history): Εὐαγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως (præparatio evangelica) Ed. i. of Steph. 1544 ss. c. not. F. Vigeri 1628. Col. 1688. fol. Εὐαγγελική ἀποδείξις (demonstratio evangelica) Ed. of Steph. 1545 : c. not. Rich. Montacutii, 1628. Lips. 1688. fol.— Εἰς εἰκονικὰς ἔρωσες ἡ θεολογίας, τῶν σημίτων ἁρματόκων. Epistola de fide Nicæa ad Cæsareenses, and some exegetical treatises.

(2) Eusebius of Nicomedia, formerly bishop of Berytus, and afterwards of Constantinople, died A. D. 340. He was the leader of the Eusebian party in the Arian controversy. His opinions are given in the works of Athanasius, Sozomen, Theodoret, (comp. especially his Epistola ad Paulianum Tyri Episcopum in Theod. i. 6), and Philostorgius. Comp. Fabric. Bibl. gr. vol. vi. p. 109, ss.*

* The homilies of Eusebius of Emisa, (who died A. D. 360) are only of secondary importance relative to the doctrine of the descensus ad inferos. Opusc. ed. Augusti, Elberf. 829. Thilo, über die Schriften des Euseb von Alex. und des Euseb von Emisa, Halle 832.
(3.) **Athanasius**, commonly called the father of orthodoxy, was born at Alexandria about the year 296, occupied the episcopal see of that town from the year 326, and died A.D. 373; he exerted a considerable influence upon the formation of the Nicene Creed, and took a prominent part in the Arian controversy. Of his numerous dogmatical works the most important are: Λόγος κατὰ Ἐλλήνων (an apologetical treatise), Λόγος πιστικῆς Ἰερατείας τῶν Θεοῦ λόγων καὶ τῆς διὰ σώματος τοῖς ἡμῖν ἰστιφανίας αὐτῶν.—


(4.) **Basil**, of Neocæsarea, surnamed the Great, was born A.D. 316, and died A.D. 379; he is of importance in the Arian and Macedonian controversies. His principal writings are: Ἀμετριτικὴς τοῦ ἀπολογισμοῦ τοῦ δοσιβαῖος Εὐνομίου (libri v. contra Eunomium) πιστικῆς ἀγίου αἰωνίου, numerous letters and homilies (in Hexaëmeron 11.—in Ps. xvii.—diversi argumenti 31. Sermones 25.) Editions of his works were published by Fronto Ducaeus and Morellus, Par. 618. 38. ii. (iii.) f.; by the Benedictine monks in the year 1688. iii. fol. and by *Garnier, Paris 721—30. iii. f. Monographies: Feisser, de vita Basilii Gron. 828. *Klose, C. R. W., Basilius der Gr. nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre, Stralsund 835. 8.

(5.) **Gregory of Nyssa**, a brother of Basil, a native of Cappadocia, died about the year 394: Λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μίγας.— He composed dogmatico-exegetical works on the creation of the world, and of man, wrote treatises against Eunomius and Apollinaris, and was the author of several homilies, ascetic tracts, etc. Though he strictly adhered to the Nicene Creed, yet he was distinguished for the mildness of his disposition; "the profundity of his scientific knowledge, as well as his peculiarities assigns to him the first place among the followers of Origen." (Hase.) His works were edited by Morellus, Par. 615. ii. f. Append. Gretser, Par. 618. Of the Benedictine edition (Paris 1780) only the first volume has appeared. Some newly discovered treatises against the Arians and Macedonians are published in A. Maji Scriptt.
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(5) Gregory of Nazianzum, surnamed the theologian, was born about the year 300 at Arianzus, near Nazianzum, was afterwards bishop of Constantinople, and died A. D. 390. His principal works are: In Julianum Apostatam invectivaduo. (published separately by Montagu, 1610. 4.)—λόγοι Ἡνωλογικοί ν. He also composed numerous orations, letters, poems, and shorter treatises. His works were published by Morellius, Paris 1630. ii. f. (Lips. 1690.) Of the Benedictine edition only the first volume has appeared. Monography: *Ullmann, Gregor von Nazianz, der Theologe, Darmst. 825.

(6) Chrysostom, was born at Antioch in Syria about the year 344, occupied the episcopal see of Constantinople, and died A. D. 407. His practico-exegetical and homiletical writings are still more valuable, than his strictly dogmatical works; at the same time he is of importance in the history of doctrines on account of this very practical tendency. Thus his views on the freedom of the will form a strong contrast to those of Augustine. In addition to his numerous homilies and sermons we have: σπι νισοςομεν, lib. vi. (edited by Bengel, Stuttg. 725. by Leo, Lips. 834), de providentia, lib. iii.—Editions of his complete works were published by Savilius, Eton 612. Fronto Ducius, Par. 609—36. *Bern. de Montfaucon, Paris 718—31. xiii. fol. Venet. 755. xiii. f. ib. 780. xiv. f.—Monographies: *Neander, der heil. Chrysostomus und die Kirche des Orients in dessen Zeitalter, Berlin 821. 22. ii. 8. and [Butler, J. D., the Life of John Chrysostom. Bibliotheca Sacra, i. p. 669 ss.]

(7) Cyrill of Jerusalem, formerly an Eusebian, went over to the Nicene party, and combated the strict Arian Acacius; he died A. D. 386. He distinguished himself by his catechetical works, in which he propounded the doctrines of the church in a popular style. His five mystagogical discourses are of importance in the dogmatic point of view. His works were edited by Milles, Oxon. 1703. f. and by *Ant. Aug. Toutée, (after his death by Prud. Maran), Par. 1720. f. Ven. 1763. f. comp. von Cölln, in Ersch. u. Grubers Encyklopädie, vol. xxii. p. 148 ss.

(8) Epiphanius of Besanduc near Eleutheropolis in Palestine, bishop of Constantia in the isle of Cyprus, died at the age of nearly one hundred years, A. D. 404. The work which he wrote against heretics: Αἰγείου ΛXXX. ἵπποι τιν Ἱερέως ὲντ' ὤν κητώτις adv. haer.) is a source for the history of doctrines. The theo-
ology of Philemon consisted in rigid adherence to the orthodox system rather than in the formation of original views. It is represented in his treatise: περιοχὴ λόγου τοῦ Ἐτερ. τοῦ ἀγκυρωτοῦ καλομέττου, which may be compared with his works, entitled: λόγος τις τῆς Κυρίου ἀνάστασι—τις τῆς ἀνάληψις τοῦ Κυρίου λόγος, etc. There is an edition of his works by *Petavius, Par. 622. fol. ib. 630. f. edit. auct. Colon. (Lips.) 682. ii. fol.

*(1a)* Ephraim, Propheta Syrorum, of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, abbot and deacon in a monastery at Edessa, died about the year 378. He gained a high reputation by his exegetical works, and rendered signal service to Syria by the introduction of Greek science and dogmatic terminology. Opp. ed. *J. C. Assemani, Rom. 732. 46. vi. fol. comp. C. A. Lengerke, de Ephraëmo Sc. S. interprete, Hal. 828. 4.


*(1c)* Cyrillof Alexandria, (died A. D. 444), is well known by his violent proceedings against Nestor, and by his Monophysite tendency. Beside homilies and exegetical works, he wrote anathemas against Nestor, treatises on the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, περί τῆς ἁπάντης και ἁληθινῆς προσκυνήσεως και λατρείας xvii. books.—κατὰ ἀναγνώσματος καὶ ἀναντίων καὶ ἀναλήψεως — and a work in defence of Christianity against the Emperor Julian, in 10 books.—Extracts of it are given by Rössler, vol. viii. p. 43—152. Editions of his works were published by *J. Aubertus, Lut. 638. vii. fol. and A. Maji Collectio T. viii.


*(1e)* Theodoret was born at Antioch, and died about the year 457. His dogmatico-polemical writings are of importance in the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies. Theodoret and Theodore are the representatives of the liberal tendency of the Antiochian school. The following work is a source for the history of doctrines: αἱ ἐν περὶ ἡ ἀναγκασμίῃς ἱστορία, Lib. v. (fabula
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Hæreticæ). He also composed several exegetical writings. There are editions of his works by J. Sirmond, Lutet. 642. iv. fol. Auctarium cura J. Garnerii, ib. 684. f.— and J. L. Schulze u. Nößelt, Hal. 769—74. 5 vol. x. 8.

(15) Arnobius, was born at Sicca Veneria in Numidia, the master of Lactantius, lived towards the close of the third, and at the commencement of the fourth century. He wrote a work under the title: adv. gentes libri vii. which was edited by J. C. Orelli, Lips. 816. Add. 817.— His writings contain many heterodox assertions, like those of his disciple:

(16) Lucius Cælius Firmianus Lactantius (Cicero christianus), he was born in Italy, became a rhetorician in Nicomedia, was tutor of Crispus (the eldest son of the Emperor Constantine), and died about the year 330. He wrote Divinarum Institut. libri vii. de ira Dei, de opificio Dei vel de formatione hominis.— Editions of this work were published by Bünemann, Lips. 739. by Le Brun and Dufresnoy, Par. 748. ii. 4. and that of Bignon, 1786. ii. 8. Comp. Ammon, F. G. Ph., Lactantii opiniones de religione in systema redactae, Diss. ii. Erl. 820. Spyker, de pretio institutionibus Lactantii tribuendo, Lgd. 826.

(17) Hilary, (Hilarius), bishop of Pictavium (Poitiers) in Gaul, died A. D. 368. Beside commentaries on the Psalms and on Matthew, and several minor treatises, he wrote: de trinitate libri xii. Editions of his works were published by the Benedictine monks, Par. 693 f. by Maffei, Ver. 730. ii. f. and by Oberthür, Würzb. 785—88. iv. 8. A. Maji Scriptt. vet. Coll. T. vi.

(18) Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus (Jerome), was born about the year 331 at Stridon in Dalmatia, and died as monk in a monastery at Bethlehem A. D. 420. In his earlier years he was a disciple of Origen, but turned afterwards his opponent, and espoused orthodoxy, which he zealously defended; he possessed great talents, and was a man of profound learning. ("He made the West acquainted with Grecian and Hebrew erudition." Hase.) He rendered greater service to biblical criticism and exegesis (by the Vulgate-version), as well as to literary history (by his work de viris illustribus), than to dogmatic theology. Concerning the latter, it may rather be said, that he preserved it like a relic which he had rescued from the Origenist deluge, than that he exerted any powerful and original influence upon the healthy development of the doctrines in general. His con-
troversial writings and letters are partly directed against the opponents of monachism, the worship of relics, celibacy, the adoration of the Virgin, etc., which he greatly admired; and have partly regard to the Pelagian and Origenist controversies. The following are the principal editions of his works: Opp. cura Erasmi, Bas. 1516. ix. f. that of the Benedictine monks (by Martianay and Pouget), Par. 693—706. v. f., and that of Vallarsi, Veron. 734—42. xi. f. Ed. 2. Venet. 766—72. iv. (Luther judged unfavourably of him.)

Ambrose, was born a. d. 340., occupied the archiepiscopal see of Milan from the year 374, and died a. d. 398. He was the chief pillar of the Nicene orthodoxy in the West, and exerted considerable practical influence upon Augustine. Of his doctrinal writings we mention: Hexaëmeron, I. vi. de officiis iii. de incarnationis dominicæ sacramento, de fide libri v. de Spiritu lib. iii. and several others. He also composed some exegetical works, of which however some are spurious (Ambrosiaster.) The principal editions of his works are that of Amerbach, Bas. 492.— and the Benedictine edition cura N. Nuriti et Jac. Frischii, Par. 686—90. ii. f.

Aurelius Augustine, a native of Tagaste in Numidia, died as bishop of Hippo Regius a. d. 430; on his eventful and deeply interesting life compare his auto-biography entitled confessiones libri xiii. ( a manual edition of which was published at Berlin 1823. with a preface by Neander), and Possidius (Possidonius); on his writings compare his own retractationes. A great part of his works consists of polemical writings, in which he opposed the Manichæans, Pelagians and Donatists. All his works, and their different editions, are enumerated in the work of Schönsmann, T. ii. p. 8. ss. A. PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS: contra academicos—de vita beata—de ordine ii.—soliloquii ii.—de immortalitate animæ etc. B. POLEMICAL WRITINGS: a) against the Manichæans: de moribus ecclesiæ cathol. et Manicheorum ii.—de libero arbitrio iii.—de genesi contra Manich.—de genesi ad litteram xii.—de vera religione—de utilitate credendi—de fide et symbolo et al. b) against the Pelagians and Semipelagians: (they are contained for the most part in vol. x. of the Benedictine edition) de gestis Pelagii—de peccatorum meritis et remissione—de natura et gratia—de perfectione justitæ hominis—de gratia Christi et de peccato originali—contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum—contra Julian. lib. vi.—de gratia et li-
betro arbitrio—de correptione et gratia—de prædestinatione
Sanctorum—de dono perseverantiae—contra secundam Juliani
responsorinem, opus imperfectum. c) against the Donatists: (in
vol. ix.) contra Parmenianum iii.—de baptismo vii.—contra litter-
aser Petiliani iii.—Ep. ad Catholicos (de unitate ecclesiae) et al.
C. DOGMATICAL works: de civitate Dei ad Marcellin. libr. xxii.
(*A manual edition of which was published by Tauchnitz. Lips.
1825. ii. 8.) de doctrina christianae lib. iv.—Enchiridion ad Lau-
rentium s. de fide, spe et caritate—de fide—de trin. xv. D.
Practical (de catechizandis rudibus) and exegetical writings,
letters, sermons, etc. Editions of his works were published by
Erasmus, Bas. 529. x. 1543. 56. 69. in xi. by the *Benedictine
monks, Paris 679—701. xi. (in 8 vol.) Antwerpen 700—703. xi.
xii. f. 756—69. xviii. 4. Opp. omnia, supplem. ed. Hier. Vignier,
Par. 654. 55. ii. f.—*Wiggers, pragmatische Darstellung des
(31.) John Cassian, a pupil of Chrysostom, was probably a na-
tive of one of the western countries, founded Semipelagianism,
and died about the year 440. De institut. cenob. lib. xii.—
Collationes Patrum xxiv.—de incarnatione Christi adv. Nестo-
rion, libr. vii. The principal editions of his works are: Ed.
vol. ii. and his Diss. de Joanne Cassiano, Rost. 824. 5.
(32) Vincentius Lerinensis (Lerinensis) a monk and presbyter
in the monastery in the isle of Lerinum, near the coast of
Gallia Narbonica, died about the year 450. Commonitoria duo
pro catholicae fidei antiquitate et universitate adv. profanas
omnia haereticorum novitates. There is an edition of this
work by Jo. Costerii et Edm. Campiani, Col. 600. 12. (last
edition by Herzog, Vratislav. 839.) comp. Wiggers ii. p. 208
flwg.
(33) Salvian, a native of Gaul, adv. avaritiam lib. iv. He com-
posed a work on the doctrine of providence which is of impor-
tance in dogmatic theology: de gubernatione Dei (de providen-
tia) Bas 530. * Venet. (Baluz.) 728. 8. (together with Vinc.
Lerin. Par. 684. 8.)
(34) Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, died a. d. 461. He is
of importance in the Monophysite controversy by the influence
which he exerted upon the decisions of the council of Chalcedon.

Prosper of Aquitania opposed the Pelagians in several writings, Carmen de ingratis, and others. Opp. by Jean Le Brun de Maret and Mangeant, Par. 711. fol. Wiggers ii. p. 136 flwg.

Gennadius, a presbyter at Massilia, died about the year 493: de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, edited by Elmenhorst, Hamb. 614. 4.; it is also found among the works of Augustine (T. viii.)


Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severianus Boethius, was born at Rome A. D. 470, and beheaded A. D. 524, in the reign of the Emperor Theodorich; he wrote: de trin. etc. de persona et natura, (contra Eutychem et Nestorium.)—fidei confessio s. brevis fidei christianae complexio. He also composed several philosophical writings, among which that entitled de consolatione philosophica lib. v. is worthy of notice, inasmuch as it shows how the ancient philosophy of the Stoics was associated with the speculative dogmatic theology of the church without being much influenced by the spirit of true Christianity. Schleiermacher even questions: "whether Boethius ever was a true Christian." Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 175.

Gregory the Great, (bishop of Rome, A. D. 590), died A. D. 604. Protestants regard him commonly, but without sufficient reason, as the last of the Fathers in point of time. Opp. Par. 675. Venet. 768—76.—Wiggers, de Gregorio Magno ejusque placitis anthropologicis. Comment. i. 838. 4.

Isidore Hispalensis, died A. D. 633; he attempted previous to the time of John Damascenus, to arrange the doctrines of the church in the form of a system, but his work is little better than a compilation: Sententiarum sive de summo bono libri iii. Opp. ed Faust. Arevalo, Rom. 797. vii. 4. He wrote moreover some original works on doctrinal subjects: Liber questionum sive expositionis sacramentorum—de natura rerum—exhort. ad pœnitentiam—and lastly, he composed several his-
torical, canonical, and practical treatises. Oudin, Comment. vol. i. p. 1582—96.

§ 83.

THE EASTERN CHURCH FROM THE FOURTH TO THE SIXTH CENTURY.

The Schools of Alexandria and Antioch.

Münter, Dr. F., über die antiochenische Schule, in Stäudlins and Tzschirners Archiv, i. 1. p. 1. ss.

During this period an important change took place in the theological sentiments of the school of Alexandria. Formerly it had been the seat of enlightened Christianity, and of that idealistic theology, which did not rest satisfied with the popular system of literal interpretation; during the present period the doctrinal tendency of the school of Egypt was on the contrary altogether realistic. As it had once been the task of the Alexandrian school, so it became now the task of the School of Antioch, to defend a more liberal theology against the rude attacks of the narrow-minded advocates of what was then understood as orthodoxy. The consequence was, that the teachers of that school shared the same fate with Origen—they were treated as heretics. The school of Antioch however, so far from resembling the earlier Alexandrian school, in giving countenance to the arbitrary system of allegorical interpretation, adopted the grammatical interpretation, to which, [as well as to biblical criticism in general], they thus rendered signal service. But on this account they have also sometimes been charged with a want of spirituality.

The change of opinions respecting classical literature, which many thought irreconcilable with the spirit of the gospel (the dream of Jerome in his Epist. ad Eustachium. Ullmann, Gregor von Nazianzum, p. 543.) could not but exert a prejudicial influence upon the critical judgment of commentators.
§ 84.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.—AUGUSTINISM.

About the same time a new era commences in the history of doctrines with the appearance of Augustine. From the dogmatic point of view the West now assumes a higher degree of importance than the East, which exhausts itself in the controversies respecting the nature of Christ, and the worship of images. The realistic tendency of the church of Rome, (a tendency which had always been represented by the western churches), gradually gains the ascendancy over the hellenistic idealism of past ages; the philosophy of Aristotle supplants that of Plato. Augustine sows in his theology the seeds of two systems, which more than a thousand years afterwards were to wage open war against each other. The Roman-Catholic system was based on his doctrine of the church (in opposition to the Donatists); the system of evangelical Protestantism rests upon his views on original sin, on free grace, and predestination (in opposition to the Pelagians.) But both these systems appear harmoniously connected in his own person, and are founded no less on the position which he occupied relative to the church, and to his opponents, than on the experience of his own life.

§ 85.

THE HERESIES.

With regard to the heresies respecting the nature of Christ which prevailed during the first period, the Ebionitic (judaizing) heresy may be considered as entirely suppressed. The Gnostic (antijudaizing) tendency on the contrary, was more firmly established in the sys-
tem of Manes (Manichæism), which as complete dualism was at once the companion and opponent of Christianity, and from its very nature belonged to that form of oriento-pagan philosophy which had not then disappeared.\(^2\) The system of the followers of Priscillian must be regarded as a continuation of Gnosticism, though modified by Manichæism; it first spread in the West in the course of the fourth century, but was suppressed by violent persecutions.\(^3\) Even the Paulicians manifested a leaning towards Gnostico-Manichæan notions, though they appeared at first to have been driven by the prevailing want of practical godliness in the church, to return to the simplicity of apostolical Christianity.\(^4\) These heresies, which are, as it were, the younger branches which the old stock of Gnosticism continued to shoot forth, must be distinguished from those, which arose during the present period in consequence of a philosophical treatment of separate doctrines, viz.: 1. The heresies of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata with their opposites, the Arian, Semiarian, Eusebian and other heresies (which continued to prevail among the Goths, Burgundians and Vandals, long after they had been condemned. 2. The heresy of the Pelagians, who never formed a distinct sect, but by means of a modified system (Semipelagianism) ever and anon crept into the church, from which they had been excluded by the more rigid decisions of several synods. 3. The Nestorian heresy with its opposites, the Monophysite and Monothelite heresies. The Nestorians after having been defeated in Europe, succeeded in winning over to their party the Chaldeans, and the Thomas-Christians in Asia. The peculiar notions of the Monophysites are still entertained by the Jacobites and Copts, and those of the Monothelites exist to the present day among the Maronites in Syria.\(^5\)
Some writers have indeed numbered Sabellianism among the judaizing heresies, but without sufficient reason, for it arose entirely out of philosophical speculation, and was not, like Ebionitism, founded upon a national religion. The notions of the Pelagians concerning the meritoriousness of works bore some resemblance to Judaism, but they did not originate with it.

Manichæism is distinguished from Gnosticism by a more complete development of the dualistic principle: this also accounts for its rigid and uniform appearance, while Gnosticism is divided into many branches, and admits of more variety. There is far less of historical Christianity in Manichæism, than in Gnosticism: it rests on its own historical foundation, which is at least partly an imitation of Christianity, and forms (like Mohammedanism at a later period) a separate system of religion rather than a sect. Comp. Beausobre, Histoire de Manichée et du Manichéisme, Amst. 734. 2 voll. 4. *Baur, das manichäische Religionssystem, Tüb. 831. Trechsel, F., über den Kanon, die Kritik und Exegese der Manichäer, Bern 832. Colditz, F. E., die Entstehung des manichäischen Religionssystems, Lpz. 337. (where Manichæism is compared with the Indian, Persian, and other systems of religion.)

On the history of the followers of Priscillian, which is of more importance in the history of the church, than in the history of doctrines, because they were the first heretics persecuted with the sword, comp. Sulp. Sev. hist. sacr. ii. 46—51. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 1486 flwg. Baumgarten-Crusius i. p. 292 flwg.


On all these heresies which have a peculiar bearing upon the developement of doctrines during this period, comp. the special history of doctrines. Concerning the external history of the controversies themselves see the works on ecclesiastical history.
Respecting the dogmatic material of this period we have to distinguish between,—1. *Those* doctrines, which owe their main development to the controversies in which the Catholic Church was engaged with the aforesaid heretics; and, 2. *Those* which developed themselves more gradually.

To the former class belong *Theology* proper (the doctrine of the Trinity), *Christology*, and *Anthropology*; to the latter those parts of theology, which treat of the attributes and character of God, creation, etc., as well as the doctrine of the sacraments, and eschatology. It must however be admitted that they exerted a more or less considerable influence upon each other. We think it best to begin with the history of the first class of doctrines, which may be considered the pillars on which the whole structure rests, and then to pass to the second. The first class may be subdivided into two divisions, viz. the theologicocristological on the one, and the anthropological on the other hand. The controversies respecting the doctrines belonging to the former of these two divisions were principally carried on in the East, those concerning the latter in the West.
B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN ORTHODOXY AND HERESY.

(POLEMICAL PART.)

FIRST DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING THEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY.

a. THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 87.

THE RELATION OF THE FATHER TO THE SON.

Lactantius, Dionysius of Alexandria, and the followers of Origen.

The term Logos, respecting which the earlier Fathers so little agreed that some understood by it the Word, others the Wisdom, (reason, spirit), was so indefinite that even Lactantius, who lived towards the commencement of the present period, made no distinction between the λόγος and the πνεύμα. Hence it happened that from the time of Origen it fell increasingly into disuse, and in its place the other term: Son, which, at all events, is more frequently employed in the New Test. in reference to the human nature of the historical Christ, was applied to the second person of the Godhead (previous to his incarnation.) The disciples of Origen, in accordance with the sentiments of their master, understood by this second person a distinct hypostasis subordinate to the Father. Such is the view of Dionysius of Alexandria; but he
endeavoured to clear himself from the charges brought forward against him by Dionysius of Rome, by putting forth his notions in a less offensive form. The doctrine of Origen now met with a most remarkable fate. It consisted, as we have already seen, of two elements, viz. the hypostasis of the Son, and his subordination to the Father. The former was maintained in opposition to Sabellianism, and received as orthodox doctrine; the latter, on the contrary, was rejected, and, inasmuch as it was held by the Arians, condemned by the catholic church. Thus Origenism gained the victory on the one hand, but was defeated on the other. But by this very circumstance it is proved to be a necessary link in the chain, a necessary member of a series of systems which are connected by its means.

(1.) The theology of Lactantius must be considered as an isolated phenomenon in the present period, and has always been regarded as heterodox. Lactantius, after having opposed the gross and sensuous interpretation of the birth of Christ: ex con-nubio ac permisstone feminae alicujus, Instit. div. iv. c. 8, returns to the meaning which the term Word (sermo) has in common life: Sermo est spirituscum voce aliquid significante prolatus. The Son is distinguished from the angels, in that he is not only spiritus (breath, wind), but also the (spiritual) Word. The angels proceed from God only as taciti spiritus, as the breath comes out of the nose of man, while the Son is the breath which comes out of God's mouth, and forms articulate sounds; hence he identifies Sermo with the Verbum Dei, quia Deus procedentem de ore suo vocalem spiritum, quem non utero, sed mente conceperat, inexcogitabili quadam majestatis sua virtute ac potentia, in effigiem, quae propio sensu ac sapientia vigeat, comprehendit. There is however a distinction between the word (Son) of God, and our words. Our words being mixed with the atmosphere, soon perish; yet even we may perpetuate them by committing them to writing—quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est et manere in aeternum et sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tamquam rivus de fonte traduxerit. Lactantius is so far from holding the doctrine of the Trinity, that he finds it
necessary to defend himself against the charge of believing not so much in three, as in two Gods. To justify his belief in the existence of two natures in the One God, he makes use of the same expressions, which orthodox writers employed in later times for the purpose of defending the doctrine of the Trinity: Cum dicimus Deum Patrem et Deum Filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque seccernimus: quod nec Pater a Filio potest, nec Filius Patre seccerni, siquidem nec Pater sine Filio potest nuncupari, nec Filius potest sine Patre generari. Cum igitur et Pater Filium faciat et Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est. He then comes back to the illustrations used before him, e.g. those drawn from the river and its source, the sun and its beams; he even surpasses his predecessors in comparing the Son of God with an earthly son, who, residing in the house of his father, has all things in common with him, so that the house may be named after the son, as well as after the father, (the Arians reasoned very much in the same way.)

(2) This is obvious especially in the opposition which Dionysius offered to Sabellianism. Of his work addressed to the bishop of Rome and entitled: "Εἰς γεγονός καὶ Ἀπολογία Lib. iv. fragments are preserved in the writings of Athanasius (σημε ἔρωτισ εἰς Ἐπ. Ἀλλ. liber) Opp. i. p. 243. and Basil; they were collected by Constant in his Epistt. Rom. Pontt. in Galland. T. iv. p. 495. Gieseler, i. § 64. Neander, i. 3. p. 1037. Münischer von Colln, p. 197—200. Schleiermacher (see the next §.) p. 402 f. According to Athanasius, p. 246, Dionysius was charged with having compared in a letter to Euphranor and Ammonius the relations subsisting between the Father and the Son to that in which the husbandman stands to the vine, the shipbuilder to the ship, etc. The Arians even asserted, (see Athanasius, p. 253), that he taught like themselves: οὐκ ἄν ἦν ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ, οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἦν χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου αὐτός θα ὁ υἱὸς εὑρ ἦν στιν γεννηθῆναι ἀλλ' ἦν ποιήσας τοις οὐκ ἦν, οὐ γὰρ αὐτῶς ιστιν, ἀλλ' ὑπερέφησαν. Comp. however the expressions quoted by Athanasius, p. 254, which go to prove the contrary. But the bishop of Rome insisted that Dionysius should adopt the phrase ὑμοῦσια (Homousia), to which the latter at last consented, though he did not think that it was founded either upon the language of Scripture, or upon the terminology till then current in the church. Orthodox theologians of later times, (e. g. Athanasius) endeavouring to do
more justice to Dionysius of Alexandria, maintained that he had used the aforesaid offensive illustrations only *κατ' οἰκονομίας, and that they might be easily explained from the stand he took against Sabellianism. Athanasius, p. 246 sq; see on the other side Löffler, Kleine Schriften, vol. i. p. 114 flwg. (quoted by Heinichen on Euseb. vol. i. p. 306.) On similar assertions made by later Origenists, such as Theognostus (in the second book of his Hypotyposees, see Phot. bibl. cod. 106), Gregory Thaumaturgus (in opposition to Paul of Samosata), and Pierius, see Münzcher ed. by von Colln, l. c. p. 195. Gieseler, i. § 64.

§ 88.

The Theories of Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata.


Sabellius, a presbyter of Ptolemais, who lived about the middle of the third century, adopted more or less the notions of the earlier Monarchians, such as Praxeas, Noëtus, and Beryllus, and maintained, in opposition to the doctrine propounded by Origen and his followers, that the appellations Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were only so many different manifestations and names of one and the same Divine being. He thus converted the real distinction of persons (the Trinity of essence) into a distinction of mere modes (the Trinity of manifestations.) In illustration of his views, he made use not only of various images which his opponents sometimes misinterpreted, but also of such expressions as were afterwards transferred to the terminology of the orthodox church. By this means he avoided indeed on the one hand the
subordination of the Son to the Father, and acknowledged the manifestation of the Deity in Christ as such; but, on the other, he destroyed the personality of the Son, and thus gave the appearance of Pantheism to this direct manifestation of God in Christ. For the denial of the incarnation of Christ (as distinct from God the Father) necessarily implied that of the existence of the Son as such. Concerning the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, it is of more importance to the history of heresies, than to that of doctrines, to know how far they agreed with the notions of Sabellius, or how nearly they approached the earlier opinions of Artemon and Theodotus. If the latter, it would follow that his system (with regard to the nature of Christ) was rather deistic, than pantheistic.—The opinions of Sabellius undoubtedly exerted a much greater influence upon the development of doctrines during the present period, than those of Paul of Samosata; the notions of the latter are but too intimately connected with his repulsive personal character.2)

2) Eus. vii. 6. Epiph. Hær. 62. Athan. contra Arian. iv. 2. and other passages. Basil. Ep. 210. 214. 235. Theodoret fab. hær. ii. 9. According to Epiphanius Sabellius taught that there were: ἵναι ὑποστάσεις τριάν ἰδέας (ἱδεα, ἰδέα, ἰδέα), and illustrated this by adducing the human trias of body, soul, and spirit, and the three qualities of the sun, viz. the enlightening (φωτισικός), the warming (τὸ Ψάλτρον), and the periphery (τὸ περιφερείας σχῆμα.) But it is difficult to determine, how far he applies the one or the other of these characteristics to the persons of the Trinity, and carries out the analogy in all its particulars. According to Athanasius iv. 25. he also referred to the variety of gifts coming from the one Spirit, as illustrative of the Trinity. He explained the thing itself from the Divine economy; God is called Father as the creator of the world and as legislator; he is called Son in relation to the work of redemption, and Holy Spirit as the sanctifier of man; hence he regarded these three different modes of the Divine manifestation (according to Athanasius iv.
13.) as a πληροφορής, or ἐκτίνος, of it. He made a more definite distinction than later orthodox theologians, (the Nicenians and followers of Athanasius), between these three modes of manifestations and the άντροφος, whom he called ὁσιάωμ, (according to Athan. de Synodis 16.) On this point, as well as on the sense in which he used the terms πρέσβεων and ἐμμονός, see Schleiermacher, l. c. Baumgarten-Crusius, i. 1. 200 flwg. Neander Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1019 flwg. [translat. ii. p. 276 flwg.] Möhler, Athanasius der Grosse, vol. i. p. 184 flwg.

(2) Paul, a native of Syria, bishop of Antioch from the year 260, was charged with heresy at several synods, and at last removed from his office (269—272.) Of his dispute with the presbyter Malchion a fragment is preserved by Mansi, vol. i. p. 1001 flwg. Comp. the different accounts given by Epiph. 65. 1. and Euseb. vii. 27. The writers on the history of doctrines vary in their opinions respecting the relation in which he stands to either Sabellianism, or to the Unitarianism of the Artemonites. (See Euseb. v. 28. ab init.) comp. Schleiermacher, p. 389. 99. Baumgarten-Crusius, i. p. 204. Augusti p. 59. Meier Dogmengesch. p. 74. 75. Dorner, p. 40. supposes the difference between Sabellius and Paul of Samosata to have consisted in this, that the former thought that the whole substance of the Divine being, the latter that only one single divine power, had manifested itself in Christ. Trechsel (Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus, vol. i. p. 81.) adopts the same view. At all events, we can hardly expect any serious and persevering attempts at a doctrinal system from a man whose vanity is unquestionable. Though the charge that he countenanced Jewish errors, in order to obtain favour with the Queen Zenobia, is unfounded (Neander i. 3. p. 1009.) [translat. ii. p. 270.] yet it is quite probable that the vain show he made of his principles as a free thinker was in full accordance with his ostentatious character. In later times the terms Sabellianism and Samosatanism were frequently confused. But more generally, those who denied all distinction between the persons of the Trinity, were called Πατριστικήν in the West, and Σαβιλίανοι in the East. Comp. Athanasius de Synod. 25. 7.
§ 89.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Arianism.

The system of ARIUS, a presbyter of Alexandria, forms a striking contrast with that of Sabellius. Arians, in endeavouring to define the distinction between the persons of the Trinity, carried the idea of a subordination of the one to the other, and, in the first place, of the Son to the Father, so far as to represent the former as a creation of the latter. (1) This opinion, which he sought to promulgate at Alexandria, met with the most decided opposition on the part of Alexander, bishop of that town. (2) This contest, which was at first merely a private dispute, gave rise to a controversy, which exerted greater influence upon the history of doctrines than all former controversies, and was the signal for an almost endless succession of subsequent conflicts.

(1) Sources: Arii Epist. ad Euseb. Nicomed. in Epiph. Hær. 69. § 6. Theodoret hist. eccles. i. 4. Epist. ad Alex. in Athan. de synodis Arian. et Selcuc. c. 16. and Ep. hær. 69. § 7. Of the work of Arius entitlod Θεολογία, only some fragments are preserved by Athanasius. — According to his Epist. ad Euseb. his opinion was: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἦν ἵνα ἄγνωπος, οὐδὲ μέσος ἄγνωπτον καὶ οὐδὲν πρότον, ἀλλ' οὕτω ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινὸς, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἔθελεματι καὶ βουλή ὑπόστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰῶνων, πληρής οἰκος, μονογενής ἄναλλοϊς, καὶ σὺν γεννήθη ἦτοι κτισθῇ ἦτοι ἄρα ἢ ἐμελεμονθῇ, οὗτ ἢν ἄγνωπτος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν. His views are fully settled on the last (negative) point, while he endeavours in the preceding part of the quotation to discover an expression which would give complete satisfaction. "We are persecuted," he continues, "because we say that the Son hath a beginning, while we teach that God is ἄμαξος. We say ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὑπήρκει, because he is no part of God, nor is he created of any thing already in existence (he rejects accordingly the theory of emanation, as well as the notion that Christ is made of sub-
ject matter.”) Comp. the letter to Alex. 1. c. where he defends his own doctrine against the notion of Valentinus concerning a προβολή, against that of the Manicheans concerning a μέγας, and largely, against the opinions of Sabellius; he there uses almost the same phraseology which occurs in the letter to Eusebius. The same views are expressed in still stronger language in the fragments of the aforesaid work Thalia (in Athan. contra Arian. Orat. i. § 9.): οὐχ ἀδικεῖ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ἢ, ἀλλ' ὑστερον γίγνοντων οὐχ ἀδικεῖ ἢ ἢ μὴ ὃς ἐκεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ οὐκ ἴσον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὗ ὄντων ὑπάτου καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπάτας οὐκ ἴσον ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς. κτίσμα γὰρ ἵστη καὶ σοτήριον καὶ οὐκ ἴσον ἐλπίδων Θείας ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ μετοχὴ καὶ αὐτῶς Ἰδιοποιηθη. οὐχ οίδα τὸν πατέρα ἄκριβῶς ὁ υἱός, οὔτε ὁ δήμος ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα τελείως καὶ οὔτε σωτῆρι, οὔτε γινώσκει ἀκριβῶς ο λόγος τὸν πατέρα. οὐκ ἴσον ὁ ἐλπιδωτος καὶ μνήμης αὐτῶς τοῦ πατρὸς λόγου, ἀλλ' ὑστερον μόνον λέγεται λόγος καὶ σοτήρ, καὶ χάριν λέγεται υἱός καὶ δύναμις: οὐκ ἴσον ἄρχεσι τῷ πατέρα, ἀλλὰ τριστής ἤστη φύσις, ὡς τὰ κτίσματα, καὶ λείπει αὐτῷ εἰς καθάληψιν τοῦ γένους τελείως τὸν πατέρα. contra Arian. i. § 5.: ἦνα Θείλης ἡμᾶς (ὁ Θεός) δημιουργήσας, τότε διʼ αὐτοὐκ εἶναι τινὰ καὶ ἀπώμασιν αὐτῷ λόγον καὶ Σοφίαν καὶ ὑμᾶς ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δημιουργήσας.—He proves this from the figurative expression Joel ii. 25. (the Septuagint reads, “the great power of God” instead of “locusts.”) Comp. Neander, Kirchengeschichte ii. 2. p. 767 flwg.

(a) Concerning the opinion of Alexander, see his letter to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, in Theodoret hist. eccles. i. 4. and the circular letter ad Catholicos in Socrat. i. 6. Münscher edit. by von Cölln p. 203—206. He founds his arguments chiefly on the prologue to the Gospel of John, and shows μεταξὺ πατρὸς καὶ υἱῶν οὐδὲν οὔτε διάστημα. All time and all spaces of time are created by the Father through the Son, etc.

§ 90.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Doctrine of the Council of Nice.


The Emperor Constantine the Great and the two
bishops of the name Eusebius (viz. of Cæsarea and of Nicomedia) having in vain endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the contending parties, the first general (ecumenical) council was held at Nice (A. D. 325.), principally through the intervention of the bishop Hosius of Corduba. After several other formulæ apparently favourable to Arianism had been rejected, a confession of faith was adopted, in which it was established as the inviolable doctrine of the catholic church, that the Son is of the same essence (οὕσως) with the Father, but sustains to him the relation in which that which is begotten, stands to that which begets.

(1) Comp. Epist. Constantini ad Alexandrum et Arium. Vita Const. ii. 64—72. and on the attempts of the two bishops to bring about a reconciliation, see Neander l. c. p. 783 flwg.

(2) One of these is the confession of faith which Eusebius of Cæsarea proposed, Theodor. hist. eccles. i. 11. comp. Neander l. c. p. 797 flwg. It contained the expression: ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, Ὁς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φως ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, σφυ πάσην τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννημένος. According to Athan. de decret. Syn. Nic. 20. they would at first only decide that the Son of God is εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς, δομοῦς τοῦ καὶ ἀπαράλλακτου καθά πάντα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἄγνωστος καὶ άΰί, καὶ εἰν αὐτῷ εἶναι αληθεῖν.

(3) Πιστεύομεν εἰς Ἰην Θεόν, πατέρα κοσμοκράτους, πάντων ὀρατῶν καὶ καὶ ἀοράτων τιμῆτε καὶ εἰς Ἰην υἱὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆς, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς θεοῦς τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ, φως ἐκ φωτός, Θεοῦ ἀληθείαν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθείαν, γεννημένον οὐ ποιημένον, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τοῦ γενέσθαι καὶ τὰ τῇ γῇ, τὸν Ἵμαρ τοὺς ἀληθείους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελήφαντα καὶ σάρκα ἐνταῦθα ἐναπιστήσαστα, παῦσαν καὶ ανάστατα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπλοῦντα εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, ἐκχώμην ἔξωτα καὶ κῆρυξα. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον τυπίμα. Τοῦ δὲ λέγοντος ὅτι οὐκ εἶναι ἐν τούτῳ, καὶ εἰς ἐν θεοὶ ἐνεμοῖν, καὶ εἰς ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ἡ θεοῦς, ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς τετραγωνοῖς τῶν ἐν θεοῖς, ἀνεκφανέτης ἡ ἀγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Athan. epist. de decret. Syn. Nic.—Eus. Cass. ep. ad Cæsariens.—Socrat. i. 8. Theodoret h. e. i. 11. Münscher von Cölln, p. 207—9.

Respecting the definitions of the phrases εἰς θεοῦς and ἀληθείας.
comp. Athanasius, l. c. We find that even at that time a distinction was made between sameness and similarity. The Son is equal to the Father in a different sense from that in which we become like God by rendering obedience to his laws. This resemblance moreover is not external, accidental, like that between metal and gold, tin and silver, etc.

§ 91.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Further Fluctuations until the Synod of Constantinople.

But the phrase ἴμικονιος did not meet with general approbation. In this unsettled state of affairs the party of the Eusebians, who had for some time previous enjoyed the favour of the court, succeeded in gaining its assent to a doctrine in which the use of the term ἴμικονιος was studiously avoided, though it did not strictly inculcate the principles of Arianism. Thus Athanasius, who firmly adhered to this watchword of the Nicene party, found himself compelled to seek refuge in the West. Several synods were summoned for the purpose of settling this long protracted question, a number of formulæ were drawn up and rejected, till at last the Nicene doctrine, which was equally that of Athanasius, was solemnly confirmed by the decisions of the second œcumenical synod of Constantinople (A. D. 381.)

(1) Several Asiatic bishops took offence at the term in question. Socrat. i. 8. 6. Münscher von Colln, p. 210. Respecting the further particulars of the external events, see the works on ecclesiastical history. Leading Historical Facts: I. The banishment of Arius and the bishops Theonas and Secundus. The fate of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice. II. Arius is recalled A. D. 330, after having signed the following confession of faith: αἰς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν ἐν αὐτῶν σῶς πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον, Ἱερὸν λόγον, διὸ ὅτα πάντα ἐγένετο
THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

x. τ. η. (Socr. i. 26.) Synods of Tyre and Jerusalem, (A. d. 335.) III. Banishment of Athanasius into Gaul. The sudden death of Arius at Constantinople (A. d. 336.) prior to his solemn readmission into the church. Different opinions concerning this event. IV. Death of the Emperor Constantine the Great at Nicomedia (A. d. 337.) (Socr. i. 27—40.) A remarkable change had taken place in the views of Constantine towards the close of his life. The Arians were greatly supported by his son Constantius, who ascended the throne A. d. 337.

(2) Concerning this name see Gieseler i. § 82.

(3) I. The four confessions of faith drawn up by the Eusebians and presented at the council of Antioch (A. d. 341), in Athan. de syn. c. 22—25. Walch, p. 109. (see Münscher edit. by von Cölln, p. 211 flwg. Gieseler i. § 82. note 4.); in all of these the word ὑμοίουσις is wanting, but in all other points they were not favourable to Arianism. II. Formula μαχεῖστιχος issued by the Eusebians at the second council of Antioch (A. d. 443), in which Arianism was condemned, Tritheism rejected, the doctrine of Athanasius found fault with, and in opposition to it the subordination of the Son to the Father was maintained. III. The synod of Sardica, (A. d. 347, or, according to others, A. d. 344)* Socrat. ii. 20.; but the western church alone remained at Sardica, the eastern held its assemblies in the neighbouring town of Philippopolis. The Formula Philippopolitana, preserved by Hilary (de Synodis contra Arianos, § 34.) is partly a repetition of the formula μαχεῖστιχος. IV. The confession of faith adopted at the first council of Sirmium (A. d. 351. in Athanas. § 27. in Hilary § 37. and in Socrat. ii. 29. 30.), was directed against Photinus; see below § 92. V. The formula of the second council of Sirmium (A. d. 357.— in Hilary § 11. Athanas. § 28. Socrat. ii. 30.) was directed both against the use of the term ὑμοίουσις, and against speculative tendencies in general: Seire autem manifestum est solum Patrem quomodo genuerit filium suum, et filium quomodo genitus sit a patre, (comp. above Irenæus § 42. 9.); but it also asserts the subordination of the Son to the Father in the strict Arian manner: Nulla ambiguitas est, majorem esse

* Respecting the chronology see Wetzer, H. J., restitutio verae Chronologiae rerum ex controversiis Arianis inde ab anno 325 usque ad annum 350 exortarum contra chronologiam hodie receptam exhibita. Francof. 1827.
Patrem. Nulli potest dubium esse, Patrem honore, dignitate, claritate, majestate et ipso nomine Patris majorem esse filio, ipso testante: qui me misit major me est (John xiv. 28.) Et hoc catholicum esse nemo ignorat, duas Personas esse Patris et Filii, majorem Patrem, Filium subjectum cum omnibus his, quae ipsi Pater subjicit. VI. These strict Arian views were rejected by the Semiarians at the synod of Anycra in Galatia (A. D. 358.) under Basil, bishop of Anycra; the decrees of this synod are given in Epiph. hær. 73. § 2—11. (Münscher von Cölln and Gieseler i. § 83.) VII. The confession of faith adopted at the third synod of Sirmium (A. D. 358.) in which that agreed upon at the second synod (the Arian) is condemned, and the Semiarian confession of the synod of Anycra is confirmed. Comp. Athan. § 8. Socrat. ii. 37. VIII. Council of the western church at Ariminum (Rimini), and of the eastern at Seleucia (A. D. 359.)

(4.) Symbolum Niceno-Constantinopolitanum: Πιστεύωμεν εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τούτῳ παντοκράτωρι, σωτηρίαν κυρίου οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁ γεννᾷ τὸ πάντων καὶ ἀδότων καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τὸν Μονογενῆ, τὸν εἰς τὸν πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰωνίων, φως ἐκ φωτὸς, ὁν τοίνυν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινὸν, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιήθην, ὡμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγίνετο. Τὸν δὲ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀδερφούς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμών σωτηρίαν κατέδιδα, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ σαρκίσθη ἐκ συνεματῶν ἁγίων καὶ Μαρίας τῆς σαρκίνου, καὶ ἐναρκτισθῆναι σταυρωθήναι δι' υπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Πνεύμονος Παλάτου, καὶ σαθόναι καὶ ταφιναν καὶ ἀναστάσαντα εἰς τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γεραφάς καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς καὶ καθεζόμενον εἰς δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἰσχύομεν μετὰ δόξης κυρίου ζωῆς καὶ ιδρύματι τῆς βασιλείας εἰς ἵνα τίτολος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, etc. (Concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit, see below § 93. note 7.)

§ 92.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF THE CAUSES WHICH GAVE RISE TO THE AFORESAID FLUCTUATIONS.

Arianism and Semiarianism on the one hand, and return to Sabellianism on the other (Marcellus and Photinus.)

Klose, C. R. W., Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius, Kiel 1833. By the same: Geschichte und Lehre des Marcellus und Photinus, Hamburg 1837.

From the very nature of the controversy in question it followed, that the difficult task of steering clear both of Sabellianism and Arianism, devolved on those who were anxious to preserve orthodoxy in all its purity. In maintaining the sameness of essence they had to hold fast the distinction of persons; in asserting the latter they had to avoid the doctrine of subordination. The Semimariarins, and together with them Cyrill of Jerusalem, and Eusebius of Caesarea endeavoured to abstain from the use of the term, lest they should fall into the Sabellian error; nevertheless the former asserted in opposition to the strict Arians (the followers of Aetius, and the Eunomians,) that the Son was of similar essence with the Father. But Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and still more his disciple Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, carried their opposition to Arianism so far as to adopt in substance the principles of Sabellianism. They modified it however to some extent by drawing a distinct line between the terms Logos and Son of God, and thus guarded it against the very semblance of Patri-passianism.

(1) Chrysostom represents the necessity, as well as the difficulty of avoiding both these dangers, de sacerdotio iv. 4. sub finem: ἐν τῇ γὰρ μίαν τις ἑνὶ Σιῶν, πῆς τὸν ιαυτὸν σαρκονίαν εὐθίως...
CAUSES OF THESE FLUCTUATIONS. 253

The leaders of the Semiarians (ἡμισιάσιοι) were Basil, bishop of Ancyra, and Georgius, bishop of Laodicea. Comp. the confession of faith adopted by the synod of Ancyra, (A. D. 358), in Athanas. de Syn. § 41. Münscher ed. by von Colln. p. 222.

Cyrill Cat. xvi. 24. He rejects, generally speaking, speculations that are carried too far, and thinks it sufficient to believe: ἵνα ἡ παρέκκλησις μὴ να δοκιμασίας ἵνα μὴ κύριοι, ὁ μονογενὴς αὐτοῦ υἱὸς ἵνα τὸ σωτήρ αὐτοῦ ἵνα τὸ σωτήριον τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσῃν τῷ τέκνῳ. Instead of οὐκ ἰσότατοι he would prefer οὐκ ἰσόβατοι κατὰ πάντα, iv. 7. but comp. the various readings in the work of Toutée, p. 54. and Münscher ed. by von Colln. p. 226. Socrat. iv. 25. He also maintains, that it is necessary to hold the right medium between Sabellianism and Arianism, iv. 8: Καὶ μὴν ἀπαλλαγμοὺς τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ἱερῶν, μητῆς συμπληρών ἐνεγκαθάρισεν ἡ συναγωγὴ κατὰ τὸν Χριστόν, x. 4. On the formation of compound words by means of the pronoun αὐτός, of which Eusebius makes frequent use, comp. the demonstr. evang. iv. 2. 13. and Heinichen, l. c. p. 223. In the same work v. 1. p. 215. the subordination of the Son to the Father is mentioned, though he calls him iv. 3. p. 149. υἱὸν γεννητὸν πρὸ χρόνων

* Comp. the note of the scholiast in the Cod. Med. (in the work of Vales and Heinichen iii. p. 219): καὶ ἡμισιασίοι Θεολογία, Ἐυαίσθησις τούτου τοῖς συναδέξεως καὶ συναλλαγμάτων καὶ συνεκπαίδευσι τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῶν ἀνακαλούν αὐτῶν τῶν ἁγίων, ὡσπερ ὡς τοὺς καὶ συναδέξεις τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἡμισιασίοις, and the more recent note in the Cod. Mazarin. ibidem.

The opinions of Marcellus (who died about the year 374,) may be known partly from the fragments of his treatise against Asterius (de subjectione Domini, edited by Rettberg, under the title: Marcelliana, Gött. 1794. 8.), partly from the writings of his opponents, Euseb (κατὰ Μακεδίλου Lib. ii. καὶ περὶ τῆς ἱεροσα- οσιατίκης ὑπολογίας) and Cyrill of Jerusalem (Cat. xv. 27. 33.), partly from his own letter to Julius, bishop of Rome (Epiph. haer. 72. 2.) The earlier writers are divided in their opinions concerning the orthodoxy of Marcellus; the language of Athanasius is very mild and cautious (ὅτι τοῦ προσώπου μειδίας, Epiph. haer. 72. 4.) though he does not directly approve of his sentiments. Basil the Great on the other hand (according to Ep. 69. 2. and 263. 5.) and most of the eastern bishops insisted upon his condemnation; most of the later writers consider him a heretic. Comp. Montfaucon, Diatribe de causa Marcelli Ancy- rani (in collect. nova Patr. Par. 1707. T. ii. pag. li.) Klose, p. 21—25. Gieseler, i. § 82. note 10. Marcellus had formerly de- fended the term ἰδιωσάς at the council of Nice. When he in the course of the controversy, and of his opposition to the Arian sophist Asterius, seemed to lean more towards Sabellianism, he might do so without his own knowledge. Comp. Baumgarten- Crusius, i. p. 227—78. Concerning the doctrine itself, Marcellus returned to the old distinction made between λόγος ἰνδιάδης and φερομενις; he imagined on the one hand that the λόγος was ἰδιωσός in God, and on the other that it was an ἰδιόγενος δημιουργεῖ proceeding from him. Inasmuch as he maintains the reality of the Logos (whom he does not consider to be a mere name), in opposition to the Sabellians, and rejects the idea of a generation adopted by the council of Nice, (because it infringes the Divi-
nity of the Logos,) he occupies an intermediate position between the one and the other. He also endeavoured to re-introduce the older, historical signification of the phrase υἱὸς θεοῦ, which was to be understood of the personal appearance of the historical Christ, and not of the pre-existence of the Logos; for the idea of generation cannot be applied to the latter. His disciple Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, (to whom his opponents gave the nickname Σωτηρίων,) adopted similar views, but carried them to a much greater extent; he died about the year 376. His doctrine was condemned in the aforesaid formula μακριστικός, and again afterwards at the council of Milan (A. D. 346.) He himself was dismissed from his office by the council of Sirmium (A. D. 351.) The sect of the Photinians however continued to exist till the reign of Theodosius the Great. From what has been said concerning him by : Athan. de Syr. § 26. Socrat. ii. 19. Epiph. hær. 70. Hilary (Fragm. and de Synodis,) Marius Mercator (Nestorii sermo iv.), and Vigil. Tapsens. (dialogus) it cannot be fully ascertained, how far Photinus either adhered to the principles of his master, or deviated from them. Comp. on this point Münchener Handbuch, iii. p. 447. Neander ii. 2. p. 908. Baumgarten-Crusius p. 279. Gieseler i. p. 342. Hase, Kirchengeschichte, p. 130. Klose, p. 66 fīwg. He too asserted the co-eternity of the Logos (but not of the Son) with the Father, and employed the term λογοσάρως to denote their unity, as Sabellius had used the word υἱοσάρως. He applied the name "Son of God," only to the incarnate Christ. The only difference between Marcellus and Photinus probably was, that the latter developed more the negative aspect of Christology than his master, and consequently considered the connection of the Logos with the historical Christ to be less intimate. Hence his followers were called Homuncionitae, (according to Mar. Mercator quoted by Klose, p. 76.) But we should bear in mind: "that theologians then but little understood the distinction made by Marcellus and Photinus between the terms Logos and Son of God. In refuting their opponents they invariably confounded these expressions, and thus might easily draw dangerous and absurd inferences from their propositions. But at the same time it is evident that their own arguments would take a wrong direction, and thus lose the greatest part of their force." Münscber, Handbuch l. c.
DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Nicene Creed had decided nothing concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit. While Lactantius yet identified the Word with the Spirit, other theologians regarded the Spirit as a mere Divine power and gift, or at least did not venture to determine his nature in any more definite way, though accustomed to teach the Divinity of the Son in unequivocal terms. But Athanasius inferred from his premises the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and was followed by Basil, surnamed the Great, as well as by Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa. At last the general council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), influenced by Gregory of Nazianzum, adopted more precise doctrinal definitions concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit, especially in opposition to the Macedonians. Though the term itself was not applied to the Spirit in the canons of this council, yet by determining that he proceeds from the Father, they prepared the way for further definitions, in which honour and power equal in every respect to those of the Father and the Son were ascribed to him.

It would indeed have been necessary to adopt more precise definitions; for Arius (according to Athan. orat. 1. § 6.) maintained that the Spirit stood in the same relation to the Son, as the Son to the Father, and that he was the first of the creatures made by the Son. But it did not appear wise, to involve the matter in question still more by contending about the Divinity of the Spirit; many of the Nicene Fathers who consented that the term should be applied to the Son, would not have so easily admitted it in reference to the Spirit. See Neander, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2. p. 892.

See above § 87. 1.

They had to guard against a twofold error; the one was
DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

to fall back into Sabellianism, the other to continue Arianism. Lactantius, on the one hand, separated the Son from the Father (after the manner of the Arians), and on the other, confounded the Spirit with the Son (as the Sabellians did.) Some writers followed his example, while others ascribed a distinct personality to the Spirit, but asserted that he was subordinate to both the Father and the Son. Gregory of Nazianzum gives a summary of the different views entertained in his time in the fifth of his theological orations, which was composed about the year 380 (de Spir. S. Orat. xxxi. p. 559): "Some of the wise men amongst us regard the Holy Spirit as an energy (ινέγμα), others think that he is a creature, some again that he is God himself, and, lastly, there are some who do not know what opinion to adopt from reverence, as they say, for the Sacred Scriptures, because they do not teach anything definite on this point. Eustathius of Sebaste belonged to this latter class; he said in reference to the Macedonian controversy (Socri. ii. 45): ἵγω ὁ ἄρι ήνομάζων τὸ στήμα τὸ ἀγίον αἰζώμαι, ὅτι κτίσμα καλῶ τολμήσαμί. Comp. Ullmann, Gregor von Nazianz. p. 380. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 2. p. 892. Eusebius of Caesarea was the more willing to subordinate the Spirit to both the Father and the Son, the more he was disposed to admit the subordination of the Son to the Father. He thinks that the Spirit is the first of all rational beings, but belongs nevertheless to the Trinity, de theol. eccles. iii. 3. 5. 6. Hilary was satisfied that that, which searcheth the deep things of God, must be itself divine, though he could not find any passage in Scripture in which the name "God" was given to the Holy Spirit, de trin. lib. xii. c. 55. (Tuum est quicquid te init, neque alienum a te est, quicquid virtute scrutantis inest.) comp. de trin. ii. 29: De spiritu autem sancto nec tacere oportet, nec loqui necesse est, sed sileri a nobis eorum causa, qui nesciunt, non potest. Loqui autem de eo non necesse est, quia de patre et filio auctoribus confitendum est, et quidem puto an sit, non esse tractandum. Est enim, quandoquidem donatur, accipitur, obtinetur, et qui confessioni patris et filii connexion est, non potest a confessione patris et filii separari. Imperfectum enim est nobis totum, si aliquid desit a toto, de quo si quis intelligentia nostræ sensum requirit, in Apostolo legimus ambo: quoniam estis, inquit, filii Dei, niais Deus spiritum filii sui in corda vestra clamantem abba pater. Et rursum: nolite contristare Spir. S. Dei, in quoignata e·tis
THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

Unde quia est et donatur et habetur et Dei est, cesset hinc sermo calumniantium, cum dicunt per quem sit et ob quid sit, vel qualis sit. Si responsio nostra displicebit, dicentium, per quem omnia et in quo omnia sunt, et quia spiritus est Dei, do-num fidelium: displiceant et apostoli et evangelistae et prophetæ, hoc tantum de eo quod esset loquentes, et post haec pater et filius displicebit.—He also advises us not to be perplexed by the language of Scripture, in which both the Father and the Son are sometimes called Spirit. Cyrill of Jerusalem too endeavours to confine himself to the use of scriptural definitions on the nature of the Holy Spirit, though he distinctly separates him from all created beings, and regards him as an essential part of the Trinity. He urges especially the practical aspect of this doctrine in opposition to the false enthusiasm of heretical fanatics, Cat. 16 and 17.*

(4) Athanasius (Ep. 4. ad Serap.) endeavoured to refute those, who declared the Holy Ghost to be a πνεῦμα, or the first of the ἀγγέλων λειτουργικῶν, and were called (τρισικη, συμμακαχυτικῆς.) He shows that we completely renounce Arianism only when we perceive in the Trinity nothing that is foreign to the nature of God (ἀλλάτριον ἀγγέλων ἐπιμηκνύμενον), but one and the same being, which is in perfect accordance with itself. Τριάς δέ ἐστιν οἷς ἰδίω ἰδίας ἰδιματίων μόνον καὶ φαντασίας λίγων, ἀλλὰ ἄλλες καὶ υπάρχου τριάς (Ep. i. 28. p. 677.) He appealed both to the decisions of Holy Writ, and to the testimony of our own Christian consciousness. How could that which is not sanctified by anything else, which is itself the source of sanctification to all creatures, possess the same nature as those beings which are sanctified by it? We have fellowship with God, and participate in a Divine life by means of the Holy Spirit; but this could not be, if the Spirit were created by God. It is no more certain that he communicates to us the principle of Divine life, than it is that he himself is one with the Divine being (εἴ δὲ ζωοποίησιν ὑμᾶς ἀμφιβολον, ἢτι ἡ τούτων φύσις ζωού ἑστι.) Ep. i. ad Serap. § 24. p. 672. 73. Neander, l. c. p. 895.

* As one shower waters flowers of the most different species (roses and lilies), so one Spirit is the author of many different graces, etc. Cat. xvi. 12. He is υἱὸς, εἰ ἄγαθος, μίγας παρά Θεῖον σύμμαχος, καὶ φροντάτος, μίγας ἰδέαναλος ἀναλωμαία, μίγας ὑφεροταυείνη ὑπὲρ ἵμων etc. ibid. c. 19. His glory far surpasses that of all angels, c. 28.
(a) Basil the Great was induced by a particular motive, to compose his treatise de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to the bishop Amphiloctius of Iconium, (comp. with it Ep. 189. Homilia de fide, T. ii. p. 132. Hom. contra Sab. T. ii. p. 195.) He too maintained that the name God should be given to the Spirit, and appealed both to Scripture in general, and to the baptismal formula in particular, in which the Spirit is mentioned together with the Father and the Son. He did not however lay much stress upon the name itself, but simply demanded, that the Spirit, so far from being regarded as a creature, should be considered as inseparable from both the Father and the Son. He spoke in eloquent language of the practical importance of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (as the sanctifier of the human heart), de Spir. S. c. 16: τὸ δὲ μὴγίστρον τικμῆρον τῆς σφές τῶν σατηρῶν καὶ ὁλην τῶν νιώτων αναφέρει, δι’ οὗ οὐκ εἶχοι λὶγήτερον πρὸς τὸν Θείον, ώς πρὸς ἐκαστὸν ἵκεν τὸ σπνῶμα τι νῇ ἅμι (1 Cor. ii. 10. 11.) In answer to the objection, that the Spirit is called a gift, he remarks, that the Son is likewise a gift of God, ibid. c. 24. comp. Klose, Basilius der Grosse, p. 34 flwq. His brother, Gregory of Nyssa, proceeds in the second chapter of his larger catechism upon ideas similar to those of Lactantius, that the Spirit (breath) must be connected with the Word, since it is so even in the case of man. He does not, however, like Lactantius identify the Spirit with the Word, but draws a distinction between them. The Spirit is not to be considered as anything foreign which enters from without into the Deity (comp. Athanasius); to think of the Spirit of God as similar to ours, would be detracting from the glory of the Divine omnipotence. “On the contrary, we imagine that this essential power which manifests itself as a separate hypostasis, can neither be separated from the Godhead in which it rests, nor from the Divine Word which it follows. Nor does it cease to exist, but being self-existing (αὐτόχριστον) like the Deity, it is ever capable of choosing the good, and of carrying out all its resolutions.” Comp. Rupp, Gregor von Nyssa, p. 169. 70. The views of Gregory of Nazianzum agreed with those of the two writers already named, though he clearly perceived the difficulties with which the doctrine in question was beset in his time. He was prepared to meet the objection, that it would introduce a ἴδιον ξίον καὶ ἄγγελον (Orat. xxx. 1. p. 556. Ullmann, p. 381); he also acknowledged that it was not expressly taught in Scripture, and therefore thought, that it was quite justifiable to go beyond the
letter itself. He has recourse to the idea of a gradual revelation, which, as he imagines, stands in connection with a natural development of the Trinity. " The Old Test. set forth the Father in a clear, but the Son in a somewhat dim light; the New Test. reveals the Son, but it only intimates the Divinity of the Spirit; but now the Spirit dwells in our midst, and manifests himself more distinctly. It was not desirable that the Divinity of the Son should be proclaimed, as long as that of the Father was not fully recognized; nor did it appear advisable to add that of the Spirit, as long as that of the Son was not believed." Gregory numbered the doctrine of the Holy Spirit among those things of which Christ speaks, John xvi. 12, and recommended therefore some degree of prudence in discourses on this dogma. He himself developed his doctrine principally in his controversy with Macedonius, and refuted him by proving that the Holy Spirit is neither a mere power, nor a creature, and accordingly, that he is God himself. For further particulars, see Ullmann, p. 378 flwg.

(6) The word Πνευματομάχοι has a general meaning, and comprehends of course the strict Arians. But the Divinity of the Spirit was equally denied by the Semlarians, whose views concerning the nature of the Son resembled those of the orthodox party; the most prominent theologian among them was Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople (A. D. 341—360.) Soz. iv. 27. says of him: Εἰσήχθη δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ τὸν ιησοῦν, κατὰ πάντα τι καὶ καὶ οὕσια ὅμων τῷ πατρί τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύμα ἀμορφος τῶν αὐτῶν προσβείς ἀπεφαινεν, διὰκόσμου καὶ ἑπτήσεως καλὼν. Theodoret ii. 6. adds, that he did not hesitate to call the Spirit a creature. His opinion was afterwards called the Marathonian, from Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia. The Macedonians, though condemned at the second ecumenical council, continued to exist as a separate sect in Phrygia down to the fifth century, when they were combated by Nestor. The objections which the Macedonians either made themselves to the Divinity of the Spirit, or with which they were charged by their opponents, are the following: " The Holy Spirit is either begotten or not begotten; if the latter, we have two uncreated beings (ἐὰν τὰ ἄναγχα), viz. the Father and the Spirit; if begotten, he must be begotten either of the Father or of the Son; if of the Father, it follows that there are two Sons in the Trinity, and hence brothers, (the question then arises, who is the elder of the two, or are they twins?) but if
PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.


The canons of the council of Constantinople however had not fully settled the point in question. The relation of the Spirit to the Trinity in general had been determined, but the particular relation in which he stands to the Son and the Father separately, remained yet to be decided. Inasmuch as the formula declared, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, without making any distinct mention of the Son, room was left for doubt, whether it denied the procession of the Spirit from the latter, or not. On the one hand, the assertion that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, and not from the Son, seemed to favour the notion, that the Son is subordinate to the Father; on the other, to maintain that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son, would be placing the Spirit in a still greater dependence (viz. on two persons instead of one.) Thus the desire fully to establish the Divinity of the Son, would easily detract
from the Divine nature of the Spirit; the wish, on the contrary, to prove the self-existence and independence of the Spirit, would tend to throw the importance of the Son into the shade. The Greek Fathers, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, asserted the procession of the Spirit from the Father, without distinctly denying that he also proceeds from the Son.\(^{(1)}\) Epiphanius on the other hand, ascribed the origin of the Spirit to both the Father and the Son, with whom Marcellus of Ancyra agreed.\(^{(2)}\) But Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret would not in any way admit that the Spirit owes his existence to the Son,\(^{(3)}\) and defended their opinion in opposition to Cyrill of Alexandria.\(^{(4)}\) The Latin Fathers, on the contrary, and Augustine in particular,\(^{(5)}\) taught the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. This doctrine was so firmly established in the West, that at the third synod of Toledo (A.D. 589.) the clause filioque was added to the confession of faith adopted by the council of Constantinople, which afterwards led to the disruption between the eastern and western church.\(^{(6)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) In accordance with the prevailing notions of the age the Father was considered as the only effectual principle (μία ἄγγελη), to whom all other things owe their existence, of whom the Son is begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds, who performs all things through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit. The phrase: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, was maintained especially against the Pneumatomachi. It was asserted in opposition to them, “that the Holy Spirit does not derive his existence from the Son in a dependent manner, but that he stands in a direct relation to the Father, as to the common first cause; that the Holy Spirit proceeds in the same manner from the Father, as the Son is begotten of the Father.” Neander, Kirchengeschichte, ii. p. 897.

\(^{(2)}\) Epiph. Ancor. § 9., after having proved the Divinity of the Spirit e. g. from Acts v. 3. says: ἐὰν Ἰησοῦς ἐν παρθένῳ καὶ νίκῳ ἐν πνεύμα, without expressly stating that he ἐπαρκεῖναι ἐν τοῖς νίκοι.
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Comp. Ancor. 8. : Πνεῦμα γὰρ Θεοῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Πνεῦμα υἱοῦ, οὗ παρὰ τίνα σύνεσιν, καθάπερ εἰ ἡμῖν ὑπαρκῇ καὶ σύνεσιν, ἄλλῳ εἰ μίσους Πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, εἰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τρίτον εἰς ὑμεῖς. Marcellus inferred from the supposition, that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, the sameness of the last two in the Sabellian sense. Eus. de eccles. theol. iii. 4. p. 168. (quoted by Klose, über Marcell p. 47.) Concerning the views of Photinus see Klose, l. c. p. 83.

(3) Theodore of Mopsuestia in his confession of faith (quoted by Walch Bibl. Symb. p. 204.) combated that opinion which would represent the Spirit as ὑποταξίαν εἰληφέρει. On the opinion of Theodoret comp. the ix. anathema of Cyril Opp. v. p. 47.

(4) Cyrill condemned all who denied that the Holy Spirit was the proprium of Christ. Theodoret in reply observed, that this expression was not objectionable, if nothing more were understood by it, than that the Holy Spirit is of the same essence (ὑμοοὐσιος) with the Son, and proceeds from the Father; but that it ought to be rejected if it were meant to imply, that he derives his existence from the Son, or through the Son, either of which would be contrary to what is said John xv. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 12. Comp. Neander, l. c. p. 900.

(5) Augustine tract. 99. in evang. Joh.: A quo autem habet filius, ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab illo habet utique ut etiam de illo procedat Spir. S. Et per hoc Spir. S. ut etiam de filio procedat, sicut procedit de patre, ab ipso habet patre. Ibid.: Spir. S. non de patre procedit in filium et de filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit, quamvis hoc filio Pater dederit, ut quemadmodum de se, ita de illo quoque procedat. De trin. 4. 20: Nec possumus dicere, quod Spir. S. et a filio non procedat, neque frustra idem Spir. et Patris et Filii Spir. dicitur.

(6) This additional clause made its appearance at the time when Rekkared, king of the Visigoths, passed over from the Arian to the catholic church. The above synod pronounced an anathema against all who did not believe that the Spirit proceeded from both the Father and the Son. Comp. Neander, l. c. p. 901.
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY CONCLUDED.

The more accurately the Divinity both of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son was defined, the more important it became, first, exactly to determine the relation in which the different persons stand to the Godhead in general, and to each other in particular, and, secondly, to settle the ecclesiastical terminology. Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa in the Greek, Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine in the Latin church exerted the greatest influence upon the formation of the said terminology. According to it the word οὐσία (essentia, substantia) denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the abstract; the word ἰδιότης (persona) signifies the individual, concrete. (1) Each person possesses some peculiarity (ἰδιότης), by which it is distinguished from the other persons, notwithstanding the existing sameness of essence. Thus underived existence (ἀγνωσία) belongs to the Father, generation (γέννας) to the Son, and procession (ἐγένεσις, ἐγένσις) to the Holy Spirit. (2) Since Augustine rejected all the distinctions which had been formerly made between the different persons, and referred to the one God that which had been predicated before his time of the separate persons, he could not entirely avoid the appearance of Sabellianism. (3) Boëthius and others adopted his views on this point. (4)

(1) The writers of this period avoided the use of the term πρόσωπον, which would have corresponded more exactly to the Latin word "persona," while ἰδιότης means literally substantia, lest it might lead to Sabellianism; but they sometimes confounded ἰδιότης with οὐσία, and used occasionally φώς instead of the latter. This was done e. g. by Gregory of Nazianzum,
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Thus Augustine (de trin. ii. 18.) refers the appearances of the Deity, which were formerly ascribed to the Logos alone, to the whole Trinity. In support of his view he appeals to the three men who appeared to Abraham. He also thinks that the mission of the Son is not only a work of the Father, but of the whole Trinity, c. 8. The similarity between the Augustinian and Sabellian theories may farther be seen in the anthropological comparison, which he institutes between the Trinity on the one hand, and the memoria, intelligentia et voluntas on the other ix. 11. x. 10. xv. 7. But he by no means lost sight of the distinction of the persons, i. 5. Comp. however the whole of his treatise de trinitate, and with it what he says de civ. Dei xi. 24. Retract. ii. 15. and other passages quoted by Münscher von Cölln, p. 246—49.

Boëth. de trin. (ad Symmach.) c. 2.: Nulla igitur in eo (Deo) diversitas, nulla ex diversitate pluralitas, nulla ex accidentibus multitudo, atque idcirco nec numerus. c. 3.: Deus vero a Deo nullo differt, ne vel accidentibus, vel substantialibus differentiis in subjecto positis distat; ubi vero nulla est differentia, nulla est omnino pluralitas; quare nec numerus; igitur unitas
tantum. Nam quod tertio repetitur, Deus; quum Pater et Filius et Spir. S. nuncupatur, tres unitates non faciunt pluralitatem numeri in eo quod ipsae sunt. Non igitur si de Patre et Filio et Spir. S. tertio prædicatur Deus, idcirco trina prædicatio numerum facit. c. 6.: facta quidem est trinitatis numerositas in eo quod est prædicatio relationis; servata vero unitas in eo quod est indifferentia vel substantiae vel operationis vel omnino ejus, qua secundum se dicitur, prædicationis. Ita igitur substantia continet unitatem, relationem multiplex trinitatem, atque ideo sola sigillatim proferuntur atque separatim quae relationis sunt; nam idem Pater qui Filius non est, nec idem uterque qui Spir. S. Idem tamen Deus est, Pater et Filius et Spir. S., idem justus, idem bonus, idem Magnus, idem omnia, qua secundum se poterunt prædicari.

§ 96.

TRITHEISM, TETRATHEISM.

In keeping the three persons in the Godhead distinctly separate much caution was needed, lest the idea of ściωia which refers to a unity, should be taken as a generic term, and made to embrace the Ἳωρασις as the species. This would necessarily have given rise to the notion of three Gods. But another error had to be guarded against, viz. that of distinguishing God as such ( αἰθέρατος) from Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of mechanically enumerating them. In the latter case there would have been the appearance of four persons, or even four gods. Tritheites, and Tetratheites indeed are found in the catalogue of heretical teachers, though many of the charges brought forward against them are founded on false inferences.

(1) To the former belonged John Ascusnages of Constantinople, who was banished by the Emperor Justinian, and John Philoponus, who died at the commencement of the seventh century; the latter used φοῖις instead of Ἳωρασις. Comp. Joh. Dam. de haeresib. p. 101. ss. Photii Bibl. Cod. 75. Niceph. xviii. 45—49., extracts
The doctrine of the church concerning the Trinity appears most fully developed, and expressed in its most perfect symbolical form in what is called the *Symbolum quicunque* (commonly, but erroneously called the Creed of St. Athanasius.) It originated in the school of Augustine, and is ascribed by some to Vigilantius Tapsensis, by others to Vincentius Lerinensis, and by some again to others. By the repetition of positive and negative propositions the mysterious doctrine is presented to the understanding in so hieroglyphical a form, as to make man feel his own weakness. The consequence was that all further endeavours of human ingenuity to solve its apparent contradictions by philosophical arguments, must dash against this bulwark of faith, on which salvation was made to depend, as the waves against an impregnable rock.

* While salvation thus appears to be made dependent on the most refined philosophical definitions, it is pleasing to hear other men raising their voices during this period, who did not attach such unqualified value to the mere orthodoxy of the understanding, and who were fully convinced of the limits of
b. CHRISTOLOGY.

§ 98.

THE TRUE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

Traces of Docetism.—Arianism.

It was no less difficult to determine the relation of the Divine to the human nature of Christ, than to define the relation which exists between the three persons of the Trinity and the One God. For the more decidedly the church asserted the Divinity of the Son of God, the more the doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos had to be guarded against erroneous notions either concerning the true Divinity, or respecting the true humanity of Christ. In opposition to Docetism the doctrine of the human nature of Christ had indeed been so firmly established, that no one was likely to deny that he possessed a human body, though Hilary, who was orthodox in all other points, bordered upon Docetism by maintaining that the body of Jesus could not undergo any real sufferings. But two other questions arose, which were beset with still greater difficulties. In the first place, it was asked, whether a human soul formed a necessary part of the humanity of Christ;—and if so (as the orthodox maintained in opposition to the Arians) it was still doubtful whether this soul was to be understood only as the animal soul, or as both the animal soul and the human knowledge and the insufficiency of such dogmatic definitions. Greg. Orat. xxxi. 33. p. 577. Ullmann, p. 336. (comp. however p. 334. 35.) Rufinus also says, expos. p. 18.: Quomodo autem Deus pater genuerit filium, nolo discutias, nec te curiosius ingeras in profundi hujus arcumen (al. profundo hujus arcani,) ne forte dum inaccessae lucis fulgorem pertinacius perscrutaris, exiguum ipsum qui mortalibus divino munere concessus est, perdas aspectum.

Aut si putas in hoc omni indagationis genere nitendum, prius tibi propone quae nostra sunt: quae si consequenter valueris expedire, tunc a terrestribus ad celestia et a visibilibus ad invisibilitia properato.
rational spirit of man (in distinction from the Spirit of God.)

(1) Concerning the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, comp. above, § 66. n. 4. Hilar. de trin. x. 23: Habens ad patiendum quidem corpus et passus est, sed non habuit naturam ad dolendum. (He compares it to an arrow which passes through the water without wounding it.) — Comment. in Ps. cxxxviii. 3. Suscepitergo infirmitates, quia homo nascitur et putatur dolere, quia patitur; caret vero doloribus ipse, quia Deus est. The usage of the Latin word pati allowed such a distinction to be made.) — De trin. xi. 48: In forma Dei manens, servi formam assumsit, non demutatus, sed se ipsum exinaniens et intra se latens et intra suam ipse vacuefactus potestatem; dum se usque ad formam temperat habitus humani, ne potentem immensamque naturam assumptae humanitatis non ferret infirmitas, sed in tantum se virtus inconscripta moderaretur, in quantum oporteret eam usque ad patientiam connexi sibi corporis obedire.

(2) Athan. contra Apollin. ii. 3: "Αειός δι' ἀφραχά μόνην τῇς ἀποστασίᾳς τῆς Αιώνος υμολογής ἄνει δι' τοῦ ἠκολούθη ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπων, τούτιστι τῇς ξυρίας, τῇς ἄνεις ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ λίγι ἡγοῦνται, καὶ τῆς τῶν πάθων νόησιν καὶ τῆς ἔσων ἀνάστασιν τῇ Αιώνος προθάμων τολμᾶν. Comp. Epiph. Hær. 69. 19. and other passages quoted by Münscher von Cölln, p. 268. This notion was very prominently brought forward by the Arians, Eudoxius and Eunomius; respecting the former see Cave, Historia Script. eccles. i. p. 219; concerning the latter comp. Manei, Conc. T. iii. p. 648.—But even some orthodox theologians of this period used indefinite language on this point previous to the rise of the Apollinarian controversy. Comp. Münscher von Cölln, p. 269.

§ 99.

THE DOCTRINE OF APOLLINARIS.

Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, who, generally speaking, enjoyed a high reputation among orthodox theologians, imagined that that higher life of reason which elevates man above the rest of creation, could be of no use to him, in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily,
or rather, that its place was wholly supplied by the Logos. His intention seems to have been not so much to detract from the dignity of Christ, as to honour him. He was opposed by Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, to whose exertions it must be attributed, that the catholic church adopted the doctrine, that Christ possessed a perfect human nature consisting of a body, and of a rational soul, together with his Divine nature. The council of Constantinople (A. D. 381.) condemned Apollinarism as heretical.

Apollinaris was led by his philosophical turn of mind to suppose, that he might establish his argument with mathematical precision. Of the writings in which he explained his views, only fragments are extant in the works of Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, and Leontius Byzantinus (who lived about the year 590); they were the following: περὶ σαφεί̔ωσις λογίδων (ἀπὸδειξείς περὶ τῆς Ἑινας ἰναπαξίωσις); τὸ κατὰ κεφάλαιαν Βίβλιον. περὶ ἀναστάσεως. περὶ πίστεως λογίδων, and some letters (in Gallandii Bibl. PP. T. xii. p. 706 ss. Angelo Maj Class, auct. T. ix. p. 495 ss.) Apollinaris objected to the union of the Logos with a rational soul, that the human being thus united to the Logos, must either preserve his own free will, in which case there would be no true union of the Divine and the human, or that the human soul had lost its proper liberty by becoming united to the Logos, either of which would be absurd. According to the threefold division of man, Apollinaris was willing to ascribe a soul to the Redeemer, in so far as he thought it to be a mean between body and spirit. But that which itself determines the soul (τὸ αὐτοκριτοῦ), and constitutes the higher dignity of man, the νοῦς (the ἕνα λογίῳ) of Christ, could not be of human origin, but must be purely Divine; hence the Divine reason supplied the place of the human; hence there existed a specific difference between Christ and other beings. In their case everything had to undergo a process of gradual development, which cannot be brought about without either conflicts or sin, (ἐστὶ γὰρ τίλλως ἀνθρώπως, ἵππι καὶ ἄμαρτῃ. apud. Athan. i. 2. p. 923. Comp. c. 21. p. 939. ἀμαρτία ἱνατίσθαισ.) But this could not take place in the case of Christ: οὐδεμία ἁπάντως ἐν χρήσει-νυν νῦς ἢστιν ἀθρώπως. Comp. Gregory of Nyssa, (An-
tirrhet. adv. Apollin. iv. c. 221.) At the same time Apollinaris supposed the body and soul of Christ to be so completely filled with the higher and Divine principle of spiritual life, that he did not hesitate to use expressions such as: "God died, God is born," etc. He even maintained that on account of this intimate union Divine homage is also due to the human nature of Christ, l. c. p. 241. 264. His opponents therefore charged him with Patripassianism. But we do not think that Apollinaris ever asserted, as Gregory of Nazianzum would have us believe, that Christ must have possessed an irrational, animal soul, e. g. that of a horse, or an ox, because he had not a rational human soul; Gregory himself seems to have drawn such inferences from the premises of Apollinaris. On the other hand he accused his opponents in a similar manner of believing in two Christs, two Sons of God, etc.

(2.) Athanasius maintained, in opposition to Apollinaris, contra Apollinar. libri ii. (but without mentioning his opponent by name, as he enjoyed personal intercourse with him), that it behoved Christ to be our example in every respect, and that his nature therefore must resemble ours. Sinfulness, which is empirically connected with the development of man, is not a necessary attribute of human nature, as the Manichæan notions would lead us to suppose. Man, on the contrary, was originally free from sin, and Christ appeared on that very account, viz. in order to show that God is not the author of sin, and to prove that it is possible to live a sinless life (the controversy thus touched upon questions of an anthropological nature.)—Athanasius distinctly separated the Divine from the human (comp. especially lib. ii.), but he did not admit that he taught the existence of two Christs. Comp. Neander, Kirchengeschichte ii. 2. p. 923. Möhler, Athanasius, ii. p. 262 ss. (his attacks upon the doctrine of Luther are out of place.)

* Gregory of Nazianzum (Ep. ad Cledon. et orat. 51.) equally asserted the necessity of a true and perfect human nature. It was not only necessary, as the medium by which God manifested himself; but Jesus could redeem and sanctify man only by assuming his whole nature, consisting of body and soul. (Similar views had been formerly held by Irenæus, and were afterwards more fully developed

* But he remarks more justly, p. 263: "It is the more to be regretted that Apollinaris fell into such errors, as he devised his doctrine for the purpose of defending the Divinity of the Redeemer."
by Anselm.) Gregory thus strongly maintained the doctrine of the two natures of the Saviour. We must distinguish in Christ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα, but not ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλα. Compare the Epist. ad Nectar. sive orat. 46. with his 10 anathemas against Apollinaris, and Ullmann p. 396—413. The work of Gregory of Nyssa entitled λόγος ἀντιγενητικὸς πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου (which was probably composed about the year 376 or 377), may be found in Zaccagni, Collect. monum. vett. and Gallandii Bibl. Patr. vi. p. 517. comp. Gieseler i. § 83. note 30. Rupp. p. 139.—He opposed the followers of Apollinaris (Συνοδισταί, Διομομενοί) in his Ep. 77. The doctrine of Apollinaris was also condemned in the West by Damasus, bishop of Rome (comp. Münscher von Colln p. 277.), and once more by the second oecumenical synod of Constantinople (A. d. 381. Can. i. vii.)—On the question, whether Apollinaris or his disciples ever adopted the Docetic errors respecting the body of Christ? see Möhler l. c. p. 264.

§ 100.

THE DOCTRINE OF NESTOR.


The desire of preserving the perfect human nature of Christ together with the Divine, led from time to time to the inquiry, whether that which the Scriptures relate respecting the life and actions of the Redeemer, his birth, sufferings, and death, refers only to his humanity, or to his Divine as well as to his human nature; and if the latter, in what respect it may be said to refer to both. While the teachers of the Alexandrian school asserted in strong terms the unity of the Divine and the human in Christ, the theologians of Antioch, Diodore of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, made a strict distinction between the one and the other.(1) At last the phrase: mother of God (Σιώπολος)(2) which the increasing homage paid to the Virgin had brought into use, gave rise to the
controversy respecting the two natures of Christ. Nestor, patriarch of Constantinople, disapproved of the phrase in question, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ, but not to God.\(^3\) Cyrill, patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him, and both pronounced anathemas against each other.\(^4\) Nestor supposed, in accordance with the Antiochian mode of thinking, that the Divine and the human natures of Christ ought to be distinctly separated, and admitted only a συνάψεως (junction) of the one and the other, an Ἰνοικύνης (indwelling) of the Deity. Cyrill on the contrary, was led by his Egyptian notions, to maintain the perfect union of the two natures (φυσική Ἰνοικύνη) Nestor was condemned by the synod of Ephesus (A. D. 431.)\(^5\) but the controversy was not brought to a close.


\(^{(2)}\) Concerning the ecclesiastical meaning of this term which came gradually into use, see Socrat. vii. 32. Münsscher von Cölln, i. 286. The absurd discussions on the partus virgineus, (comp. e. g. Rufinus expos. 20.) where Mary is called the porta Domini, per quam introivit in mundum, etc. belong to the same class.

\(^{(3)}\) Anastasius, a presbyter of Alexandria, (A. D. 428), preached against the use of the term in question, and thus called forth the present controversy. He was followed by Nestor, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Socrat. vii. 32. Leporius, a presbyter and monk at Massilia, and follower of Pelagius, had previously propounded a similar doctrine in the West, see Mün-
The views of Nestor himself are contained in iii. (ii.) Sermones Nestorii, quoted by Mar. Mercator, p. 53—74. Mansi iv. p. 1197. Garner, ii. p. 3 ss. He rejected the appellation "mother of God" as heathenish and contrary to Heb. vii. 3. Resting, as he did, on the orthodox doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, he could say: Non peperit creatura eum, qui est increabilis, non recentem de virgine Deum Verbum genuit Pater. In principio erat enim verbum, sicut Joh. (i. 1.) ait. Non peperit creatura creatorem [increabilem], sed peperit hominem, Deitatis instrumentum. Non creavit Deum Verbum Spir. S......sed Deo Verbo templum fabricatus est, quod habitaret, ex virgine, etc. But Nestor by no means refused to worship the human nature of Christ in its connection with the Divine, and strongly protested against the charge of separating the two natures: Propter utentem illud indumentum, quo utitur, colo, propter absconditum adoro, quod foris videtur. Inseparabilis ab eo, qui oculis paret, est Deus. Quomodo igitur ejus, qui non dividitur, honorem [ego] et dignitatem audeam separare? Divido naturas, sed conjungo reverentiam (quoted by Garner, p. 3.) and in the fragment given by Mansi, p. 1201: ἄλλα ἐν ἃς φυσιν ὁ χριστός ἐκεῖνης τὴν φυσιν ἄλλα ἐν ἃς ὁ χριστὸς τὴν φυσιν ἄλλα ἐν ἃς την μην ὁ χριστὸς τὴν φυσιν ἄλλα ἐν ἃς την μην. He preferred calling Mary ἡ θεότοκος or Χριστοτόκος instead of Θεοτόκος. Comp. the other passages in the work of Münscher ed. by von Colln, p. 284—86.

(4) On the external history of this controversy, see the works on ecclesiastical history. It commenced with a correspondence between Nestor and Cyrill, in which they charged each other with separating and confounding the two natures of Christ. Cyrill was supported by Cælestinus, bishop of Rome, "Nestor by the eastern bishops in general, and John, bishop of Antioch, in particular. In the course of the controversy Nestor declared himself willing, even to adopt the term Θεοτόκος, if properly explained. Comp. the Acta, and especially the anathemas themselves in Mansi v. p. 1 ss. and iv. p. 1099. in Mar. Mercator, p. 142. (Garner ii. 77 ss.) reprinted in Baumgarten’s theologische Streitigkeiten, vol. ii. p. 770 ss. Gieseler Lehrb. der Kirchengesch. i. § 88. note 20. Münscher von Colln, p. 290—95.

(5) The acts of the Synod are given in Mansi iv. p. 1123. Fuchs. iv. p. 1 flwg. The synod was overruled by Cyrill. An
anti-synod was held under John, bishop of Antioch, in opposition to Cyrill and Memnon; these in their turn excommunicated John and his party. The emperor Theodosius at first confirmed the sentence of deposition which the two contending parties had pronounced upon each other, but afterwards restricted it to Nestor, who was abandoned by all. John of Antioch himself was prevailed upon to give his consent to the condemnation of his friend after Cyrill had signed a confession of faith which more or less contradicted his former anathemas, (comp. Mün- scher ed. by von Cölln, p. 297.) The consequence was the separation of the Nestorian party (Chaldean Christians, Thomas-Christians) from the catholic church; on the history of the Nestorians see J. S. Assemanni, de Syris Nestorianis, in Bibl. Orient. Rom. 1728. T. iii. P. 2. “We may call the view of Cyrill (according to which the human is changed into the Divine), the supernatural aspect of the union in question, and that of Nestor (according to which the two natures are only joined together) the mechanic.” Dorner, p. 90.

§ 101.

EUTYCHIAN-MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY.

The doctrine which separated the two natures of Christ, had been rejected by the condemnation of Nestor. But with the growing influence and power of the party of Cyrill, which was headed by Dioscurus, Cyrill's successor, the still greater danger arose of confounding, instead of separating the said natures. The zeal of Eutyches, archimandrite [abbot] of Constantinople, who maintained the doctrine of one nature alone of Christ, caused new disturbances. Dioscurus endeavoured to force the Monophysite doctrine by violent means upon the eastern church, but both he, and his sentiments were at last condemned at the synod of Chalcedon (A. D. 451.) In the course of the controversy Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, had addressed a letter to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. On the basis of this Epis-
tola Flaviana the synod pronounced in favour of the doctrine of two natures, which should neither be separated nor confused, and, in order to prevent further errors, drew up a confession of faith, which should be binding upon all parties.\(^5\)


Eutyches was charged by Eusebius of Dorylaeum with the revival of Valentinian and Apollinarian errors, and deposed by a synod held at Constantinople in the year 449. See Mansi vi. p. 694—754. According to the acts of this synod he taught: Μετὰ τὴν ἐνασθεσάμενην τοῦ Ιεωθέν τοῦ Κυ-γίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν καὶ ταύτην Ιεωθέν σαφώθησαν καὶ ἐνασθεσάμενον. He denied that the flesh of Christ was of the same essence (ἁμαρτίας) with ours, though he would not be understood to teach, that Christ brought his body with him from heaven. But when his opponents brought him at last to a dilemma, he went so far as to admit the sameness of essence in respect to the body. But he could not be induced to confess his belief in the existence of two natures, a Divine and a human. He maintained that there had been two natures only ἕνωσις; but after that he would acknowledge only one. Concerning the agreement subsisting between his doctrine and that of Cyril, see Münchser edit. by von Colin, p. 301.

These violent proceedings were carried to an extreme length at the Synod of Robbers a. d. 449. (Latrocinium Ephesi- num. οὕτως λέγεται) the acts of which may be found in Mansi vi. p. 593 ss. Fuchs. iv. p. 340 ss.

The epistle in question is given in Mansi v. p. 1359. (separately published by K. Phil. Henke. Helmst. 1780. 4. comp. Griesb. opusc. acad. T. i. p. 52 ss.) Comp. Münchser von Colhn. p. 302. Salva proprietate utriusque naturæ et substantiæ et in unam coeunte personam, suspetta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, a eternitate mortalitas; et ad resolvendum conditionis nostre debitum natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili, ut quod nostris remedius congruebat, unus atque idem
mediator dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris etc. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo, et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communique, quod proprium est : Verbo scilicet operante, quod verbi est, et carne exsequente, quod carnis est etc. He then ascribes birth, hunger, nakedness, sufferings, death, burial, etc. to the human, the miracles to the Divine nature; the passage in John xiv. 28. refers to the former, that in John x. 30. to the latter.

We cannot fail to perceive a dogmatic parallel between the decisions of this synod respecting the nature of Christ, and those of the council of Nice, with this difference only, that the latter understood by ipso that which belongs to each nature separately, but by ipsum that which both have in common; the reverse is the case in the decisions of the synod of Chalcedon.

§ 102.

PROGRESS OF THE CONTROVERSY. — THEOPASCHITISM.

But the authority of the decision of the Synod of Chalcedon was not at once generally acknowledged. Many conflicts ensued before the doctrine of "two natures in one person" was received as the orthodox doctrine of the church, and finally inserted into what is commonly called the Athanasian Creed. The exact medium however between the two extreme views was not strictly preserved. For by the admission of a new clause, viz. that one of the Divine persons had been crucified (Theopaschitism), into the creed of the fifth oecumenical synod (A. D. 553) the Monophysite notion gained the ascendancy within the pale of the church.

1. The Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno, A. D. 482, in Evagr. iii. c. 14. (separately published by Berger, Wittemb. 1723. 4.) was intended to bring about a reconciliation between the contending parties, but was not followed by any permanent success. Comp. Jablonsky, Diss. de Henotico Zenonis. Francof. ad Viadr. 1737. 4. Münscher v. Cölln, p. 306. 7.

2. Symb. Athan. pars ii. — (Comp. § 97.)

27. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem, ut incarnatio
tem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. 28. Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei filius, Deus pariter et homo est. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: homo ex substantialia matris in sæculo natus. 30. Perfectus deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens. 31. æqualis Patri secundum divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem. 32. Qui licet deus sit et homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. 33. Unus autem non conversione divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum. 34. Unus omnino non confusione substantiarum, sed unitate personæ. 35. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita et deus et homo unus est Christus. 36. Qui passus est pro salute
nostra, descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, 37. ascendit in coelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. 38. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere debent cum corporibus suis et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem. 39. Et qui bona cgerunt, ibunt in vitam aeternam: qui vero mala, in ignem aeternum. 40. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisquam fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

(3) Peter Fullo (ὁ γνασίως) was the first who introduced the clause ἵνα ἐσταυρωθῇ into the Trishagion. [On the τρισάγιον see Gieseler, l. c. i. § 110. note 12.] He was however banished by an imperial decree about the year 470.—In the year 533 Justinian pronounced the phrase unum crucifixum esse ex sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate to be orthodox, (Cod. l. 1. Tit. 1. 6.); he did so in accordance with John II. bishop of Rome, but in opposition to his predecessor Hormisdas.—The decree of the council is given in Mansi ix. p. 304: Εἴ τις οὖς ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἵσταυρω-μίνον σαρκί Κύριον ἢμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐνα Σατανᾶς ἄλλης καὶ χύριον τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἐνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθημα ἰστω.—This victory of the advocates of Theopaschitism was only the counterpart of the one which the friends of the phrase ἵσορκος had gained in former years. Thus such expressions as “God is born, God died,” came gradually into use in dogmatic theology. It was in this sense that, e. g. the author of the soliloquia animae (which may be found in the works of Augustine) c. 1. offered the following prayer: Manus tuae, Domine, fecerunt me et plasmaverunt me, manus inquam illæ, quæ affixe clavis sunt pro me.

§ 103.

VARIOUS FEATURES OF THE MONOPHYSITE DOCTRINE.

APHTHARDOCETÆ, PHTHARTOLATRI, AGNÆÆ.

Gieseler, J. C. L., commentatio, qua monophysitarum veterum variae de Christi persona opiniones in primis ex ipsorum effatis recens editis illustratur. Parts I. II. Göttingen 1838. IV.

The Monophysites themselves were not agreed on the question whether Christ possessed a corruptible, or an incorruptible body? The Phthartolatri (Severians)
maintained the former, the Aphthardocetae (Julianists) asserted the latter, in accordance with their opinions respecting the nature of Christ. Different views obtained among the Aphthardocetae themselves on the question whether Christ's body was created, or not, and led to the formation of two distinct parties, the Ktistolatri and the Akstiteta. The omniscience of Christ necessarily followed from the Monophysite doctrine. The assertion therefore of Themistius, deacon of Alexandria, that the man Jesus had been ignorant of many things (Agnoetism, Mark xiii. 32; Luke ii. 52;) was rejected by the strict Monophysites.

(1) Sources: Leont. Byzant. (in Gallandii Bibl. Patr. xii.) Niceph. Callistilib. xvii. Gieseler (in the 2nd Part of the dissertation cited before) endeavours to prove, that the view of the Julianists was by no means purely Docetic, but allied to that taken by Clement of Alexandria, Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, etc., and also bore resemblance to the opinions entertained by Apollinaris. Xenajas (Philoxenus), bishop of Hierapolis, who was the contemporary of Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus, appears as the representative of this view, comp. p. 7. Different meanings were attached to the word ϕυτός, which was made at one time to denote the frailty of the living body, and its susceptibility of undergoing sufferings, at another to signify the dissolubility of the corpse; ibidem, p. 4.

Though the orthodox church was far from giving the least countenance to Docetism, yet the ideas entertained by Origen in the preceding period (see § 66. note 6.) viz. that Christ rose from the tomb with a glorified body, found many more friends in the present period. Not only Hilary, whose views, generally speaking, come nearest to those of the Docetæ, but also Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the eastern theologians, with the exception of Ephraim the Syrian, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyrill of Jerusalem, more or less adopted the notion of Origen. Thus Chrysostom says in reference to John xxi. 10: Ἰδοὺ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς καιρὸς ὁ δραμάτων ἠμαρτήσεως ὀλίγη, ἐλλήνων γὰρ ἔερεν : in support of his opinion he appealed especially to the appearance of Christ when the doors were shut, etc. On the other hand, the last mentioned Fathers of the eastern church, as well as the western theologians, Jerome in particular, asserted that Christ possessed the very same body both prior and anterior to his resurrection.
Cyrill firmly maintains that Christ was in simplici sensu. Augustine and Leo the Great, on the contrary, endeavoured to reconcile the notion of the identity of Christ's body with the idea of its glorification. Thus Leo says in Sermo 69. de resurrect. dom. No. 4. (T. i. p. 73): resurrectio Dominii non finis carnis, sed commutatio fuit, nec virtutis augmento consumta substantia est. Qualitas transiit, non natura defectit et factum est corpus impassibile, immortale, incorruptibile.... nihil remansit in carne Christi infirmum, ut et ipsa sit per essentiam et non sit ipsa per gloriam. Gregory the Great and others used similar language. Most of the theologians of this period also adhered to the opinion, that Christ had quickened himself by his own power, in opposition to the notion entertained by the Arians, viz. that the Father had raised him from the dead. For the doctrine of the two natures in Christ led them to imagine, that the union subsisting between the Divine and the human was so intimate and permanent, that both his body and soul, after their natural separation by death, continued to be connected with his Divine nature, the one in the grave, the other in Hades. Nor did Christ stand in need of the angel to roll away the stone; this took place only in consequence of his resurrection. His ascension was likewise brought about by an independent act of his Divine nature, but not by a miracle wrought by the Father upon him, (generally speaking theologians were accustomed at this time to consider the miracles of Christ as effects produced by his Divine nature.) The cloud which formerly enveloped all the events of Christ's life, was now changed into a triumphal car (χρυσός) which angels accompanied. Comp. Athan. de assumpt. dom., and for further particulars see Müller, l. c. p. 40 ss. p. 83 ss.

§ 104.

THE DOCTRINE OF TWO WILLS IN CHRIST.—MONOTHELITES.


The attempt made by the Emperor Heraclius in the seventh century, to re-unite the Monophysites with the catholic church, led to the controversy respecting the two wills in Christ which was allied to that concerning his natures. In accordance with Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, the emperor hoping to reconcile the two parties, adopted the doctrine of only one Divine-human energy (ingêva), and of one volition in Christ. But
Sophronius, an acute monk of Palestine, and afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem (A.D. 635), endeavoured to show that this doctrine was inadmissible, since the doctrine of two natures set forth by the synod of Chalcedon necessarily implied that of two wills. After several fruitless attempts had been made to establish the Monothelite doctrine, the sixth oecumenical council of Constantinople (A.D. 680), with the co-operation of the bishop of Rome, adopted the doctrine of two wills, and two energies as the orthodox doctrine, but decided that the human will should always be regarded as subordinate to the Divine.

In this way the controversy was removed from the province of pure metaphysics to that of Christian ethics, and touched upon questions which more properly belong to anthropology. But this did not affect the thing itself.

When the Emperor Heraclius, in the course of his campaign against Persia, passed through Armenia and Syria, he came to an understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and Jacobites, and induced Sergius, the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, to give his assent to the doctrine of \( \text{ιν Σιλημα και μία ισίγγεια}, \) or of an ισίγγεια Σιλημεία. Cyrus (a Monophysite) whom the Emperor had appointed patriarch of Alexandria, effected at a synod held in that town A.D. 633 a union between the different parties. The acts of this synod are given by Mansi Conc. xi. p. 564 ss., as well as the letters of Cyrus, ibid. p. 561.

Sophronii Synodica which is given in Mansi xi. 461. Those Monophysites who maintained the doctrine of two natures, and of only one will, were quite as inconsistent as most of the orthodox theologians in the Arian controversy, who held that the Son was of the same essence with the Father, but asserted the subordination of the Spirit.

The Emperors of Greece endeavoured at first to settle the matter amicably, by the ἰςσεις of Heraclius (A.D. 638), and the τίτις of Constans II. (A.D. 648.) see Mansi x. p. 992. p. 1029 ss. Constans prohibited all farther disputes on the point in question. Afterwards Pope Martin I. and Maximus were treated with
the greatest cruelty; for further particulars see Neander, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 377 ss.

(5) Pope Honorius was in favour of the union, but his successors Severinus, and John IV. opposed it. The latter condemned the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Pope Theodore excommunicated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, till the doctrine of two wills and two energies was at last adopted at the first synod of the Lateran held under Pope Martin I. in the year 649. see Mansi x. p. 863 ss.: Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, qua ab haereticis impie confetetur, et duas voluntates, pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quae in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvatur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso praedicatur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit. (comp. Gieseler l. c. § 128. note 15.)

(a) This synod was summoned by Constantinus Pogonatus. The decision of the synod was based upon the epistle of Pope Agatho, which was itself founded upon the canons of the above synod of the Latin church (Agathonis ep. ad Imperatores in Mansi xi. 233—286); Agatho expressed in it his belief in duas naturales voluntates et duas naturales operationes, non contrarias, nec adversas, nec separatas etc. This was followed by the decision of the council itself, see Mansi xi. 631 ss. Münscher edit. by von Colln ii. p. 80.: Αὐτὸς δὲ ἡσυχὰς ἡσύχασιν εὐλημάτα ὑπὲρ καὶ δῶς ἡσυχὰς ἀγρυπνίας ἀδιαμερίστους, ἀνεφίτως, ἀμερίστους, ἀ συγχέως, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἄγων πατείων διδασκαλίαν κηρύσσομεν καὶ δῶς ἡσυχὰς ἡσύχασιν ὑπὲρ εὐπαθεία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς καὶ ἀνεφίτως ἤρθας αἰτητικοὶ ἄλλη ἑπόμενον τὸ ἀνεφίτως αὐτοῦ ἡσύχασι, καὶ μὴ ἀντιπάθει τῇ ἀντιπάθει, καὶ ἀντιπάθει, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανθεικὴ ἡσύ-

Respecting the insufficiency of these, and the indefiniteness of the other canons of the council see Dorner, p. 99 ss. The reformers did not recognize the decisions of this council. The Monothelites (Pope Honorius included) were condemned. They continued to exist as a distinct sect in the mountains of Lebanon and Antilebanon under the name of Maronites (which was derived from their leader, the Syrian abbot Marun, who lived about the year 701.) Comp. Neander l. c. p. 398.
§ 105.

PRACTICO-RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE OF CHRISTOLOGY DURING THIS PERIOD.

The sight of these manifold controversies, in which the person of the Redeemer is made the object of passionate conflicts, is certainly far from being pleasant. Still it is cheering to see, how the faith of Christians in those times was both supported by that idea of the Godman, which was above all such strife, and how it gave to the doctrine of the one and undivided person of Christ its due import.

"All the Fathers agreed, as it were with one accord, that not only that limited importance is attached to the person of Christ, which belongs to every individual in history, but that he stands in an essential relation to the whole human race; on this account alone they could make a single individual the subject of an article of faith, and ascribe to him a lasting and eternal importance relative to our race." Dorner, l. c. p. 78.

SECOND DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 106.

ON MAN IN GENERAL.

The more distinctly the pre-existence of the Son was asserted in connection with the idea of a Divine hypostasis, the more necessary it became to guard against every thing which would seem to favour the notion, that the case of man was somewhat analogous to that of Christ. Hence Origen's doctrine of the pre-existence
of the human soul, which none but Nemesius and Prudentius ventured any longer to defend, was rejected as erroneous. Some writers still adhered to the theory of Tertullian respecting the propagation of the soul per traducem (Traducianism, comp. § 55.), which was in one respect favourable to the doctrine of original sin. But during the present period another scheme came to be more generally adopted, which is known under the name of Creatianism. Its advocates thought that every human soul was created as such, and at a certain moment of time united with the body developing itself in the womb. Others again preferred avoiding all definitions of this kind. In the West the threefold division of man (§ 54.) gave way to the simple division into body and soul, on the mutual relation of which different views obtained among the Fathers of the present period. Nor did they agree in their opinions respecting the image of God, though most of them admitted that it consisted in the intellectual faculties of man, in his capacity of knowing God, and in the authority which he exercises over the irrational creation. There were still some who imagined that the image was also reflected in the body of man; but while the Audiani perverted this notion in support of gross anthropomorphism, others gave it a spiritual interpretation. The immortality of the soul was generally believed; Lactantius however did not regard it as as the natural property of the soul, but as the reward of virtue.

(1) The former did so as philosopher (de humana natura 2. p. 76 ss. of the Oxford edit.), the latter as poet (Cathemerin. hymn. x. v. 161—168.)

(2) Conc. Const. A. D. 540. see Mansi ix. p. 396 ss.: Ἡ ἱκαλησία τοῖς θείοις ἑπομένη λύγως φάσκει τὴν ψυχὴν σωματικοῦ καὶ οὐ καὶ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὑστερόν, κατὰ τὴν Ἱεργίνως φρενοθέμβειαν.

(3) Lactantius maintains Inst. iii. 18., that the soul is born with the body, and distinctly opposes Traducianism, de opif. Dei ad
Demetr. c. 19.: Illud quoque venire in quaestionem potest, utrum anima ex patre, an potius ex matre, an vero ex utroque generetur. Nihil enim ex his tribus verum est, quia neque ex utroque, neque ex alterutro seruntur animae. Corpus enim ex corporibus nasci potest, quoniam confertur aliquid ex utroque; de animis anima non potest, quia ex re tenui et incomprehensibili nihil potest decedere. Itaque serendarum animarum ratio uni ac soli Deo subjacet.

“Denique celesti sumus omnes semine oriundi,
Omnibus ille idem pater est”

ut ait Lucretius: nam de mortalibus non potest quidquam nisi mortale generari, nec putari pater debet, qui transfudisse aut inspirasse animam de sua nullo modo sentit; nec, si sentiat, quando tamen et quomodo id fiat, habet animo comprehensum. Ex quo appareat, non a parentibus dari animas, sed ab uno eodemque omnium Deo patre, qui legem rationemque nascendit tenet solus, siquidem solus efficit; nam terreni parentis nihil est, nisi quidquid amplius potest, ideo nasci sibi filios optant, quia non ipsi faciunt. Cetera jam Dei sunt omnia: scilicet conceptus ipse et corporis informatio et inspiratio animae et partus incolunt et quaeunque deinceps ad hominem conservandum valent: illius munus est, quod spiramus, quod vivimus, quod vigemus—In opposition to Traducianism he appeals to the fact, that intelligent parents have sometimes stupid children, and vice versa, which could not well be ascribed to the influence of the stars!—In accordance with this opinion Hilary asserts Tract. in Ps. xci. § 3.: Quotidie animarum origenes occultae et incognita nobis divinae virtutis molitione procedunt. Pelagius and the Semipelagians Cassian and Gennadius adopted substantially the same view, see Wiggers, Augustin und Pelagius, i. p. 149. ii. p. 354. Pelagius taught (in Symb. quoted by Mansi iv. p. 355.): animas a Deo dari credimus, quas ab ipso factas dicimus, anathematizentes eos, qui animas quasi partem divinae dicunt esse substantias; Augustine agreed with him as far as the negative aspect of this proposition was concerned, Retract. i. 1.: (Deus) animum non de se ipso genuit, sed de re nulla alia condidit, sicut condidit corpus e terra; this refers however in the first place to the creation of our first parents. But he did not expressly state, whether he thought that the soul was newly
created in every instance; on the contrary, he declined to investigate this point: Nam quod attinet ad ejus (animi) originem, quod ut sit in corpore, utrum de illune sit, qui primo creatus est, quando factus est homo in animam vivam, an semper ita fiant singulis singuli, nec tunc sciebam (in his treatise contra Academicos) nec adhuc scio. Comp. Ep. 140. (al. 120.) ad Honorat. (T. ii. p. 320.)—The phrase mentioned before (No. 2.) γνώριμον φυσικήν οίκον γίνεται τῷ σώματι, which was used by the Greek church, and is also found in the works of Theodoret (fab. hær. v. 9. p. 414.) implies the doctrine commonly called Creatianism. Yet Traducianism continued to be professed not only by heterodox writers, e. g. Eunomius and Apollinaris, but also some orthodox theologians, such as Gregory of Nyssa, de bom. opif. c. 29. He directs our attention to the fact, that body and soul belong essentially together, and cannot be possibly imagined to be separated from each other: ἀνάλληλος ὁ οίκος τοῦ ἁνδρικοῦ, τοῦ διὰ ψυχής τι και σώματι, συνενθολεῖ, μέναν αὐτὸν καὶ κοινά τῆς συστάσεως τῆς ἄρεξτης ύποσυνέδεσθα, ὡς ἐν μὴ αὐτὸς ἀιντού προγενεστέρος κε και νεκτερος γόνοι, τοῦ μὲν σωματικῶν προγενεστέρος κεν αὐτῷ, τοῦ δὲ ἵπτερο γριαντεῖτον, etc. which he proves by analogies drawn from nature. The views of Anastasius Sinaiota on this point are very carnal (Hom. in Bandini monum. eccl. gr. T. ii. p. 54. in Münscher von Collin, i. p. 332.) τοῦ μεν σώματος τῆς γυναικείασ γῆς και αἰματος συνίστατον ἢ δὲ ψυχή διὰ τῆς συστάσεως, ὡς δὲ τινὸς ἰμαυσίματος ἐκ τοῦ ἁμαρτώλου ἀξίους μεταδίδοται. According to Jerome, Ep. 78. ad Marcellin. (Opp. T. iv. p. 642. ap. Erasm. ii. p. 318) even maxima pars occidentalis entertained the opinion, ut quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex anima et similis cum brutis animantibus conditione subsistat. But Jerome himself rejects all other systems, and designates Creatianism as the orthodox doctrine. Epist. ad Pammach. (Opp. T. iv. p. 318. ap. Erasm. ii. p. 170) quotidiem Deus fabricatur animas, cujus velle fecisse est et conditor esse non cessa. Noli despicere bonitatem figuli tui, qui te plasmavit et fecit ut voluit. Ipsum est Dei virtus et Dei sapientia, qui in utero virginiis ædificavit sibi domum. The advocates of Creatianism saw

in the birth of every human being something analogous to the
miracle of Christ’s incarnation, without identifying the one with
the other (which Jerome would have been the last to do); those
who adopted Traducianism were compelled to consider Christ’s
birth as an exception to the rule; but even this exception re-
quired some restriction on account of the equality subsisting
between his human nature and ours. Many theologians there-
fore preferred obviating these difficulties by following August-
tine’s example, who pointed out the impossibility of compre-
hending the origin of existence. Thus Gregory the Great, Epp.
vii. 59. ad Secundinum (Opp. ii. p. 970) says: Sed de hac re dul-
cissima mihi tua caritas sciat, quia de origine animae inter sanc-
tos Patres requisitio non parva versata est; sed utrum ipsa ab
Adam descenderit, an certe singulis detur, incertum remansit,
eamque in hac vita insolubilem fassi sunt esse questionem.
Gravis enim est quæstio, nec valet ab homine comprehendi, quia
si de Adam substantia cum carne nascitur, cur non etiam cum
carne moritur? Si vero cum carne non nascitur, cur in ea
carne, quæ de Adam prolata est, obligata peccatis tenetur? (he
thus deduces Traducianism from the doctrine of original sin,
the correctness of which he assumes, while the latter, on the
contrary, was generally inferred from the former.)

Hilary of Poitiers asserts in Matth. can. v. § 8. that the
soul, whether in the body or out of the body, must always pre-
serve its corporeal substance, because everything that is created,
must exist in some form or other (in aliquo sit necesse est.)
This sentiment reminds us of the notions of Tertullian. But
elsewhere he looks upon the soul as a spiritual, incorporeal
being. Comp. in Ps. lii. § 7. in cxxix. § 6. (nihil in se habens
corporale, nihil terrenum, nihil grave, nihil caducum.) August-
tine frankly acknowledges the difficulty of defining the relation
in which the soul stands to the body, de morib. eccles. cath. c.
4: Difficile est istam controversiam dijudicare, aut si ratione
facile, oratione longum est. Quem laborem ac moram susci-
pere ac subire non opus est. Sive enim utrumque sive anima
sola nomen hominis teneat, non est hominis optimum quod op-
timum est corporis, sed quod aut corpori simul et animae aut
solii animae optimum est, id est optimum hominis.—On the psy-
chological views of Augustine comp. Schleiermacher, Geschichte
der Philosophie, p. 169 ss., on those of Claudius Mammertus
and Boëthius, ibid. p. 174.
ON THE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN GENERAL.

Concerning the origin of sin, the generally received opinion was, that it is to be ascribed to the will of man, and stands in the most intimate connection with his moral freedom. Augustine himself defended this doctrine (at least in his earlier writings), which was opposed to the Manichæan notion, that evil is inherent in matter. Lactantius, on the contrary, manifested a strong
leaning towards Manichæism by designating the body as the seat and organ of sin. The ascetic practices then so common among Christians, sufficiently indicate, that the church tacitly approved of this view. Athanasius regarded sin as something negative, and believed it to consist in the blindness and indolence of man, which prevent him from elevating himself to God. Similar (negative) definitions were given by Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nyssa. But sin was most frequently looked upon as opposition to the law of God, and rebellion against his holy will, analogous to the sin of Adam, which was now generally admitted to be a historical fact (contrary to the allegorical interpretation of Origen.)

1 Aug. de duab. animab. contra Manich. § 12.: Colligo nusquam nisi in voluntate esse peccatum— de lib. arb. iii. 49.: Ipsa voluntas est prima causa peccandi.—In many other passages he regards sin from the negative point of view as a conversion a majori bono ad minus bonum, defectio ad eo, quod summe est, ad id, quod minus est, perversitas voluntatis a summa substantia detortae in infirmi. See the passages in Julius Müller, die Lehre von der Sünde i. p. 340 ss.


3 Athan. contra gent. 4. (Opp. i. p. 4.): ὅτα δὲ ἵστη τὰ καλὰ, οὐκ ὅτα δὲ τὰ φαῦλα ὅτα δὲ φημι τὰ καλὰ, καθότι ἐν τοῖς ἤτοι Ἰουνίος τὰ παραδιέγγειται ἵνα ὅτα δὲ τὰ κακὰ λίγω, καθότι ἵστην ἐκκόμιος ἡμῶν ὅτα ἀναπτύλασται ibid. c. 7. p. 7.: δὲ τὸ κακὸν οὐ παρὰ Ἰουνίῳ οὔδε ἐν Ἰουνίῳ οὔτε ἄχθης γίγνοι, οὔτε οὐδεὶς τίς ἵστην αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ ἀνέβουσα κατὰ στρέφον τῆς τοῦ κακοῦ φαντασίας ἰαυτοῖς ἰαυτοῖς ἠράζει καὶ ἀναστάσσει τὰ οὐκ ὅτα καὶ ἴστη βούλλονται. Comp. that which follows. Athanasius traces the evil propensity of man to indolence, c. 3. p. 3: οἱ δὲ ἀνέβουσα καταλογιζόντας τῶν κρυμμάτων, καὶ ἄχθήσαντες περὶ τῆς τοῦτον καταλήψιν, τὰ ἵγγατιον μᾶλλον ἰαυτῶν ἠράζειν. Indolence is connected with sensuality, because it does not go beyond the bodily and the visible. Comp. the subsequent part of the chapter. In the same manner Basil M. hexaëmeron hom. ii. p. 19. (Paris edit. 1638.) says: οὐ μὴν οὖν παρὰ Ἰουνίῳ τὸ κακὸν τὴν
Even those theologians who kept themselves free from the influence of the Augustinian system, supposed that the sin of Adam was followed by disastrous effects upon the human race, but restricted them (as the Fathers of the preceding period had done) to the mortality of the body, the hardships and miseries of life, and sometimes admitted that the moral faculties of man had been affected by the fall. Thus Gregory of Nazianzum in particular (to whom Augustine appealed in preference of all others) thought that both the ρῶ; and the ψυχή had been considerably impaired by the fall, and regarded the perversion of man's sentiments and its consequence, idolatry, which the writers previous to his time had ascribed to the influence of demons, as the effect of the first sin. But he was far from supposing the total depravity of
mankind, and the entire loss of the free will. On the contrary, the doctrine of the freedom of the will continued to be distinctly maintained by the Greek church. Athanasius himself, commonly called the father of orthodoxy, asserted in the strongest terms that man has the ability of choosing between good and evil, and was so far from believing in the general corruption of mankind, as to look upon several individuals, who lived prior to the appearance of Christ, as righteous. Cyrill of Jerusalem also assumed that men are born in a state of innocence, and that a free agent alone can commit sin. Similar views were entertained by Ephraim the Syrian, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil the Great, and others. Chrysostom, whose whole tendency was of a practico-moral kind, brought the liberty of man and his moral self-determination most distinctly forward, and passed a severe censure upon those who endeavoured to excuse their own immoralities by ascribing the origin of sin to the fall of Adam.

(1) Orat. xxxviii. 12. p. 670. xliv. 4. p. 837. xiv. 25. p. 275. xix. 13. p. 372. Carmen. iv. v. 98. and other passages quoted by Ullmann, p. 421 ss. Comp. especially the interesting parallel which is there drawn between Gregory and Augustine, as well as between the expressions of the former in the original, and the (corrupt) translation of the latter. "Gregory by no means taught the doctrines afterwards propounded by Pelagius and his followers; but if all his sentiments be duly considered, it will be found that he is far more of a Pelagian than of an Augustinian." Ullmann, l. c. p. 446.

(2) According to Methodius (in Phot. Bibl. Cod. 234. p. 295), man does not e. g. possess the power either of having desires, or of not having them (ιδομιλίας ἢ μὴ ἱδομιλίας), but he is at liberty either to gratify (χειλέως) them, or not. Comp. Nemes. de nat. hom. c. 41: πᾶσα γενεσιν ἀνάγκη τὸν ἱσχύον τὸ βουλέωςαί καὶ κύριον ἰναι πράξεως. εἰ γὰρ μὴ κύριος εἶν πράξεων, περιτής ἢν τὸ βουλέωςαί.

(3) Athan. contra gent. c. 2. p. 2: ἢ ἐρχεῖς μὲν ὁμοί ἢν κακία, οὐδὲ
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γὰς οὖν ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἵστιν, οὐδ' ἠλώς κατ' αὐτοὺς ὡσάχει αὐτῇ. cf. contra Arian. or. 3. (4.) Opp. T. i. p. 582. 83: σωλακ γὰς οὖν ἁγίοι γεγόνασι καθαροὶ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. (He alludes to Jeremiah and John the baptist; but they cannot properly be called σωλακ.) Nevertheless death has reigned even over them, who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression (Rom. v. 14.)


Basil the Great delivered a discourse εἰς τούτων αὐτεξοθείς, the authenticity of which was rejected by Garnier (T. ii. p. xxvi.), but in modern times again defended by Pelt and Rheinwald (Homiliarium patrist. i. 2. p. 192.) Though he admitted the depravity of mankind, he asserted that human liberty and Divine grace must co-operate. Comp. also the Hom. de Spir. S. and Klose, l. c. p. 59. ss. Gregory of Nyssa also supposed a universal tendency to sin (de orat. dom. Or. v. Opp. i. p. 751 ss.), but he did not believe in the sinful state of infants; Orat. de infantibus qui præmature abripientur (Opp. iii. p. 317 ss.)

(5.) See the passages collected from his homilies (especially on the epistle to the Romans) by Münscber von Colln, i. p. 363, which might easily be multiplied. "Chrysostom was so zealous for the promotion of true morality, that he must have considered it a point of special importance to deprive men of every ground of excuse for the neglect of moral efforts. His practical sphere of labour in the cities of Antioch and Constantinople, gave a still greater impulse to this tendency. For in these large capitals he met with many who sought to attribute their want of Christian activity to the defects of human nature, and the power of Satan or of fate." Neander, Kirchengeschichte iii. 2. p. 1369. 70. Comp. Chrysostomus, i. p. 51. p. 283 ss. But Chrysostom urged quite as strongly the existence of depravity in opposition to a false moral pride. Hom. vi. Montf. T. 12. in Neander, Chrysostomus, ii. p. 36. 37. Comp. Wiggers, i. p. 442.
§ 109.

THE OPINIONS OF THE WESTERN THEOLOGIANS PREVIOUS TO THE TIME OF AUGUSTINE, AND OF AUGUSTINE HIMSELF PREVIOUS TO THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

During this period, as well as during the preceding, the theologians of the Western church were more favourable than those of the Eastern, to the Augustine doctrine. *Hilary* and *Ambrose* taught the propagation of sin by birth; Ambrose appealed especially to Ps. li. 5. in support of the doctrine of original sin, but without determining to what extent every individual shares in the common guilt.\(^1\) Nevertheless neither of them excluded the liberty of man from the work of moral reformation.\(^2\) Thus Augustine himself at an earlier period of his life defended human freedom in opposition to the Manichæans.\(^3\)
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Class. ii. Opp. iii. p. 1190. and some other passages (in Mün-
scher von Cölln, p. 355.)

(2) Hilar. Tract. in Psalm. cxviii. lit. 15. p. 329: Est quidem
in fide manendi a Deo munus, sed incipiendi a nobis origo est.
Et voluntas nostra hoc proprium ex se habere debet, ut velit.
Deus incipienti incrementum dabit, quia consummationem per
se infirmitas nostra non obtinet, meritum tamen adipiscendae
consummationis est ex initio voluntatis.

(3) De gen. contra Manich. ii. 43. (c. 29): nos dicimus nulli
naturæ nocere peccata nisi sua; nos dicimus, nullum malum esse
naturale, sed omnes naturas bonas esse.—De lib. arb. iii. 50. (c.
17) : Aut enim et ipsa voluntas est et a radice ista voluntatis non
receditur, aut non est voluntas, et peccatum nullum habet.
Aut igitur ipsa voluntas est prima causa peccandi, aut nullum
peccatum est prima causa peccandi. Non est cui recte impute-
tur peccatum, nisi peccanti. Non est ergo cui recte imputetur
nisi volenti.... Quæcumque ista causa est voluntatis, si non ei
potest resisti, sine peccato ei ceditur, si autem potest, non ei
cedatur et non peccabitur. An forte fallit incautum? Ergo
caveat ne fallatur. An tanta fallacia est ut caveri omnino non
possit? si ita est, nulla peccata sunt: quis enim peccat in eo
quod nullo modo caveri potest? Peccatur autem; caveri igi-
tur potest. Comp. de duab. animab. contra Manich. 12. and
with it the retractationes of the different passages; also de nat.
et grat. 80. (c. 67.)

§ 110.

THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

* Wiggers, G. F., Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustin-
ismus und Pelagianismus, Berlin 1821. Hamburg 1833. ii. 8. ↑ Lentzen,
J. A., de Pelagianorum doctrinæ principiis, Colon. ad Rhen. 1833. 8.

Towards the commencement of the fifth century Cele-
estius and Pelagius (Brito, Morgan ?) made their ap-
ppearance in the West.(1) The views by which they were
induced to deny the natural depravity of man, were
partly in accordance with the opinions hitherto enter-
tained by the theologians of the Greek church, but part-
ly carried to a much greater length. Some of the propositions on the ground of which the presbyter Paulinus accused Celestius at the synod of Carthage (A. d. 412), had been previously defended by orthodox theologians; others were directly opposed both to the doctrine of Scripture (and especially that of Paul), and the general belief of the church, and thus threatened the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. It is however difficult to decide how far the views of Pelagius accorded with these assertions, since he expressed himself very cautiously. But it is certain that what is commonly called Pelagianism does not so much represent single notions of a single individual, as a complete moral and religious system, which formed a decided contrast to Augustinism. The former was in so far overcome by the latter, as in consequence of the turn which the controversy took, and of the great authority of Augustine in the West, his doctrine gained the victory over that of Pelagius. The followers of Pelagius formed not a sect properly so called. But Pelagianism, though condemned, lost none of its advocates, especially as but few could fully enter into all the consequences of the Augustinian system, and find in them real inward satisfaction. It will be necessary, in order to examine more fully the subject before us, to divide the subject matter of controversy into three leading sections, viz. 1. sin; 2. grace and liberty; and, 3. predestination.

(1) On the personal character and history of Celestius and Pelagius see Wiggers, p. 33 ss.

(2) The 6 or 7 capitula (the numbers vary according as the several propositions are separated, or joined together) are preserved by Augustine de gestis Pelagii, cap. 11. (comp. de peccato originali, 2. 3. 4. 11. c. 2—10.), as well as in the two commonitorii of Marius Mercator, [comp. Gieseler § 87. note 4.] They are the following (comp. Wiggers i. p. 60.):
1. Adam was created mortal, so that he would have died whether he had sinned or not;
2. Adam's sin has only affected himself, and not the human race;
3. New-born infants are in the same condition in which Adam was previous to the fall (ante prævaricationem);
4. The whole human race dies neither in consequence of Adam's death, nor of his transgression; nor does it rise from the dead in consequence of Christ's resurrection;
5. Infants obtain eternal life, though they should not be baptized;
6. The law is as good a means of salvation (lex sic mittit ad regnum cœlorum), as the gospel;
7. There were some men, even before the appearance of Christ, who did not commit sin.

If we compare these propositions with the doctrines of the earlier theologians, we find, that the third was held by some of the Greek Fathers (e.g. Theophilus of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria, see above, § 62. 1.); that the fifth was substantially the same with that defended by Gregory of Nazianzum and others, viz. that unbaptized children are not condemned on account of their not being baptized (comp. § 72.); and that even the seventh, however heterodox it may appear, does not stand quite alone, inasmuch as the father of orthodoxy himself made a similar assertion (§ 108. 3.) On the other hand, the first two and the fourth propositions, in which all connection between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity, and its effects even in relation to the mortality of the soul, are denied, would have been condemned by the earlier theologians. But none appears so heretical, so much opposed to the doctrine of Paul and the Gospel as the sixth. And lastly, the denial of the connection subsisting between the resurrection of Christ and ours (in the fourth proposition), must have offended those who believed in the union of Christians with Christ; it may however be asked, whether some of these extreme views are more than the consequences which Celestius was compelled to infer from his premises by the opposition he met with? See Neander, Kirchengeschichte ii. 3. p. 1219.

(4) Augustine perceives no other difference between Pelagius and Celestius (de pecc. orig. c. 12.) than that the latter was
more open, the former more guarded, the latter more obstinate, the former more deceitful, or, to say the least, that the latter was more straight-forward (liberius), the former more cunning (astutius.) Prosper of Aquitania calls him therefore coluber Britannus (in his poem de ingratis, append. 67.—comp. Wiggers, p. 40.)—Neander, (Chrysostomus, vol. ii. p. 134.) judges more mildly of him: "Pelagius is deserving of our esteem on account of his honest zeal for the promotion of morality; his object was to combat the same perverse antichristian tendency which Augustine opposed. But he was wrong in the manner in which he sought to attain his object," etc. Comp. Kirchengeschichte ii. 3. p. 1195 ss. "For aught we know from his writings, he was a clear-headed, intelligent man, who possessed far more of a serious and moral turn of mind, than of that disposition which finds itself compelled to dive into the depths of the mind and of the spirit, and to bring to light hidden things," p. 1199.

(4) The Principal Points in the External History of the Controversy are: The condemnation of his doctrine at Carthage A.D. 412. Pelagius repairs to Palestine, where Jerome becomes one of his most zealous opponents, and, conjointly with Paulus Orosius, a disciple of Augustine, accuses him at a synod held at Jerusalem (A.D. 415.) under John, bishop of Jerusalem. John however did not pronounce his condemnation, but reported the whole matter to Innocent, bishop of Rome.—Synod at Diospolis (Lydda), under Eulogius of Cæsarea. The plaintiffs were Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix. Acquittal of Pelagius. Dissatisfaction of Jerome with the decisions of this synod (Synodus miserabilis!)—Under Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, Pelagius and Celestius entertain new hopes.—Synod of the North-African bishops at Carthage A.D. 418. and condemnation of Pelagius.—The Emperor Honorius decides the controversy.—Zosimus is induced to change his views, and publishes his Epistola tractoria, in which the Pelagian doctrine is condemned. Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia, undertakes to defend Pelagianism (respecting him see Wiggers, i. p. 43 ss.)—He was anathematized at the synod of Ephesus (A.D. 431.), in connection with Nestor (was it merely accidental that they were condemned in common?) Still the system of Augustine was not recognized in the East.
§ 111.

FIRST POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Sin.—Original Sin and its Consequences.


Pelagius, from a speculative, and especially ethical point of view, regarded every human being as a moral agent who is complete in himself, and separate from all others. Hence sin would necessarily appear to him as the free act of the individual, and in his opinion there could be no other connection between the sin of the one (Adam), and the sin of the many (his posterity), than that which exists between the example on the one hand, and voluntary imitation on the other. Every infant is accordingly in the same condition in which Adam was prior to the fall. Neither sin nor virtue is inherent, but the one, as well as the other, develops itself, when man comes to make use of his liberty, for which he himself is alone responsible.\(^{(1)}\) Augustine, on the contrary, resting his system on more profound conceptions, which however might easily prevent a clear insight into the moral relations of man, considered the human race as a concrete totality. With a predominant bias towards religion, he directed his attention more to the inner and permanent state of the soul, and its absolute relation to God, than to the passing and external action of the individual. This tendency, as well as the experience of his own heart and life, led him to suppose a mysterious connection subsisting between the transgression of Adam, and the sin of all men—a connection which loses itself in the dim beginnings of nature no less than of history. Mere suppositions however did not satisfy his mind; but carrying
out his system in all its logical consequences, and applying a false interpretation to certain passages, he laid down the following rigid proposition as his doctrine: "As all men have sinned in Adam, they are justly exposed to the vengeance of God because of this hereditary sin and guilt of sin."(2)

\[Pelag. \text{ lib. I. de lib. arb. in Aug. de pecc. orig. c. 13.:}\] Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles, vel vituperabiles sumes, non nobiscum oritur, sed agitur a nobis: capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni nascimur, et ut sine virtute ita et sine vitio procreamur, atque ante actionem proprie voluntatis id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit; he even admits the preponderance of good in man, when he (according to August. de nat. et gr. c. 21.) speaks of a naturalis quaedam sanctitas, which dwells in man, and keeps watch in the castle of the soul over good and evil, and by which he means conscience. Comp. Julian (quoted by August. in Op. imp. i. 105.): Illud quod esse peccatum ratio demonstrat, inveniri nequit in seminibus. 122.: Nemo naturaliter malus est: sed quicunque reus est, moribus, non exordiis accusatur. Other passages will be found in Munscher ed. by von Colin, i. p. 375 ss. Comp. Wiggers, p. 91 ss. Augustine himself protested against the expression peccatum naturæ, or peccatum naturale, which the Pelagians imputed to him, and always returned to the use of the phrase peccatum originale. The Pelagians considered bodily death not as the effect of the first sin, but as a physical necessity, though Pelagius himself conceded at the synod of Diospolis, that the death of Adam was a punishment inflicted upon him, but only upon him. Aug. de nat. et gr. 21. (c. 19.) Op. imp. i. 67. vi. 27. 30.

\[A list of the works written against the Pelagians will be found in Münscher ed. by von Cölln, p. 373. The passages bearing on this question, which can be understood however, only in their own connection, are also given there, p. 377 ss. Wiggers, p. 99 ss. On Augustine's interpretation of Rom. v. 12. (in quo omnes peccaverunt, Vulg.) see Op. imp. ii. 47 ss. 66. contra duas Epp. Pel. iv. 7. (c. 4.); Julian on the other hand, gives the following explanation: in quo omnes peccaverunt nihil aliud indicat, quam: quia omnes peccaverunt. Augustine's\]
exposition was confirmed by the synod of Carthage (A.D. 418.)
Comp. Münscher von Cölln, p. 381, 382. But it would be a
great mistake to ascribe the whole theory of Augustine to this
exegetical error; very different causes gave rise to that
theory, viz. 1. His own disposition, moulded by the re-
markable events in the history of his external and internal
life; 2. perhaps some remnants of his former Manichean no-
tions, of which he might be unconscious himself, e. g. that of
the defiling element of the concupiscientia, libido in the act of
generation; 3. his realistic mode of thinking, which led him to
confound the abstract with the concrete, and to consider the in-
dividual as a transitory and perishing part of the whole (massa
perditionis.) In connection with this mode of thinking another
cause might be, 4. his notions of the church as a living organ-
ism, and of the effects of infant baptism; 5. the opposition
which he was compelled to make to Pelagianism, which threat-
ened to destroy the true nature of Christianity. Thus, accord-
ing to Augustine, not only was physical death a punishment
inflicted upon Adam and all his posterity, but he looked upon
original sin itself as being in some sense a punishment of the
first transgression, though it was also a real sin (God punishes
sin by sin), and can therefore be imputed to every individual.
But it is on this very point, viz. the imputation of original sin,
that his views differed from all former opinions however strict
they were. He endeavoured to clear himself from the charge of
Manicheism (in opposition to Julian) by designating sin not a
substance, but a vitium, a languor; he even charged his opponent
with Manichaeism.—Respecting his views of the insignificant
remnant (lineamenta extrema) of the Divine image left in man,
and of the virtues of pagans, see Wiggers, p. 119. note.

§ 112.

SECOND POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Liberty and Grace.

Pelagius admitted, that man in his moral efforts stands
in need of the Divine aid, and therefore spoke of the
grace of God as assisting the imperfections of man by a
variety of means. (1.) He supposed however that this
grace of God is something external, and added to the efforts put forth by the free will of man; it must therefore be deserved by virtuous inclinations.\(^{(2)}\) Augustine on the other hand looked upon it as the creative principle of life, which produces out of itself the liberty of the will, which is entirely lost in the natural man. In the power of the natural man to choose between good and evil, to which great importance was attached by Pelagius, as well as by the earlier church, he saw only a liberty to do evil, since the regenerate man alone can will good.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Pelagius made a distinction between having the power (posse), having the will (velle), and being (esse), and referred the first to God, the second to man, and the third, which includes also actions (effectus), both to God and to man, de lib. arb. (Aug. de gratia Christi c. 4.) But man owes to God, that he can will, c. 18.: Habemus autem possibilitatem a Deo insitam, velut quandam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam atque fecundam etc. The freedom of the will is common to Jews, Gentiles, and Christians; grace, according to Pelagius himself, belongs exclusively to Christianity. Pelagius also rejected the proposition of Celestius, " gratiam Dei non ad singulos actus dari."

\(^{(2)}\) Pelagius considered as means of grace especially the doc
trine (as the manifestation of the Divine will), the promises, and trials (to which belong the wiles of Satan); but Julian strongly denied, that the will of man is thus built up by them (fabricetur, condatur); he sees in them nothing but an adjutorium of the undisturbed free will. Comp. Aug. de grat. Chr. c. 8. Op. imp. i. 94. 95.

\(^{(3)}\) Augustine on the contrary maintains, non lege atque doctrina insonante forinseculus, sed interna et occulta, mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum non solum veras revelationes, sed bonas etiam voluntates (de grat. Chr. 24.) He recognizes in the grace of God an inspiratio dilectionis, and considers it as the source of every thing. Nolentem prævenit, ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit. Enchir. c. 32.—He understands by freedom to be free from sin, that state of
mind in which it is no longer necessary to choose between good and evil. The same view is expressed in his treatise de civit. Dei xiv. 11. which was not a controversial writing: Arbitrium igitur voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitis peccatisque non servit. Tale datum est a Deo: quod amissum proprio vitio, nisi a quo pari potuit, reddi non potest. Unde Veritas dicit: Si vos Filius liberavit, tunc vere liberi eritis. Idque ipsum est autem, ac si diceret: si vos Filius salvos fecerit, tunc vere salvi eritis. Inde quippe liberator, unde salvator. comp. contra duas epp. Pel. i. 2. The freedom of the will is greater in proportion as the will itself is in a state of health; its state of health depends on its subjection to the Divine mercy and grace. Contra Jul. c. 8. he calls the human will servum proprie voluntatis arbitrium.—Such expressions were so much misused by the monks of Adrumetum (about the year 426.) that Augustine himself was compelled to oppose them (especially in his treatise de corrptione et gratia); on the whole he himself frequently appealed from a practical point of view to the will of man (see the next §.)

§ 113.

THIRD POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Predestination.

We have already seen that Augustine held the doctrine of hereditary depravity, the guilt of which man has himself incurred, and from which no human power, nor human volition can deliver, but those alone will be saved to whom the grace of God is imparted. From these premises it would necessarily follow, that God, in consequence of an eternal decree, and without any reference to the future conduct of man, has elected some out of the corrupt mass to become vessels of his mercy (vasa misericordiae,) and left the rest as vessels of his wrath (vasa irae,) to bear the just consequences of their sins. Augustine called the former predestinatio, the latter reprob-
THIRD POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

*tio, and thus evaded the necessity of directly asserting the doctrine of a predestination to evil (praedestinatio duplex.)^1 On the whole, he endeavoured to soften the harshness of his theory by practical cautions.^2 But the doctrine in question became to many a stone of stumbling, which orthodox theologians themselves (especially those of the Greek church) endeavoured by every possible means to remove.^3 This prepared the way for those vague and unfounded schemes to which Semipelagianism (see the following section) gave rise.

^1 De Praed. Sanctorum 37. (c. 18.): Elegit nos Deus in Christo ante mundi constitutionem, praedestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum: non quia per nos sancti et immaculati futuri eramus, sed elegit praedestinavitque ut essemus. Fecit autem hoc secundum placitum voluntatis suae, ut nemo de sua, sed de illius erga se voluntate glorietur etc. In support of his views he appealed to Eph. i. 4. 11. and Rom. ix., and spoke of a certus numerus electorum, neque augendus, neque minuendus, de corrept. et gr. 39. (c. 13.)—He refutes the objections of the understanding by quoting Rom. ix. 20, and adducing examples from sacred history. Even in *this* life worldly goods, health, beauty, physical and intellectual powers, are distributed unequally, and not always in accordance with our views of merit. ibid. 19. c. 8. Christ himself was predestinated to be the Son of God. de pred. 31. (c. 15.)

^2 De dono persev. 57. (c. 22.): Praedestinatio non ita populis prædicanda est, ut apud imperitam vel tardioris intelligentiae multitudinem redargui quodammodo ipsa sua prædicatione videatur; sicut redargui videtur et præscientia Dei (quam certe negare non possunt) si dicatur hominibus: “Sive curatis, sive dormiatis, quod vos præscivit qui falli non potest, hoc eritis.” Dolosì autem vel imperiti medici est, etiam utile medicamentum sic alligare, ut aut non prosit, aut obsit. Sed dicendum est: “Sic currite, ut comprehendatis, atque ut ipso cursu vestro ita vos esse præcognitos noveritis, ut legitime curreritis,” et si quo alio modo Dei præscientia prædicari potest, ut hominis segnità repellatur. 59 :...de ipso autem cursu vestro bono rectoque conciscite vos ad praedestinationem divinae gratiae pertinere.
Notwithstanding the condemnation of Pelagius at the synod of Ephesus, the system of Augustine did not exert any influence upon the theology of the eastern church. **Theodore of Mopsuestia** wrote (against the advocates of Augustinism): στις τῶν λόγων τῆς φύσει καὶ ἀντὶ μὴν ἀνθρώπων; 5 books Photii Bibl. Cod. 177. (some Latin fragments of which are preserved by Mar. Mercator ed. Baluz.) Fritzsche, p. 107 ss. (on the question whether it was directed against Jerome, or against Augustine? see Fritzsche l. c. p. 109. and Neander, Kirchengeschichte ii. p. 1360. 61.) **Theodoret, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium** and others continued to follow the earlier course of dogmatic theology. See the passages in Münscner von Cölln i. p. 408—10. and comp. § 108.

**§ 114.**

**SEMIPELAGIANISM AND THE LATER FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.**


In opposition both to the extreme Augustinians (Predestinarians,) and to Augustinism itself, a new system developed itself, upon which Monachism undoubtedly exerted a considerable influence, as its very principles are essentially Pelagian, but which owed its origin likewise to a more healthy practico-moral tendency. Its advocates endeavoured to pursue a middle course between the two extremes, viz. Pelagianism and Augustinism, and to satisfy the moral, as well as the religious wants of the age, by the partial adoption of the premises of both systems, without carrying them out in all their logical consequences. The leader of the Gallican theologians (Massilienses) who propounded this new system, afterwards called Semipelagianism, was **John Cassian, a disciple of Chrysostom,** whom **Prosper of Aquitania** and
others combated. He was followed by *Faustus, bishop of Rhegium*, who gained the victory over *Lucidus*, a Hyper-Augustinian presbyter, at the *Synod of Arles* (*A. D. 475*). For the space of some 30 or 40 years Semipelagianism continued to be the prevailing form of doctrine in Gaul until it met with new opposition on the part of *Avitus of Vienne*, *Caesar of Arelate*, *Fulgentius of Ruspe* and others. After a variety of proceedings Augustinism gained a firm footing even in Gaul, by means of the Synods of *Arausio* (Orange) and *Valencia* (*A. D. 529*), but with the important restriction that the doctrine of predestination to evil was not adopted. Boniface II., bishop of Rome, in consequence of the measures adopted by his predecessors, confirmed these decisions (*A. D. 530*) “*Gregory the Great transmitted to subsequent ages the milder aspect of the Augustinian doctrine, which has regard to practical Christianity, rather than to speculation.*”

(1) In speaking of Predestinarians, we might refer to the monks of Adrumetum in the province of Byzacene, in North Africa, and to Lucidus, mentioned below, who taught the doctrine of a prædestinatio duplex, but it is satisfactorily proved, that (historically) “*a sect, or even a separate party of Predestinarians who dissented from Augustine, never existed*” (as was formerly erroneously supposed.) Comp. Wiggers, ii. p. 329 ss. 347. This error was spread by *J. Sirmond*, historia predestinatiana, Opp. T. iv. p. 267 ss. and by the work edited by him under the title *Predestinatus*, in which the prædest. hæresis is mentioned as the ninetyeth in the order of heresies (reprinted in Gallandii Bibl. x.) Comp. also *Walch*, Historie der Ketzerei v. p. 218 ss. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte ii. 3. p. 1339 ss.

(2) According to the reports made by *Prosper* and *Hilary*, scil. Prosperi (428. 29.) to Augustine (in Wiggers p. 153. Mün scher ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 411.) the treatise of Augustine entitled de correptione et gratia, had excited some commotion among the Gallican theologians and monks, in consequence of
which he wrote the further treatises de præd. sanctorum, and de dono perseverantiae. Though these Gallican theologians differed in some particulars from Cassian (see Wiggers p. 181.), yet there was a considerable agreement between their doctrine and his. Comp. also Neander, p. 1513 ss.

(a) Comp. above § 82. note 21. Of his collationes the thirteenth is the most important. Prosper complains of his syncretism contra collatorem, c. 5: Illi (Pelagiani) in omnibus justis hominum operibus liberæ voluntatis tuerunt exordia, nos bonarum cogitationum ex Deo semper credimus prodire principia, tu informe nescio quid tertium reperisti.—This tertium consisted in the following particulars: a. Cassian, who detested the profano opinio and impietas Pelagii (see Wiggers, ii. p. 19. 20.) regarded the natural man neither as morally healthy (as Pelagius did), nor as morally dead (like Augustine), but as diseased and morally weakened (dubitari non potest, inesse quidem omnia animæ naturaliter virtutem semina beneficio creatoris inserta, sed nisi hoc opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire, (Coll. xiii. 12.) b. He insisted so much more than Pelagius on the necessity and spiritual nature of Divine grace (Coll. xiii. 3), that he even ventured to assert, that men are sometimes drawn to salvation against their will (nonnumquam etiam invitus trahimur ad salutem.) Comp. Instit. coen. xii. 18. Wiggers, p. 85. But in opposition to Augustine he restricted only to a few (e.g. Matthew and Paul), what the latter would extend to all, and appealed to the example of Zaccheus, Cornelius the centurion, the thief on the cross, and others, in proof of his opinion. In general he ascribed the ascensus to God, as well as the descensus to earthly things to the free will of man, and looked upon grace as rather cooperans, though he does not express himself very distinctly. Only we must take care not to refer all the merits of the saints to God, so as to leave to human nature nothing but what is bad. c. He understood the atonement of Christ in a more general sense, and thus rejected the doctrine of predestination (in the sense of Augustine and the hyper-Augustinians.) The assertion that God would save only a few, appeared to him an ingens sacrilegium (Coll. xiii. 7.) An outline of his complete system is given by Wiggers, p. 47—136.

(b) Augustine himself combated Semipelagianism in the
above works. Wiggers gives a sketch of the controversy between Prosper on the one hand, and Cassian and the Semipelagians on the other, p. 136 ss.

(5) He first presided over the monastery of Lerinum, which was for some time the chief seat of Semipelagianism. On Vincentius Lerinensis comp. Wiggers p. 208 ss.; on Faustus and his doctrine, ibid. p. 224 ss. 235 ss. Respecting the doctrine of original sin the views of Faustus come nearer to Augustine's notions than those of Cassian; on the other hand, his ideas of the nature of grace are less spiritual than those of the latter; comp. Wiggers p. 287.—But he bestows more attention upon the doctrine of predestination. He decidedly rejects the doctrine of unconditional election by making a difference between predetermination and foreknowledge, the former of which is independent of the latter; de grat. et lib. arbitrio Wiggers p. 279 ss. Faustus uses e. g. the following arguments which savour strongly of anthropomorphism: When I accidentally cast my eyes upon a vicious action, it does not follow that I am guilty of it, because I have seen it. Thus God foresees adultery, without exciting man to impurity; he foresees murder, without exciting in man the desire for its commission, etc., Wiggers p. 282. 83. In speaking of the doctrine of unconditional predestination, as propounded by his opponent Lucidus, he used the strongest terms: lex fatalis, decretum fatale, fatalis constitutio, originalis definitio vel fatalis, and looked upon it as something heathenish; Wiggers p. 315. He believed in universal atonement.

(6) Comp. Gennadius Massiliensis and Ennodius Ticinensis in Wiggers p. 350 ss. A summary view of the Semipelagian doctrine in general, and its relation to both Augustinism and Pelagianism is given in the form of a table by Wiggers p. 359—64.

(7) Wiggers p. 368.


(9) Wiggers p. 369 ss. Fulgentius carrying the doctrine of imputation still farther than Augustine, consigned to everlasting fire not only those infants that are really born, but died before baptism, but also the immature fetus; de fide ad Petrum c. 30. quoted by Wiggers p. 376. But in reference to predestination, he endeavoured carefully to avoid all exaggerations which might give offence to Christian feelings (Neander Kir
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chengesch. p. 1354.) After the interference of the monks of Adrumentum he expressly blamed those who asserted the doctrine of predestination to evil, though he maintained himself a prædest. duplex (although in a different sense); Neander l. c. p. 1357. Grace is in his opinion præveniens, as well as comitans and subsequens. (Ep. ad Theodorum de conversione a seculo, quoted by Wiggers p. 386.)


(11) Among the earlier popes Celestine and Gelasius I. condemned Semipelagianism; Hormisdas, on the contrary, pronounced a very mild judgment in opposition to the Scythian monks, without however denying the doctrine of Augustine. See Bonifacii II. Epist. ad Cæsarium given by Mansi T. viii. p. 735. and App. 161 ss.


It is worthy of notice that in this protracted controversy the objective aspect of anthropology was far more developed than the subjective. The doctrine of the conditions of salvation still remains in an imperfect state, as may be seen e. g. from the indefinite manner in which the terms justicicare and justificatio (= justum facere, see Wiggers p. 380) were used, and from the want of proper definitions of the nature of faith. Wiggers therefore justly closes his account of this controversy by saying: "A more profound examination of the nature of faith would even then have given a very different appearance to Christian anthropology." It should further be observed, that the Augustinian doctrine of predestination rested firmly on his views of original sin. Adam was free before the fall, and predestination accordingly had no power over him, though God foreknew his transgression. (Aug. de civ. Dei xii. 21.) Later theologians extended predestination even to Adam, and thus completed the doctrine of predestination in a speculative point of view. The Reformation finished the work which Augustine left incomplete; the Lutherans, by developing the doctrine of faith and justification, the Calvinists, by developing that of absolute predestination. On the other hand, the Roman catholic church either placed itself in opposition to its own Father (the council of Trent and the Jesuits), or did not go beyond the doctrine propounded by him (the Jansenists.)
SECOND CLASS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINES WHICH HAVE EITHER NO CONNECTION, OR BUT A REMOTE ONE, WITH THE HERESIES OF THE AGE.

§ 115.

The opinions respecting fundamental doctrines which had been matured by controversy, exerted more or less influence upon the development of others. Thus the further theological definitions respecting the nature and attributes of God, creation, etc. are influenced by the views on the Trinity; those which relate to the atonement of Christ, and the significance of the Lord’s Supper, stand in connection with the notions concerning the nature of Christ; those respecting baptism and the sacraments as means of grace are connected with anthropological definitions; and, lastly, the development of eschatology is influenced by all the other doctrines together. Even the more general definitions concerning the nature of Christianity, the canon and its relation to tradition, etc. are in some way or other connected with certain fundamental principles.

Nevertheless we are justified in treating of these doctrines separately, inasmuch as in some respects at least, they are not affected by the contests, and present themselves rather as a continuation of former definitions.

§ 116.

THE IDEA OF RELIGION AND REVELATION.

Though the theologians of the present period did not
believe in the possibility of an abstract religion, as distinct from its positive manifestation, yet we meet in the writings of Lactantius with a more precise definition of the word: *religion*, which was borrowed from the Latin. He applies the term in question not only to the external form of worship (as Tertullian had done before him), but to the union and fellowship of men with God, which he regards as an affair purely human.\(^{(1)}\) Faith in revelation was required as a necessary condition.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Lact. Inst. iv. 28: *Hac enim conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos Deo justa et debita obsequia praebamus, hunc solum noverimus, hunc sequamur.* *Hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti Deo et religati sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen accept, non, ut Cicero interpretatus est, a relegendo.* Comp. iii. 10: *Summum igitur bonum hominis in sola religione est; nam cetera, etiam quae putantur esse homini propria, in ceteris quoque animalibus reperiuntur.* 11: *Constat igitur totius humanis consensus religionem suscipi oportere.* He compared it with *sapientia* (iv. 4.) from which it is not to be separated. By sapientia he understands the knowledge, by religio the worship of God. God is the source of both. The one without the other leads to such errors, as paganism represents on the one hand in the unbelieving philosophers (the apostate and disinherited sons), and on the other in the superstitious multitudes (the run-away slaves.) Augustine follows the terminology of Tertullian; he opposes religion to fides or pietas, de pecc. mer. et rem. ii. 2. see Baumgarten-Crusius, ii. p. 751. and comp. Nitzsch, über den Religionsbegriff der Alten, theologische Studien und Kritiken, i. 3, 4. Concerning the nature of religion, and the question whether it principally consists in knowledge, or in the form of worship? or whether it consists in spiritual fellowship with God, see the controversy between Eunomius and his opponents in § 125. and Neander, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2. p. 857.

\(^{(2)}\) On the necessity of faith in revelation in general, see Rufin. expos. fidei (in Fell's edition of Cypr.) p. 18: *Ut ergo intelligentiae tibi aditus patescat, recte primo omnium te credere profiteris; quia nec navem quis ingreditur et liquido ac profundo vitam committit elemento, nisi se prius creadt posse salvari, nec agricola semina sulcis obruit et fruges spargit in ter-
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ram, nisi crediderit venturos imbres, affuturum quoque solis temore, quibus terra consorta, segetem multiplicata fruge producat, ac ventis spirantibus nutriat. Nihil denique est, quod in vita geri possit, si non credulitas ante praecesserit. Quid ergo mirum si accedentes ad Deum, credere nos primo omnium profitemur, cum sine hoc nec ipsa exigi possit vita communis? Hoc autem idcirco in principii praemissimus, quia pagani nobis objicere solent, quod religio nostra, quia quasi rationibus deficit, in sola credendi persuasione consistat. cf. Aug. de utilitate credendi c. 13: Recte igitur catholicæ disciplinae majestate institutum est, ut accedentibus ad religionem fides persuadeatur ante omnia. He too shows, that without faith there can be no friendship even among men (c. 10), no filial love and piety. Augustine knows of no other religion than positive Christianity, and insists that reason should submit to it; for faith precedes the knowledge of reason, l. c. c. 14: Deinde fateor, me jam Christo credidiisse et in animum induxisse, id esse verum, quod ille dixerit, etiamsi nulla ratione fulciatur. Reason would never have saved man from darkness and misery, nisi summus Deus populari quasi clementia divini intellectus auctoritate est, ad ipsum corpus humanum declinaret atque submitteret, cujus non solum præceptis, sed etiam factis excitata animæ redire in semetipsas et respicere patriam etiam sine disputationum concertatione potuissent......Mihi autem certum est, nusquam prorsus a Christi auctoritate discedere, non enim reperio valentior, contra Academ. l. iii. c. 19. 20. Comp. de vera rel. c. 5. de moribus eccles. cath. c. 7: Quare deinceps nemo ex me quærat sententiam mean, sed potius audiamus oraculæ nostræque ratione divinæ submittamus affatibus. (We cannot but acknowledge that Augustine was the most ingenious and eloquent advocate of Supranaturalism in its opposition to Rationalism.)

§ 117.

APOLOGETICAL WRITINGS IN DEFENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

In proportion as the polemical tendency of the present period prevailed over the apologetical, the proofs for the truths and divinity of Christ's religion lost originality,
and most writers were satisfied with the mere repetition of former statements.(1) The attacks of Porphyry, Julian the Apostate and others, however called forth new efforts in defence of Christianity;(2) the accusations of the heathen, when Christianity was established as the religion of the world upon the ruins of the Western empire, induced Augustine to compose his apologetical treatise de civitati Dei.

(1) Among the apologists previous to the apostasy of Julian, Arnobius (adversus gentes), and his argument a tuto, ii. 4. deserve to be noticed: . . . nonne purior ratio est, ex duobus incertis et in ambigua expectatione pendentibus id potius credere, quod aliquas spe inerat, quam omnino quod nullas? In illo enim pericul nihil est, si quod dicitur imminere casum fiat et vacuum: in hoc damnum est maximum, i. e. salutis amissio, si cum tempus advenit aperiatur non fuisse mendacium. Eusebius of Caesarea likewise defended Christianity in his præp. and demonstr. evang. (§ 82. 1.); Athanasius λόγος ἀπάντησε Ἰωσήφ, etc.

(2) Eusebius l. c., Theodoret, Augustine and others combated Porphyry; Eusebius also opposed Hierocles in a separate treatise. Cyril of Alexandria wrote 10 books against the Emperor Julian, who charged Christianity with contradictions.—The dialogue entitled Philopatris formerly ascribed to Lucian, may have been composed under the same emperor, see Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 1. p. 191.

§ 118.

MIRACLES AND PROPHECY.

Since the Christians were accustomed to appeal to miracles and prophecies in support of the truth of their religion, it was of importance more precisely to define the idea of a miracle. Augustine did this by defining miracles as events which deviate not so much from the order of nature in general, as from that particular order
of nature which is known to us. With regard to prophecies, many passages of the Old Testament were still applied to the Messiah, which had no reference to him, and the truly Messianic passages were taken in a less comprehensive sense than historical interpretation required. The apologists also appealed to Christ's prophecy respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, which had long since received its accomplishment, to the fate of the Jewish nation, and the similar judgment with which God had visited the Roman empire, and compared these events with the triumphant spread of the gospel. And lastly, even Augustine takes notice of the Sibylline oracles, mentioned by Lactantius.

(1) Aug. de utilitate cred. c. 16.: Miraculum voco, quidquid arduum aut insolitum supra spem vel facultatem mirantis apparet.—de civ. D. l. xxi. c. 8: Omnia portenta contra naturam dicimus esse, sed non sunt. Quomodo est enim contra naturam quod Dei fit voluntate, quum voluntas tanti utique conditoris conditae ce cujusque natura sit? Portentum ergo fit non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura.... quamvis et ipsa quae in rerum natura omnibus nota sunt non minus mira sint, essentque stupenda considerantibus cunctis, si solerent homines mirari nisi rara.—The nearer the canon of the Bible was brought to a conclusion, the more necessary it became to make a distinction between the miracles related in Scripture, as historically authenticated facts, and those miracles which were generally believed still to take place in the church. Respecting faith in miracles in general, Augustine expressed himself very freely, de civit. Dei xxi. c. 6. 7. (in reference to miraculous phenomena, but his language is also applicable to other miraculous stories of the age): Nec ego volo temere credi cuncta, quae posui, exceptis his, quae ipsae sum expertus. Cetera vero sic habeo, ut neque affirmanda, neque neganda deceiverim. Comp. de util. cred. l. c. de vera rel. 25. (Retract. i. c. 13.) Concerning the miracles related in Scripture themselves, it was of importance to distinguish the miracles performed by Jesus from those wrought by Apollonius of Tyana, to which Hierocles and others appealed. Augustine therefore directed attention to the benevolent design
of Christ's miracles, by which they are distinguished from those which are merely performed for the purpose of gaining the applause of men, (e. g. the attempt to fly in the presence of an assembled multitude) de util. cred. i. c. Comp. Cyr. Alex. contra Jul. i. 1.: ίεω δί, δει μιν των Ελλήνων ἀκηλλαγματα εὑβροντησιας και τυλις απουντιχιζεν λόγος των εκλεκτων τεβελιας τα χριστιανικα, φανεν αν χοιρωνια γας εὐδιμα φωτι πες σκότως, ἀλλ' υδιμειρις πιστω μετα αὐτισου. — On the view of Gregory the Great respecting miracles see Neander, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 294. 95.

(2) Augustine gives a canon on this point, de civit. Dei. xvii. c. 16 ss. comp. xviii. 29 ss. and below § 122. note 4.

(3) Aug. de civ. D. iv. 34: ... et nunc quod (Judæi) per omnes fere terras gentesque dispersi sunt, illius unius veri Dei providentia est. Comp. xviii. c. 46.

(4) Arnob. ii. p. 44. 45.: Nonne vel hæc saltem fidem vobis faciunt argumenta credendi, quod jam per omnes terras in tam brevi temporis spatio immensi nominis hujus sacramenta diffusa sunt? quod nulla jam natio est tam barbari moris et mansuetudinem nesciens, que non ejus amore versa molliverit asperitatem suam et in placidos sensum adsumta tranquillitatem migraverit?

Aug. civ. D. v. 25. 26. xviii. 50: ... inter horrendas persecutiones et varias cruciatus ac funera Martyrum praedicatum est toto orbe evangelium, contestante Deo signis et ostentis et variis virtutibus, et Spiritus Sancti munerebus: ut populi gentium credentes in eum, qui pro eorum redemtione crucifixus est, Christiano amore venerarentur sanguinem Martyrum, quem diabolicum furor fuderunt; ipsique reges, quorum legibus vastabatur Ecclesia, ei nominis salubriter subderentur, quod de terra crudeler auferre conati sunt; et falsos deos inciperent persequi, quorum causa cultores Dei veri fuerant antea persecuti.


§ 119.

SOURCES OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.—BIBLE AND TRADITION.

During the present period both the Bible and tradition
were regarded as the sources of Christian knowledge.\(^{(1)}\) The statement of Augustine, that he was induced by the authority of the church alone to believe in the gospel, only proves that he considered the believer, but not the Bible, to be dependent on that authority.\(^{(2)}\) In ecclesiastical controversies and elsewhere the Bible was appealed to as highest authority,\(^{(3)}\) and its perusal recommended to the people as the source of truth, and the book of books.\(^{(4)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Nihil aliud præcipi volumus, quam quod Evangelistarum et Apostolorum fides et traditio incorrupta servat. Gratian in Cod. Theod. l. xvi. Tit. vi. 1. 2.

\(^{(2)}\) Adv. Man. 5: Evangelio non crederem, nisi me ecclesiæ catholicæ commoveret auctoritas. This passage is to be compared in its whole connection: see Lücke, Zeitschrift für evangel. Christen i. 1. 4. Lücke justly rejects, ibid. p. 71., the expedient adopted by older protestant theologians, e. g. Bucer and S. Baumgarten (Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten, vol. iii. p. 48.) viz. to assign to the imperfect tense the significations of the pluperfect "according to the African dialect."


\(^{(4)}\) Aug. Ep. 137. (Opp. ii. p. 310.): (Scriptura Sacra) omnibus (est) accessibilis, quamvis paucissimis penetrabilis. Ea, quæ aperte continet, quasi amicus familiaris sine fuco ad cor loquitur indoeerum atque doctorum.—de doctr. christ. ii. 42.: Quantum autem minor est auris argenti vestisque copia, quam de Ægypto secum ille populus abstulit in comparatione divitiarum, quæ postea Hierosolymæ consecutus est, quæ maxime in Salomone ostenduntur, tanta fit cuncta scientia, quæ quidem est utilis, collecta de libris gentium, si divinarum scripturarum scientiae comparatur. Nam quicquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi dannatur, si utile est, ibi invenitur. Et cum ibi quiscue inveniret omnia, quæ utiliter alibi didicit, multo abundanter ibi inveniet ea, quæ nusquam omnino alibi, sed in illarum tantum—
modo Scripturarum mirabilis altitudine et mirabilis humilitate discountur. Comp. Theodoret, Protheoria in Psalm. Opp. T. i. p. 602. Basilii M. Hom. in Ps. i. (Opp. i. p. 90.) Rudelbach l. c. p. 38. and Neander, gewichtvolle Aussprüche alter Kirchenlehrer über den allgemeinen und rechten Gebrauch der heil. Schrift, in his kleinen Gelegenheitsschriften Berlin 1839. p.155 ss. Chrysostom however is far from making salvation dependent on the letter of Scripture. In his opinion it would be much better, if we needed no Scripture at all, provided the grace of God were as distinctly written upon our hearts, as the characters are upon the book. (Introduct. to the homilies on Matth. Opp. T. vii. p. 1. Comp. a passage of similar import in Irenæus iii. 4. § 34. 1.)

§ 120.

THE CANON.


The more firmly the doctrine of the church was established, the nearer the canon of the Sacred Scriptures, the principal parts of which had been determined in the times of Eusebius, was brought to its completion. The synods of Laodicea, of Hippo, and (the third) of Carthage contributed to this result. The theologians of the eastern church distinctly separated the later productions of the Greco-jewish literature (i. e. the apocryphal books, libri ecclesiastici,) from the canon of the Old Test. i. e. the literature of the Hebrew nation. But although Rufinus and Jerome endeavoured to maintain the same distinction in the Latin church, it became the general custom to follow Augustine in doing away with the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Test., and in considering both as equal. The canon of the Manichæans differed considerably from that of the Catholic church.
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Eus. h. e. iii. 25. adopts three classes, viz. ομολογούμενα, ἄντικεφαλικα, νῦν (whether and in how far the last two classes differ, see Lücke l. c.)—To the first class belong the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul (inclusive of the Epistle to the Hebrews,) the first Epistle of John, and the first Epistle of Peter; to the Antilegomena belong the Epistles of James, Jude, the second of Peter, and lastly, the second and third Epistles of John. With regard to the book of Revelation the opinions differ. The following are reckoned among the νῦν: Acta Pauli, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the apostolical constitutions. The ἄρατα καὶ δουμεν score rank below the νῦν.

The Synod of Laodicea was held about the middle of the fourth century (between the years 360 and 364.) In the 59th canon it was enacted, that no uncanonical book should be used in the churches, and in the 60th a list was given of the canonical books, in Mansi ii. 574. In this list all the Hebrew writings of the Old Testament are received, and the apocryphal books excluded (with the exception of the book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah.) The canon of the New Test. is the same as ours, except the book of Revelation, which however was considered genuine in Egypt (by Athanasius and Cyrill.) But mention is made of the seven Catholic Epistles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews ascribed to Paul.—For further particulars see the introductions to the New Test.

A. D. 393. and A. D. 397. These synods number the Apocrypha of the Old Test. among the canonical books. Comp. the 36th canon Conc. Hippon. in Mansi iii. 924. and Concil. Carth. 11. c. 47. Mansi iii. 891. Innocent I. (A. D. 405.) and Gelasius I. (A. D. 494)(?) confirmed their decisions.

Rufin. Expos. Symb. (l. c.) p. 26: Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt, qui non catholicci, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt, ut est Sapientia Salomonis et alia Sapientia, quae dicitur filii Syrach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur . . . . . Eiusdem ordinis est libellus Tobiae et Judith et Maccabæorum libri. He places the Shepherd of Hermas on the same footing with the Apocrypha of the Old Test., and maintains that they might be read, but not quoted as authorities, "ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmamam." Comp. Hier. in Prologo galeato, quoted by De Wette, Einleitung, i. p. 45.
Aug. de doctr. chr. ii. 8. and other passages quoted by De Wette, l. c. Comp. Münscher Handb. iii. p. 64 ss.

Münscher, l. c. p. 91 ss. Trechsel, über den Kanon, die Kritik und Exegese der Manichäer. Bern. 1832. 8. The authenticity of the Old Test., and the connection between the Old and the New Testaments was defended in opposition to the Manichaëans especially by Augustine de mor. eccles. cath. i. c. 27. de utilitate credendi and elsewhere.

§ 121.

INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

[Davidson, S., Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 111—162.] On the literature comp. § 32.

The writers of the present period regarded inspiration as having reference either spiritually to the doctrines, or mechanically to the letter of Scripture. Not only were the contents of Holy Writ considered to be divinely inspired, but it was also thought a crime even to suppose the possibility of chronological errors, and historical contradictions on the part of the Sacred penmen. On the other hand, their different peculiarities as men were not overlooked, but made use of, in order to explain the diversity of their mode of perception and style. The allegorical system of interpretation gave way in the East to the sober grammatical method of the Antiochian school. In the West, on the contrary, some intimations of Augustine led to the adoption of a fourfold sense of Scripture, which was afterwards firmly established by the scholastic divines of the next period.

This may be seen from certain general phrases which, having originated in the preceding period, had now come into general use, such as Ἀιών γραφῆ, κυριακά γραφαί, Σιτίον πωτε γραφαί, cœlestes litteræ (Lact. Inst. iv. c. 22.), as well as the simile of
the lyre, (comp. § 32. 4.) which was applied in a somewhat different sense by Chrys. hom. de Ignat. Opp. ii. p. 594.

(2.) Eusebius of Cæsarea says that it is ἡμῶν καὶ τροπῆς to assert that the sacred writers could have substituted one name for another, e. g. Abimelech for Achish (Ἄγγέλων.) Comment in Ps. xxxiii. in Montfaucon coll. nov. T. i. p. 129. That Chrysostom designates the words of the apostle not as such, but as words of the Holy Spirit, or of God (in Ev. Joh. hom. i. Opp. T. viii. p. 6. de Lazaro conc. 4. Opp. i. p. 755. and elsewhere), may partly be ascribed to his practico-rhetorical tendency. As he calls the mouth of the prophets the mouth of God (in Act. App. hom. xix. Opp. T. ix. p. 159.), so Augustine (de consensu Evv. i. 35), compared the apostles with the hands which noted down that which Christ, the head, dictated. Thus he calls (in Conf. vii. 21.) the Sacred Scriptures venerabilem stilum Spir. S. He informs Jerome of his theory of inspiration in the following manner (Ep. 82. Opp. ii. p. 143): Ego enim fateror caritati tuae, solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris, quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud, quam velmendosum esse codicum, vel interpretem non assecutum esse, quod dictum est, vel me minime intellectisse non ambigam. Alios autem ita lego, ut quantilibet sanctitate doctrinaeque prescolleant, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsa senserunt, sed quia mihi vel per illos auctores canonicos, vel probabiliter ratione, quod a vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt. Nevertheless he admits (ibid. p. 150. § 24.) that the canonical authority may be restricted, inasmuch as in reference to the dispute between Paul and Peter, he places the former above the latter. Comp. de civ. Dei xviii. 41: Denique auctores nostri, in quibus non frustra sacrarum litterarum figitur et terminatur canon, absit ut inter se aliqua ratione dissentiant. Unde non immerito, cum illa scriberent, eis Deum vel per eos locutum, non pauci in scholis atque gynamasiis litigiosis disputationibus garruli, sed in agris atque in urbibus cum doctis atque indoctis tot tantique populi crediderunt. His opinion concerning the miraculous origin of the Septuagint version agrees with that of the earlier Fathers, ibid. c. 42—44, where he attributes (as many Hyperlutherans afterwards did in reference to the Lutheran translation) the defects of that translation to a
kind of inspiration which had regard to the circumstances of the times. But this odd notion does not exclude the noble idea of a revelation which continues to manifest itself—an idea which is above the narrow adherence to the letter, and forms the basis of his belief in tradition.—Similar views probably induced Gregory the Great to say in reference to the researches of learned men relative to the author of the book of Job, that it was not necessary to know the pen with which the King of Kings had written his royal letter, but that it sufficed to have a full conviction of its Divine contents. Thus he assigns, on the one hand, the authorship of this book to the Holy Spirit, while on the other he leaves open all discussions concerning the human instruments—discussions which were greatly dreaded in later times. Gregory the Great Moral. in Job. præf. c. 1. § 2.

Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia, who went perhaps farther than any other writer, assumed different degrees of inspiration. He ascribed to Solomon not the gift of prophecy, but only that of wisdom, and judged of the book of Job and the Song of Solomon, only from the human point of view. Hence the fifth œcumenical synod found fault with him on this very account. Mansi ix. 223. But Chrysostom, and also Jerome, admitted human peculiarities, the one in reference to the gospels (Hom. i. in Matth.), the other with respect to the apostle Paul (on Gal. v. 12.); comp. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 2. p. 751. Basil the Great says respecting the prophets (in the commentary on Isaiah commonly ascribed to him, Opp. T. i. p. 379. ed. Ben.): "As it is not every substance which is fitted to reflect images, but only such as possess a certain smoothness and transparency, so the effective power of the Spirit is not visible in all souls, but only in such as are neither perverse nor distorted." (Rudelbach p. 28.) Augustine (de consensu evang. ii. 12.) asserts, that the evangelists had written ut quisque meminerat, ut cuique cordi erat, vel brevius vel prolixius; but he is careful not to be misunderstood, lib. i. c. 2: Quamvis singuli suum quendam narrandi ordinem tenuisse videantur, non tamen unusquisque eorum velut alterius ignarus voluisse scribere reperitur, vel ignorant prætermississe, qua scripsisse alius inventur: sed sicut unicuique inspiratum est, non superfluam cooperationem sui laboris adjunxit.—Concerning Gregory of Nazianzum, comp. Orat. ii. 105. p. 60. See Ullmann p. 305. note. Epiphanius opposed very decidedly the notions
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derived from the old μαντική (comp. § 32.) according to which the inspired writers were entirely passive, and supposed that the prophets enjoyed a clear perception of the Divine, a calm disposition of mind, etc. Comp. hær. 48. c. 3. and Jerome Præm. in Nahum, in Habacuc et in Jesaiam: Neque vero ut Montanus cum insanis feminis somniat, Prophetæa in extasì sunt locuti, ut nescirent, quid loquerent, et quum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent, quod dicereant. Though Jerome allows that human (e. g. grammatical) faults might have occurred, yet he guards himself against any dangerous inferences which might be drawn from his premises (Comment. in ep. ad Ephes. lib. ii. ad cap. iii. 1): Nos quotiescunque solècisms aut tale quid annotamus, non Apostolum pulsamus, ut malevoli minimantur, sed magis Apostoli assertores sumus, etc. According to him the Divine power of the word itself destroyed these apparent blemishes, or caused believers to overlook them. "The opinion of these theologians manifestly was, that the external phenomena do not preclude the reality of the highest effects of Divine grace."

Rudelbach, p. 42.

Theodoret, who may be considered as the representative of this tendency, rejects both the false allegorical, and the merely historical systems of interpretation. Protheorìa in Psalmos (ed Schulze) T. i. p. 603. in Rudelbach, p. 36. (He calls the latter a Jewish rather than Christian interpretation.) Comp. Münter über die antiochen. Schule, l. c. and Neander Kirchengesch. ii. 2. p. 748 ss.

It is remarkable that Augustine, on the one hand, understands all biblical narratives in their strictly historical, literal sense, and, on the other, leaves ample scope for allegorical interpretation. Thus he takes much pains, de civ. Dei xv. 27. to defend the narrative of the ark of Noah against mathematical and physical objections (he even supposes a miracle by which carnivorous animals were changed into herbivorous), nevertheless he thinks that all this had happened only ad praefigurandam ecclesiam, and represents the clean and unclean animals as types of Judaism and Paganism, etc. [Comp. also Davidson, l. c. p. 138, where another specimen is given.] The passage de genes. ad litter. ab initi.: In libris autem omnibus sanctis intueri oportet, quæ ibi æterna intimentur, quæ facta narrantur, quæ futura prænuntientur, quæ agenda præcipiantur, has given rise to the doctrine of a fourfold sense of Scripture;
comp. with it de util. cred. 3: omnis igitur scriptura, quae testamento vetus vocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupiendibus quadrafariam traditur, secundum historiam, secundum etiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriaram; the further exposition of his views is given ibid. [Davidson, I. c. p. 137.] According to Augustine seven things are necessary to the right interpretation of Scripture, doct. christ. ii. 7: timor, pietas, scientia, fortitudo, consilium, purgatio cordis, sapientia. But he who will perfectly interpret an author, must be animated by love to him, de util. cred. 6: Agendum enim teci prior est, ut auctores ipsos non oderis, deinde ut ames, et hoc agendum quovis alio modo potius, quam exponendis eorum sententiis et literis. Propterea quia si Virgilium odissemus, imo si non eum priusquam intellectus esset, majorum nostrum commendatione diligeremus, quam nobis satisferet de illis ejus questionibus innumerabilibus, quibus grammatici agitari et perturbari solent, nec audiremus libenter, qui cum ejus laude illas expediret, sed ei faveremus, quipereas illum errasse ac delirasse conaretur ostendere. Nunc vero cum eas multi ac varie pro suo quisque captu aperiuntur, his potissimum plauditur, per quorum expositionem me lior inventur poëta, qui non solum nihil peccasse, sed nihil non laudabiliter cecinisse ab eis etiam qui illum non intelligunt, creditur.....Quantum erat ut similem benevolentiam preberemus eis, per quos locutum esse spiritum sanctum tam diurna vetustate firmatum est?

§ 122.

TRADITION AND THE CONTINUANCE OF INSPIRATION.

The belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures neither excluded faith in existing tradition, nor in a continuance of inspiration. Not only passing visions, by which pious individuals received Divine instructions and disclosures,(1) were compared to the revelations recorded in Scripture, but still more the continued inspiration which the Fathers enjoyed when assembled in council.(2) In course of time it became necessary to lay down certain rules by which to judge of ecclesiastical tradition de-
veloping itself on its own historical foundation in order to prevent possible abuses. Such rules were drawn up by Vincentius Lerinensis, who laid down the three criteria of antiquitas (voluntas), universitas, and consensio, as marks of true ecclesiastical tradition.\(^3\)

\(^{1}\) Comp. Münscher Handbuch, iii. p. 100: "Such exalted views on inspiration cannot appear strange to us, since they existed in an age when Christians believed and recorded numerous Divine revelations and inspirations still granted to holy men, and especially to monks." Such revelations of course were supposed not to be contradictory either to Scripture, or to the tradition of the church. Thus the voice from heaven, which said to Augustine: "Ego sum, qui sum,"—and "tolle lege" directed him to the Scriptures. Conf. viii. 12.

\(^{2}\) The decisions of the councilswere represented as decisions of the Holy Spirit (placuit Spiritui Sancto et nobis—). Comp. the letter of Constantine to the church of Alexandria, Socrat. i. 9: ὅ γὰρ τοῖς ἐκκλησίοις ἦσαν ἑπισκόπους, οὐδὲν ἔστω ἵππος, ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώμη, μάλαστα γὰρ ὅταν ἔγερεν ἄγιον σπώμα των ἄνδρων διανοιὰς ἵγκιάμους, τῇ Ἰσλα πούλησιν ἴζερημεν. The emperor indeed spoke thus as a layman. But Pope Leo the Great expressed himself in the same way, and claimed inspiration not only for councils ep. 114. 2. 145. 1., but also for emperors and imperial decreats ep. 162. 3. ep. 148. 84. 1., even for himself, ep. 16. and serm. 25. Comp. Griesbach Opusc. i. p. 21. Concerning the somewhat different opinions of Gregory of Nazianzum, (ep. ad Procop. 55.) on the one hand, and of Augustine (de bapt. contra Don. ii. c. 3.) and Facundus of Hermiane (defensio trium capitul. c. 7.) on the other, see Neander Kirchengesch. ii. 1. p. 374—79. In accordance with his views on the relation of the Septuagint to the original Hebrew (§ 121), Augustine supposes that the decisions of earlier councils were completed by those of later ones, without denying the inspiration of the former, since "the decision of councils only gives public sanction to that result which the development of the church had reached." Inspiration accommodates itself to the wants of the time. Respecting this "economy," and its abuses see Münscher, l. c. p. 156 ss.

\(^{3}\) Commonitorium or Tractatus pro catholice fidei antiqui-
assumes a twofold source of knowledge, 1. divinae legis auctoritas, 2. ecclesiae catholicæ traditio. The latter is necessary on account of the different interpretations given to Scripture. The sensus ecclesiasticus is the only right one. Vincentius, like Augustine, also supposes that tradition may in a certain sense advance, so that any opinion, respecting which the church has not as yet pronounced a decision, is not to be considered heretical, but may be condemned as such, if it be contrary to the more fully developed faith of the church. Thus many of the opinions of the earlier Fathers might be reconciled with the decisions of later councils.

§ 123.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The prevailing tendency to didactic demonstration induced men to attempt the establishment of a philosophical proof of the existence of God, in which Christians had hitherto believed as an axiom. In the writings of some of the Fathers, both of the preceding and present periods, e. g. Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzum, we meet with what might be called the physico-theological argument, if we understand by it an argument drawn from the beauty and wisdom displayed in nature, which is always calculated to promote practical piety. But both the writers before mentioned, mistrusted a merely objective proof, and showed that a pure and pious mind would best find and know God. The cosmological proof propounded by Diodore of Tarsus, and the ontological argument of Augustine and Boëthius lay claim to a higher degree of logical precision and philosophical certainty. The former argument was based upon the principle that there must be a sufficient ground for every thing. Augustine and Boëthius inferred the existence of God from the existence of general ideas—a proof which was more fully developed in the next
period by Anselm, and still later by Cartesius, on which account it has often been named after either of them.

(1) Even Arnobius considered this belief to be an axiom, and thought it quite as dangerous to attempt to prove the existence of God, as to deny it; adv. gent. i. c. 33: Quisquam ne est hominum, qui non cum principis notione diem nativitatis intraverit? cui non sit ingenium, non affixum, imo ipsa pene in genitalibus matris non impressum, non insitum, esse regem ac dominum, cunctorum quaecunque sunt moderatorem?

(2) Athan. adv. gent. i. p. 3 ss. (like Theophilus of Antioch, comp. § 35. 7.) starts with the idea, that none but a pure and sinless soul can see God (Matth. v. 8.) He too compares the heart of man to a mirror. But as it is sullied by sin, God has revealed himself by means of his creation, and when this proved no longer sufficient, by the prophets, and lastly, by the Logos. Gregory of Nazianzum argues in a similar way; he infers the existence of the Creator from his works as the sight of a lyre reminds us both of him who made it, and of him who plays it. Orat. xxviii. 6. p. 499. Comp. Orat. xxviii. 16. p. 507. 508. Orat. xiv. 33. p. 281. But he too appeals to Matth. v. 8. "Rise from thy low condition by thy conversation, by purity of heart unite thyself to the pure. Wilt thou become a divine, and worthy of the Godhead? Then keep God's commandments, and walk according to his precepts, for action is the first step to knowledge." Ullmann p. 317. Augustine also propounds in an eloquent manner, and in the form of a prayer, what is commonly called the physico-theological argument (Conf. x. 6): Sed et ccelum et terra et omnia, quæ in eis sunt, ecce undique mihi dicunt, ut te amem, nec cessant dicere omnibus, ut sint inexcusabiles, etc. Ambrose, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and others express themselves in much the same manner.

(3) Diodor. xarδ ἱμακῶν in Phot. Bibl. Cod. 223. p. 209 b. The world is subject to change. But this change presupposes something constant at its foundation, the variety of creatures points to a creative unity; for change itself is a condition which has had a commencement: τροπὴ γὰρ τάς Ἰστήν ἀρχῆσων, καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις εἰς τοῦτο τροπῆν ἀναρχον καὶ συντόμως ἐστὶν, τῶν συνεχῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῶν ζώων τι καὶ συμμέτοχοι, καὶ τῶν συμμέτοχοι καὶ τῶν άλλων συνεργῶν ἡ συνεργὴ διαδοθα μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφίσει μῆτε ἐκείνην μῆτε αὐτόματον νομαίζει τῶν κόσμων, μῆτε αὖ ἀποκεφαλεῖται, ζεῖν
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(*) Aug. de lib. arb. ii. c. 3—15. There are certain general ideas which represent what is true in respect to every man, and do not vary according to the perception of every individual as sensuous ideas. Such are all mathematical truths, e. g. that three and seven make ten; such is also the higher metaphysical truth, truth as such which is the same with wisdom, (veritas, sapientia.) But this absolute truth which the human mind necessarily requires, is God himself.—Boethius expresses himself still more definitely, de consol. phil. iii. Prosa 10; he shows that empirical observation and the perception of the imperfect lead necessarily to the idea of perfection and its reality in God. Omne enim quod imperfectum esse dicitur, id deminutione perfectum esse perhibetur. Quo sit, ut si in qualibet genere imperfectum quid esse videatur, in eo perfectum quo aliquid esse necesse sit. Etenim perfectione sublata, unde illud quod imperfectum perhibetur extiterit, ne fingi quidem potest. Neque enim a diminutis inconsummatisque natura rerum cepit exordium, sed ab integris absolutisque procedens, in hæc extrema atque effecta dilabitur. Quod si............est quædam boni fragilis imperfecta felicitas, esse aliquam solidam perfectamque non potest dubitari.........Deum rerum omnium principum bonum esse, communis humanorum conceptio probat animorum. Nam cum nihil Deo melius excogitari queat, id quo melius nihil est, bonum esse quis dubitet? ita vero bonum esse Deum ratio demonstrat, ut perfectum quoque in eo bonum esse convincat. Nam ni tale sit, rerum omnium princeps esse non poterit.........Quare ne in infinitum ratio procedat, confitendum esse summum Deum summum perfectique boni esse plenissimum. Compare Schleiermacher, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 166: "Augustine is said to have given the first proof of the existence of God. But we are not to understand by this, that he demonstrated it in an objectionable manner, i. e. objectively; he only desires to show, that the idea of God is at the foundation of all human speculation."
§ 124.

CONCERNING THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND THE DIVINE NATURE.

The definitions of orthodox theologians respecting the Trinity were, on the one hand, based on the supposition that God may be known by means of his revelation, and on the other, implied that the contents of that same revelation (as ideally developed in the dogmas of the church) are a mystery. These theologians therefore took no offence at the contradiction involved in such definitions, but thought it quite proper that reason should submit to revelation. The Arians on the contrary, in accordance with their more rationalistic system, which was principally carried out in all its logical consequences by Eunomius, asserted the possibility of a perfect knowledge of God. Though the notions concerning the Divine Being, and the doctrinal definitions of the church, were still mixed up with much that savoured of anthropomorphism, yet the speculative tendency of the most eminent theologians of the present period led them carefully to avoid all gross representations of the Godhead. Thus Athanasius taught that God is above all existence; Augustine doubted whether it would be proper to call God a substance. Gregory of Nazianzum, on the other hand, showed, that it is not sufficient merely to deny the sensuous. The gross and carnal notions of the Audians concerning God met with little approbation, while the Monophysites, by blending the Divine and the human, promoted anthropomorphism under the mask of Christian orthodoxy.

(1) According to Socrat. iv. 7. Eunomius maintained, that we know quite as much of the nature of God, as the Creator himself. It does not follow, because the mind of some is im-
paired with sin, that the same is true in reference to all. The natural man indeed has not the knowledge in question; but what is the use of a revelation which reveals nothing? Christ has opened unto us a way to the perfect knowledge of God. He is the door, viz. to this knowledge. Eunomius attached the greatest importance to the theoretical, didactical part of religion, and supposed its very essence to consist in the ἀρχισμα τῶν δογμάτων.—Comp. the refutations of Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, and of Basil. Klose, Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius. Kiel 1833. p. 36 ss. Ullmann, Gregory of Naz. p. 318. ss. Neander, Chrysostomus i. p. 353. and Kirchengesch. ii. 2. p. 854. The latter defines the characteristic feature of Eunomius as "supranaturalistic dogmatism, which is closely allied to rationalism;" his opponents charged him with having changed theology into technology. Basil also reminds him (Ep. 16.) of the impossibility of explaining the nature of God, since he cannot explain the nature even of an ant! The Arian Philostorgius, on the contrary, thought it praiseworthy, that Eunomius had abandoned the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God, which Arius himself defended. Hist. eccles. x. 2. 3.

(2) Examples are given by Münscber ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 136. Comp. also Lact. Inst. vii. 21. where he calls the Holy Spirit purus ac liquidus, and in aqua modum fluidus.

(3) Athan. contra gent. p. 3 : ἵνα υἱὸς ζωῆς ὁ θεός, ὁ θεότητος. Aug. de trin. v. 2. vii. 5. prefers the use of the word *essentia* to *substantia*, comp. de civ. Dei xii. 2. though he calls himself (Ep. 177. 4.) God *substantialiter ubique diffusus*. Comp. Boëth. de trin. c. 4 : Nam quum dicimus Deus, substantiam quidem significare *videmur*, sed eam, quae sit *ultra substantiam*. Augustine’s writings however contain many profound thoughts relative to the knowledge of God. But every thing shows how much he felt the insufficiency of language to express the nature of God. de doctr. christ. i. c. 6 : *Imo vero me nihil aliud quam dicere volui. Hoc unde scio, nisi qui Deus ineffabilis est: quod autem a me dictum est, si ineffabile esset, dictum non esset. Ac per hoc ne ineffabilis quidem dicendum est Deus, quia et hoc cum dicitur, aliquid dicitur. Et fit nescio quae pugna verborum, quoniam si illud est ineffabile, quod dici non potest, non est ineffabile quod vel ineffabile dici potest*. Quae pugna verborum silentio cavenda
potius quam voce pacanda est. Et tamen Deus, cum de illo nihil
digne dici possit, admisit humanae vocis obsequium et verbis
nostriis in laude sua gaudere nos voluit. Nam inde est quod et
dicitur Deus.— On this account he, as well as Tertullian (§ 38.
3.) assigns to anthropomorphism its proper position, de vera
rel. 50: Habet enim omnis lingua sua quaedam propriana
genera locutionum, quae cum in aliam linguam transferuntur, videntur
absurda, and the remainder of the passage; de genesi c. 17:
onmes, qui spiritualiter intelligunt scripturas, non membra
corporea per ista nomina, sed spirituales potentius accipere
didicerunt, sicut galeas et scutum et gladium et alia multa.—
But he prefers such anthropomorphism, as forms an idea of
God from corporeal and spiritual analogies, though erroneous,
to the purely imaginary speculations of conceited philosophers,
de trinit. Lib. i. ab init. It is not we, that know God, but God,
who makes himself known to us, de vera rel. c. 48: Omnia,
qua de hac luce mentis a me dicta sunt, nulla quam cadem
luce manifesta sunt. Per hanc enim intelligo vera esse quae
dicta sunt et hæc me intelligere per hanc rursus intelligo.—
The same spirit is expressed in the beautiful passage from the
(spurious) Soliloq. animae c. 31: Qualiter cognovit te? Cognovi
te in te; cognovi te non sic tibi es, sed certe sicut mihi es, et
non sine te, sed in te, quia tu es lux, quaé illuminasti me.
Sicut enim tibi es, soli tibi cognitus es; sicut mihi es, secundum
gratiam tuam et mihi cognitus es . . . Cognovi enim te,
quoniam Deus meus es tu. (comp. Cyrillof Jerusalem below,
§ 127. 1.)

(4) Orat. xxviiii. 7—10. p. 500 sqq. in Ullmann p. 530. The
negative knowledge of God is of no more use, than to be told
that twice five are neither 2, nor 3, nor 4, nor 5, nor 20, nor
40, without being told that it is 10.— Gregory thinks that the
words ὦ κύριε and ὀ θέος are comparatively speaking the best
expressions to denote the Divine being; but gives the preference
to the name ὦ κύριε, partly because God applied it to himself (Ex.
iii. 14.), partly because it is more significant. For the term
ὀ θέος, is derived from another word, and can be taken relatively
(like the name Lord); but the appellation ὦ κύριε is in every
respect independent, and belongs to none but God. Orat. xxx.

(5) Comp. above § 106. note 5.
Polytheism and Gnosticism having been defeated, it was of less importance in the present period, than in the preceding, to defend the unity of God. The dualism of the Manichæans alone called for a defence of Monotheism. The definitions respecting the Trinity moreover made it necessary, that the church should not fail distinctly to declare, that the doctrine of the Trinity does not exclude that of the unity of God. In treating of this subject, theologians used much the same language as those of the former period.

(1.) Athanasius contra gent. p. 6. combatted the Dualism of the Gnostics. In opposition to the Manichæans Titus of Bostra (contra Manich. lib. i. in Basnagii mon. t. i. p. 63. sa.), Didymus of Alexandria (ibid. p. 204. 205.), Gregory of Nyssa (contra Manich. syllogismi x. Opp. iii. p. 180.), Cyrill of Jerusalem (Cat. vi. 20. p. 92. [94.]), and Augustine in his different polemical writings, defended the doctrine of one Divine being.

(2.) Comp. e. g. the Symbolum Athanasianum § 97. et tamen non sunt tres Dii, etc. On the controversy with the Tritheites and Tetratheites see § 96.

(3.) E. g. Lact. i. 3. Arnob. l. iii. Rufin. expos. p. 18: Quod autem dicimus, orientis ecclesias tradere unum Deum, patrem omnipotentem et unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universitate. Verbi gratia: si quis enim dicit unum hominem, aut umum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit. Potest enim et alius homo esse et tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus vel tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri, sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si e. c. dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur, ut alius vel tertius addi non possit; unus est enim sol. Multo magis ergo
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Deus cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri, sed universitatis vocabulo notatur, i.e. quia propterea unus dicatur quod alius non sit.

§ 126.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Several theologians, e.g. Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyrill of Jerusalem, and others, showed that what we call the attributes of God, are only expressions by which we designate his relation to the world, and that these expressions are either negative or figurative. But Augustine proved in a very ingenious manner, that the attributes of God cannot be separated from his nature as contingent phenomena. Other theologians of the present period were equally cautious in defining particular attributes, e.g. those of omniscience and omnipresence. Some endeavoured to refine the idea of the retributive justice of God, and to defend it against the charge of arbitrariness, while others again sought to reconcile the omniscience of God, and consequently his foreknowledge, with human liberty.

Gregory says Orat. vi. 12. p. 187: "There can be no antithesis in the Godhead, because it would destroy its very nature; the Godhead, on the contrary, is in so perfect a harmony not only with itself, but also with other beings, that some of the names of God have a particular reference to this agreement. Thus he is called peace and love." Among the attributes of God he assigns (next to his eternity and infinity) the first place to love. Ullmann, p. 333.—Cyrillof Jerusalem maintains that our ideas of God, and the attributes which we ascribe to him, are not adequate to his nature, Cat. vi. 2. p. 87. (Oxon. 78.) : ἄγνωσμα γὰρ ὅχι διὰ τὶς τὸν Ἁθήν (μόνω γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτα γνώσμα) ἀλλὰ δία ἡμετέρα ἀδελφὴ βαστάσαι δύναται. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ, τί ἐστι Θεός, ἐξηγούμενα· ἀλλὰ ὅτι τὸ ἀκριβείας τιρὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὀδηγεῖσαι, μετ' ἐγγυσμόσυνης ὁμολογούμεν ἐν τοῖς γὰρ τις Θεοῦ μεγάλη γνώσει, τὸ τὸν ἀγνωσία ὁμολογεῖν (comp. also the subsequent part of the passage.)
De civ. Dei xi.10: Propter hoc itaque natura dicitur simplex, cui non sit aliquid habere, quod vel possit amittere; vel aliud sit habens, aliud quod habet; sicut vas aliquem liquorem, aut corpus colorem, aut aër lucem sive fervorem, aut anima sapientiam. Nihil enim horum est id quod habet: nam neque vas liquor est, nec corpus color, nec aër lux sive fervor, neque anima sapientia est. Hinc est, quod etiam privari possunt rebus quas habent, et in alios habitus vel qualitates vertatque mutari, ut et vas evacuetur humore quo plenum est, et corpus decoloretur, et aër tenebrescat, et anima desipiat, etc. (This reasoning is identical with the proposition of Schleiermacher, that in that which is absolute the subject and the predicate are one and the same thing; see his work: Geschichte der Philosophie p. 166.) Comp. Boéth. de trin. 4: Deus vero hoc ipsum, quod est, Deus est; nihil enim aliud est, nisi quod est, ac per hoc ipsum Deus est.

God does not know things, because they are, but things are, because God knows them, Aug. l. c.: Ex quo occurrit animo quiddam mirum, sed tamen verum, quod iste mundus nobis notus esse non posset, nisi esset: Deo autem nisi notus esset, esse non posset. Respecting omnipresence compare what he says, l. c. c. 20: Deus non alicubi est; quid enim alicubi est, continetur loco, quid loco continetur, corpus est. Non igitur alicubi est, et tamen quia est et in loco non est, in illo sunt potius omnia, quam ipse alicubi. He also excluded both the idea of space, and (in reference to the eternity of God) that of succession of time, Conf. ix. 10. 2: fuisse et futurum esse non est in vita divina, sed esse solum, quoniam ætærna est. Nam fuisse et futurum esse non est æternum. Comp. de civ. Dei xi. 5.—

He thus rejected moreover the notion of Origen (condemned by Justinian) that God had created only as many beings as he could survey; de civ. Dei xii. 18.

Lactantius wrote a separate treatise: de ira Dei (Inst. lib. v.) on this subject. His principal argument is the following: if God could not hate, he could not love; since he loves good, he must hate evil, and bestow good upon those whom he loves, evil upon those whom he hates. Comp. Augustin de vera rel. c. 15. de civ. Dei, i. 9. and elsewhere.

Chrys. in Ep. ad Eph. Hom. i. (on ch. i. 5.) distinguishes in this respect between an antecedent (Σηλημα προγοιμων) and a subsequent volition (Σηλημα διωτερ). According to the
former (*τὸ σφυρώ ς Ἁλημα, Ἁλημα ὑποκινεῖ*), all are to be saved, according to the latter sinners must be punished.

§ 127.

**CREATION.**

Since the idea of generation from the essence of the Father was applied to the Son of God alone, and employed to denote the difference between him and the other persons of the Trinity on the one hand, and between him and all created beings on the other, the idea of *creation* was susceptible of a more precise definition. The notion of Origen was combated by Methodius,\(^{(1)}\) and rejected by the chief supporters of orthodoxy, viz. Athanasius and Augustine.\(^{(2)}\) The figurative interpretation of the narrative of the fall fell into disrepute along with the allegorical system of interpretation. It became therefore the more necessary to abide by the historical conception of the Mosaic account, inasmuch as it forms the basis of the history of the fall, which in its turn served as the foundation of the Augustinian theology. But Augustine endeavoured even in this case to spiritualize the literal as much as possible, and to blend it with the allegorical.\(^{(3)}\) The dualistic theory of emanation held by the Manichæans and Priscillianists was still the antagonist of the doctrine of a creation out of nothing.\(^{(4)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) In his work *πρὸ γενετῶν*. Excerpts of it are given by Photius Bibl. cod. 235. p. 301.

\(^{(2)}\) Athan. contra arian. Orat. ii. Opp. T. i. p. 336. Augustine endeavoured to remove the idea of time from the notion of God, and at the same time to retain the doctrine, that creation had a beginning, by representing God as the author of time. Conf. xi. 10 ss. c. 13. . . . . Quæ tempora fuissent, quæ abs te condita non essent? Aut quomodo præterirent, si nunquam fuisse? Cum ergo sis operator omnium temporum, si fuit aliquid tempus, antequam feceras cœlum et terram, cur dicitur,
quod ab opere cessabas? Id ipsum enim tempus tu feceras, nec præterire potuerunt tempora, antequam faceres tempora. Si autem ante cœlum et terram nullum erat tempus, cur quæritur, quid tunc faciebas? Non enim erat tunc, ubi non erat tempus. 

Nec tu tempore tempora præcedis, alioquin non omnia tempora præcederes. Sed præcedis omnia præterita celsitudine semper præsentis æternitatis, et superas omnia futura, quia illa futura sunt, et cum venerint, præterita erunt; tu autem idem ipse es, et anni tui non deficiunt.—Cf. de civ. Dei vii. 30. xi. 4—6. c. 6. xii. 15—17.

(3) Thus he said in reference to the six days: Qui dies cujusmodi sint, aut perdifficile nobis, aut etiam impossibile est cogitare, quanto magis dicere.de civ. Dei xi. 6. Concerning the seventh day, ibid. 8. his views are very nearly those of Origen: Cum vero in die septimo requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis et sanctificavit eum, nequaquam est accipiendum pueriliter, tamquam Deus laboraverit operando, qui dixit et facta sunt, verbo intelligibili et sempiterno, non sonabili et temporali. Sed requies Dei requiem significat eorum, qui requiescunt in Deo, sicut laetitia domus letitiam significat eorum, qui laetantur in domo, etiamsi non eos domus ipsa, sed alia res aliqua lætos facit etc. On the system of chronology comp. xii. 10.

(4) Baur, manichæisches Religionssystem, p. 42 ss.: “The Manichean system acknowledges no creation properly speaking, but only a mixture, by means of which the two opposite principles so pervade each other, that their product is the existing system of the world, which partakes of the nature of both.” Comp. the statements of the Manichean Felix which are there given. —On the Priscillianists see Orosii Commonitor. ad August. Neander, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3. p. 1488 ss.

§ 128.

THE RELATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

As the distinguishing characteristics of each of the persons of the Trinity had been more precisely defined (§ 95.), the question arose among theologians, to which of the three persons the work of creation was to be as-
signed? In the Apostles' Creed God the Father (without any further distinction) was declared the creator of the world, in the Nicene Creed the Son was said to have taken a part in the creation, and the council of Constantinople asserted the same with regard to the Holy Ghost.\(^{(1)}\)  

\(\textit{Gregory of Nazianzum}\) maintained, in accordance with some other theologians of this period, that the work of creation had been brought about by the Son, and finished by the Holy Ghost.\(^{(2)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Symb. ap.: Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cæli et terræ. Comp. what Rufinus says on this passage; he shows that all things are created \textit{through} the Son. The Nicene Creed calls the Father \(\piαντοκράτηρα\, \piάντων\, \varphiατών\, \tau\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\varphiατων\, \sigmaου\tauη\), but says in reference to the Son, \(\delta^\iota\ \delta\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \piαντα\ \varepsilonγινητα, \tau\alpha\ \tau\iota\ \tau\varepsilon\ \varphi\omega\varphiα\varphiω\ \kappaαι\ \tau\alpha\ \in\ \tau\epsilon\ \gamma\eta\). The symbol of Constantinople calls the Holy Spirit \(\tau\delta\ \zi\muοστοιον.\)

\(^{(2)}\) Orat. xxxviii. 9. p. 668: \(\kappaαι\ \tau\delta\ \epsilon\nuνημα\ \i\zeta\gammaων\ \eta\iota, \lambda\epsilon\gammaω\ \sigmaυμ\-\sigmaη\rhoο\mu\\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu.\) He calls the Son also \(\tau\iota\chi\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\sigma\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu\iota\nu.\) Comp. Ullmann, p. 490. Other theologians followed Augustine's example in referring the work of creation to the whole Trinity. Thus Fulgentius of Ruspe de trin. c. 8.

\(\textsection\) 129.

**DESIGN OF THE UNIVERSE.—PROVIDENCE.—PRESERVATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.**

According to the prevailing opinion of theologians, the world was created not for the sake of God,\(^{(1)}\) but of man.\(^{(2)}\) In opposition to a mechanical view of the universe, the profound \textit{Augustine} directed attention to the connection subsisting between creation and preservation;\(^{(3)}\) but more special care was bestowed during the present period upon the doctrine of providence, on which \textit{Chrysostom} and \textit{Theodoret} in the East, and \textit{Salvian} in the West composed separate treatises.\(^{(4)}\) They took special pains to show, in accordance with the spirit of
Christianity, that the providence of God extends to the most minute particulars.\(^{(6)}\) Jerome however did not agree with them, and thinking it derogatory to the Divine being to exercise such special care respecting the lower creation, maintained that God concerns himself only about the genus, but not about the species.\(^{(6)}\) He thus prepared the way for the distinction made by the African bishop Junilius (who lived about the middle of the sixth century) between gubernatio generalis and gubernatio specialis,\(^{(7)}\) which appeared, in one aspect at least, to substitute an abstract mechanism for the concrete idea of God.

\(^{(1)}\) Thus Augustine maintained de vera rel. 15. that the angels in serving God do not profit him, but themselves. Deus enim bono alterius non indiget, quoniam a se ipso est.

\(^{(2)}\) Nemesius de nat. hom. i. p. 30. ss. (ed Oxon. 1671): άπαντας διόν ο Μόγος την των φυτων γίνεισι μη δι’ εαυτήν, αλλ’ εις τήσφη και σύστασι των άθρωτων και των άλλων ζώων γεγενημένης, and in reference to the animals he says, p. 34: και ηε τάντα τρόφη διερευνίαν άθρωτων αυστιλείν πίεvous, και τα μη ταίς άλλαις χρείαις χρήσιμα. In support of his views he adduces the example of useful domestic animals, and observes with regard to hurtful animals, that they had not been so prior to the fall, and that man possesses even now means sufficient to subdue them. Comp. Chrys. hom. τώς καταλίψαντας την έκκλησιαν, Opp. T. vi. p. 272. (Ed. Bauermeister p. 8): "Ηλιων άνίταις διά σι, και σελήνη την νύκτα ιρώσιν, και ταύχλας άνιλαμψι χρός": Χαπευαν ανιμοι διά σι, έδραμον ουταμοι σπίματα ιβλάσπησαν διά σι, και φύνα ανέδειη, και της φυσις ο δεμος την οκτίαν ιτήραις τάξιν, και ήμιρα ιφάνη και νυξ χαρηλήας, και ταύτα πάντα γίγνεις διά σι. But Chrysostom also asserted that God had created the world, δι’ αγαθότητα μόνην, de prov. i. T. iv. p. 142. Comp. Aug. de div. quast. 28. Opp. T. vi. Gregor. Nyss. Or. catech. c. 5. de hominis opificio c. 2. Lact. Inst. vii. 4.

\(^{(3)}\) His general views on the subject may be seen from de morib. eccles. cath. c. 6: Nullum enim arbitror aliquo religionis nomine teneri, qui non saltem animis nostris divina providentia consuli existimet.—He then objects particularly to the popular notion of a master-builder whose work continues to exist,
though he himself withdraws. The system of the world would at once come to a stop, if God were to deprive it of his presence, de genesi ad litt. iv. c. 12. Enchirid. ad Laurent- c. 27. He defends himself against the charge of Pantheism: de civ. Dei vii. 30: Sic itaque administrat omnia, quae creavit, ut etiam ipsa proprios exercere et agere motus sinat. Quamvis enim nihil esse possint, sine ipso, non sunt quod ipse. “The world exists not apart from God, every thing is in God; this however is not to be understood as if God were space itself, but in a manner purely dynamic.” Schleiermacher, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 168. Gregory of Nazianzus uses similar language, Orat. xvi. 5. p. 302. see Ullmann p. 491.

(4) Chrys. 3 books, de fato et providentia—Theodoret 10 orations, τιγονείς ήμιας προοίων—Salvianus de gubernatione Dei s. de prov. Comp. also Nemesius de Natura hominis (τιγονὶ φύσεως ἀληθινῶν) c. 42 ss.

(5) This is indirectly proved by Arnob. adv. gent. iv. 10. p. 142. (viz. in opposition to polytheism): Cur enim Deus præsit melli un tantummodo, non præsit cucurbitis, rapis, non cunilum, nasturtio, non ficsis, betacccis, caulisibis? Cur sola meruerint ossa tutelam, non meruerint unguos, pili, cæteraque alia, que locis posita in obscuris et verecundioribus partibus, et sunt casibus obnoxia plurimis, et curam magis deorum, diligentiamque desiderant? A direct proof is given by Nemesius, l. c. c. 44. p. 333: πάντα γὰρ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ θειόματα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ναοῖς ἀξιοῦσιν τῆς διαμονῆς καὶ σωτηρίας. δει καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄτομων καὶ τελετοφησίαν ὑπόστασις προοίων ἵστη δικτυκτική, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν ζωῶν τῶν ἄρχων τις καὶ ἡγεμονίας διοικομένων, ὅσ πολλὰ ἐδοκοῦ καὶ γὰρ μέλλεισαι καὶ μύρισις καὶ τὰ πλεῖότα τῶν συναγελαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς χειρός τίτακται, οἷς ἀξιόλογης περιήμνησ. Nemesius however makes a distinction between creation and providence, and gives a definition of the latter, c. 42. p. 308: οὖ γὰρ ταῦτα ἵστη πρόοια καὶ κτίσις κτίσιως ὡς τὸ καλῶς σταὐσαμ τὰ γινόμενα προοίων δὲ τὸ καλῶς ἐπιμεληθῆναι τῶν γεωμένων, and c. 43. p. 315: πρόοια τοῖνοι ἵστην ἐκ Θεοῦ εἰς τὰ ὄντα γεωμένων ἐπιμελέων ὀφείλονται δὲ καὶ ὁμοίως αὐτήν προοία ἵστη θεολογίας Θεοῦ, δὲ τίνως τὰ ὄντα τὴν πρόοφοιν διαγωγήν λαμβάνων κ. τ. λ. Generally speaking we find here a complete system of teleology.

ordinem cursumque rerum intelligere possumus: verbi gratia, quomodo nascatur piscium multitudo et vivat in aquis, quomodo reptilia et quadrupedia orientur in terra et quibus alantur cibis. Ceterum absurdum est ad hoc Dei deducere majestatem, ut sciat per momenta singula, quot nascantur culices, quotve moriantur [comp. on the other hand Matth. x. 29, 30], quæ cimicum et pulicum et muscarum sit multitudo in terra, quanti pisces in mari natent, et qui de minoribus majorum prædæ cedere debeant. Non simus tam fatui adulatores Dei, ut, dum potentiam ejus etiam ad ima detrahimus, in nos ipsi injuriosi simus(!), eandem rationabilium quam irrationabilium providentiam esse dicentes.

(7) Junil. de partibus legis divinæ l. ii. c. 3. ss. Bibl. max. PP. T. x. p. 345. General providence manifests itself in the preservation of the genus, and of the condition of all existence; special providence is displayed, 1. in the care of God for angels and men; 2. in that of the angels for men; and, 3. in that of men for themselves.

§ 130.

THEODICY.

The controversy with the Manichæans, whose notions however were to some extent adopted by Lactantius,(1) rendered necessary a more precise definition of the nature of evil, and such a distinction between physical and moral evil, as would represent the latter as the true source of the former. Hence the evils existing in the world were regarded either (objectively) as the necessary consequence and punishment of sin, or (subjectively) as phenomena which, being good in themselves, assume the appearance of evil only in consequence of our limited knowledge, or the corrupt state of our mind, or through a perverse use of our moral freedom. But the wise and pious, looking forward to that better time which is to come, use those evils as means of advancing in knowledge, and of practising patience.(2)
Inst. div. ii. c. 8. In the same place he expresses the unsatisfactory view which even Augustine seems to have entertained (Enchir. ad Laur. c. 27.), that evil would exist though it were merely for the sake of contrast; as if good were good only by the contrast which it forms with bad, and ceased to be so when there is no contrast.

Athan. contra gent. c. 7. Basil M. in Hexaëm. Hom. ii. 4. Hom. quod Deus non est auctor malorum (the passage should be read in its connection) Opp. T. ii. p. 78. (al. i. p. 361.) Klose p. 54—59. Greg. Nyss. orat. catech. c. 6. Greg. Naz. orat. xiv. 30. 31. xvi. 5. quoted by Ullmann p. 493. Chrys. in 2 Tim. Hom. viii. Opp. xii. 518. e. Aug. de civ. Dei xi. 9: mali enim nulla natura est, sed amissio boni mali nomen accept. Comp. c. 22. Fire, frost, wild beasts, poison, etc., may all be useful in their proper place, and in connection with the whole; it is only necessary to make such a use of them as accords with their design. Thus poison causes the death of some, but heals others; meat and drink injure only the immoderate. Unde nos admonet divina providentia, non res insipiens vitae superare, sed utilitatem rerum diligenter inquirere, et ubi nostrum ingenio vel firmitas deficet, ita credere occultam, sicut erant quædam, quæ vix potuimus invenire; quia et ipsa utilitas occultatio, aut humilitatis exercitatio est aut elationis attritio ; cum omnino natura nulla sit malum, nomenque hoc non sit nisi privationis boni. Sed a terrenis usque ad æstias et a visibilibus usque ad invisibilia sunt alia bona meliora; ad hoc inaequalia, ut essent omnia etc. Comp. de vera rel. c. 12. Evils are beneficial as punishments, ibid. c. 15 : ...amaritudine peænarum erudiamur. On the question why the righteous have to suffer as well as the unrighteous? see de civ. Dei i. 8—10. Christians rise above all trials only by love to God: toto mundo est omnino sublimior mens inhaærens Deo. De morib. eccles. cath. c. 11. This seems to be the turning-point of every theodicy (Rom. viii. 28.)
Since the ideas of generation and procession from the Father had been exclusively applied to the Son and the Holy Ghost, it was distinctly acknowledged that the angels are creatures and not emanations from the essence of God. Nevertheless they were still regarded as highly gifted creatures who are far superior to the human race. Divine homage was rendered to them; but Ambrose was the only Father during this period—and he did it merely in a passing remark—who recommended the invocation of angels to Christians. But both the prohibition of the worship of angels (angelolatry) by the synod of Laodicea (about the middle of the fourth century), and the testimony of Theodoret prove, that such a worship must have been practised in some parts of the East (it was perhaps borrowed from earlier ages). Theodoret, as well as Augustine, opposed the adoration, or at least the invocation of angels, which was disapproved of even by Gregory I., who was desirous of confining it to the Old Testament dispensation. But the practice of dedicating churches to angels, which was favoured by emperors and bishops, would necessarily confirm the people in their belief, that angels heard and answered prayer, notwithstanding all dogmatic explanations. With regard to the dogmatic definition concerning the nature of angels, Gregory asserted that they were created prior to the rest of the world; others, e.g. Augustine, dated their existence from the first day of creation. In the work of Pseudo-Dionysius (de hierarchia caelestis)
which, though composed during the present period, did not come into general use till the next, the angels were systematically divided into three classes and nine orders.

(1) Lact. Inst. iv. c. 8: Magna inter Dei filium et ceteros [sic] angelos differentia est. Illi enim ex Deo taciti spiritus exierunt. Ille vero cum voce ac sono ex Dei ore processit.

(2) Basil. M. de Spir. S. c. 16. calls the angels ἀνδρίον πνεῦμα, τῶς ἀῶλον according to Ps. civ. 4. and hence ascribes to them a certain corporeity. Gregory of Nazianzum says, Orat. vi. 12. p. 187:... τῶς εἰς καὶ αὕται τιλεῖν φωνῆς ἀπαγγέλματα. According to Orat. xxviii. 31. p. 521 ss. the angels are servants of the Divine will, powerful by strength, partly original and partly derived, moving from place to place, everywhere present, and ready to assist all, not only by reason of their zeal to serve, but also on account of the lightness of their bodies; different parts of the world are assigned to different angels, or placed under their dominion (Orat. xlii. 9. p. 755. and 27. p. 768.), as he knows who has ordained and arranged all things. They have all one object in view (Orat. vi. 12. p. 187.), and act all according to the one will of the creator of the universe. They praise the Divine greatness, and ever behold the eternal glory, not that God may thus be glorified, but that unceasing blessings may flow even upon those beings who stand nearest to God. Comp. Ullmann p. 494. 95. Augustine calls the angels sancti angelii, de civ. Dei xi. 9. Fulgentius of Ruspe de trin. c. 8. on the authority of great and learned men, asserts, that they are composed of body and spirit; they know God by the latter, and appear to men by means of the former.

(3) Ambr. de viduis ix. c. 55: Obsecrandi sunt angeli, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt. He mentions the martyrs together with them as intercessors, but soon after he counsels men to the direct invocation of the Divine physician himself.


Constantine the Great had dedicated a church at Constantinople (Μηχαήλιον) to St. Michael, Sozom. hist. eccl. ii. 3., and Theodoret, l. c. says in reference to the Phrygians and Pisidians: μήχρι ἕως τοῦ ὑπέρτηρος τοῦ ἀγίου Μηχαήλ παρ' ἱερίσιος καὶ τοῦ διωρεμένου ἱερίσιον ἵστιν ἰδίων. The Emperor Justinian, and Avitus, bishop of Vienne, also dedicated churches to angels.

Greg. Naz. xxxviii. 9. p. 668. All the angels together form in his opinion the κόσμος νοητός, as distinct from the κόσμος αἰώνιος, ἢλικός καὶ ὀνόματος. Comp. Ullmann, p. 497. Augustine expresses himself differently de civ. Dei xi. 9. They are the light which was created in the beginning before all other creatures; at the same time he so explains the dies unus (instead of primus ὁμitted) that this one day of light included the other days of creation, and then continues: cum enim dixit Deus, fiat lux, et facta est lux, si recte in hac luce creatio, intellegitur angelorum, profecto facta sunt participes lucis æternæ, quod [quæ] est ipsa incommutabilis sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, quem dicimus unigenitum Dei filium, ut ea luce illuminati, qua creati, fierent lux, et vocarentur dies participazione incommutabilis lucis et diei, quod est verbum Dei, per quod et ipsi et omnia facta sunt. Lumen quippe verum, quod illuminat omnem hominem in hunc mundum venientem, hoc illuminat et omnem angelum mundum, ut sit lux non in se ipso, sed in Deo: a quo si avertitur angelus, fit immundus.

Some of the earlier theologians, e. g. Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzum, founded different orders of angels on the various names given to them in Scripture. Bas. de Spir. S. c. 16. Greg. Orat. xxviii. 31. p. 521. mentions ἀγγέλους τινάκα καὶ ἀγγέλειον, ἔρωνος, κυριότητας, ἀγίας, ἔγοινης, λαμπρότητας, ἀναβάσεις, νικάς διάμεις, ἤ νόας. He does not however distinctly state by
what these different classes are distinguished, since he thinks these internal relations of the world of spirits beyond the reach of human apprehension. Ullmann, p. 494. Comp. Augustine Enchirid. ad Laur. 58: Quomodo autem se habeat beatissima illa et superna societas, qua ibi sint differentiae personarum, ut cum omnes tamquam generalis nomine angeli nun cupidatur... ego me ista ignorare confiteor. Sed nec illud quidem certum habeo, utrum ad cendum societatem pertinere sol et luna et cuncta sidera etc. But Pseudo-Dionysius, who lived nearly a century after Augustine, seems to have understood the subject much better; in his Hierarchia cœlestis (Ed. Lansselli, Par. 1615 fol.) c. 6. he divided the whole number of angels into three classes (hierarchies), and subdivided each class into three orders (τάγματα): i. Θεόνι. 2. Χειροβίμ. 3. Σεραφίμ. ii. 4. κυρίερια. 5. εἰκοσίας. 6. δυνάμεις. iii. 7. ἀρχαί. 8. ἀρχάγγελοι. 9. ἄγγελοι. He nevertheless observed, that the last term, as well as ὑδάμας, was common to all (c. 11). Gregory the Great followed him (Hom. in Ezekiel xxxiv. 7. Opp. Tom. i. p. 1603. al. ii. p. 477.), and mentioned the following nine classes: Angeli, Archangeli, Virtutes, Potestates, Principatus, Dominations, Throni, Cherubim atque Seraphim, which he brought into connection with the nine precious stones spoken of in Ezek. xxviii. 13.

§ 132.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Metaphysical definitions of the nature of angels were of less importance in the religious-moral, consequently dogmatic point of view, than the question whether angels, like men, possessed a free will, and were capable of sinning? It was generally admitted that this had been the case prior to the fall of the evil angels. But theologians did not agree in their opinions respecting

* Pseudo-Dionysius however (cap. 1. and 2.) endeavoured to remove the gross and sensuous ideas of the body of the angels, and designated the common terminology as ἀπόσυμφων τῷ ἀγγελικῷ ἐνεργείῳ σώματι (durum angelorum nominum apparatum), comp. his mystical interpretation of the images of angels in cap. 15.
another point, viz. whether the good angels who at first resisted temptation, will never yield to it, or whether it is possible that they too should fall into sin? Gregory of Nazianzum, and still more decidedly Cyrill of Jerusalem, pronounced in favour of the latter view. (1) Augustine adopted the former. (2)

(1) Gregory thought that the angels were not ἀθιμνατοι, but διαθιμνατοι to evil (Orat. xxviii. 31. p. 521.), and imagined that this would necessarily follow from the fact that Lucifer once fell. Orat. xxxviii. 9. p. 668. Orat. xliv. 5. p. 849. Ullmann, p. 496. (Comp. also Basil the Great de Spir. S. c. 16.) But Cyrill of Jerusalem (Cat. ii. 10.) insisted that the predicate "sinless" should be applied to none but Christ, and maintained that the angels too stood in need of pardon. Comp. Lactantius Inst. vii. 20: Angeli Deum metuant, quia castigari ab eo possunt incnarrabilia quodam modo.

(2) Aug. de ver. rel. i. 13: Fatendum est enim, et angelos natura esse mutabiles, si solus Deus est incommutabilis; sed ea voluntate, qua magis Deum quam se diligunt, firmi et stables manent in illo et fruuntur majestate ipsius, ei uni libentissime subditi. According to the Enchiridion c. 28. the good angels received after the fall of the evil ones what they had not had before, viz. certam scientiam, qua essent de sua sempiterna et nunquam casura stabilitate securi; this idea evidently corresponds with his anthropological views on the donum perseverantiae, and is more prominently brought forward de civ. Dei xi. 13: Quis enim catholicus christianus ignorat nullum novum diabolum ex bonis angelis ulterior futurum: sicut nec istum in societatem bonorum angelorum ulterior rediturum? Veritas quippe in Evangelio sanctis fidelibusque promittit, quod erunt æquales Angelis Dei? quibus etiam promittitur, quod ibunt in vitam æternam. Porro autem si nos certi sumus nunquam nos ex illa immortali felicitate casuros, illi vero certi non sunt: jam potiores, non æquales cecrisimus: sed quia nequaquam Veritas fallit, et æquales cecrisimus, profecto etiam ipsi certi sunt sua felicitatis æternæ. comp. Pseudo-Dionys. c. 7.
According to the prevailing opinion of the age pride was the true cause of the fall of the evil spirits. Almost all the theologians of this period, with the exception of Lactantius, whose notions resembled those of the dualistic Manichæans, regarded the devil as a being of limited power, whose seductions Christian believers might at any time resist. Didymus of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nyssa ventured—though with great caution—to revive the notion of Origen, that there was still hope of the final conversion of the devil. Cyrill of Jerusalem, Jerome, and Augustine combatted this opinion, which was condemned in the sixth century by the Emperor Justinian, together with the other errors of Origen. It was moreover supposed, that demoniacal powers were still brought into operation, but were most effectually resisted by the name of Christ, and the sign of the cross.

THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

καὶ μὲν τῷ κατὰ τὸν ἡμῶν πᾶσος ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπων ἡ. Cassian, Collat. viii. 6. makes mention of both superbia and invidia.—The idea of lasciviousness was put more and more into the background. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyrill of Alexandria, Augustine, and Cassian, gave also a more correct interpretation of the passage in Gen. vi. 2., which was misunderstood by earlier theologians; we may however observe, that Euseb. (praep. ev. v. 4.), Ambrose (de Noé et arca c. 4.), and Sulpicius Severus (Hist. sacra i. 3.) explained it in a sense similar to that which was formerly attached to it (§ 52. note 3.) Comp. Chrys. hom. in Gen. xxii. Opp. T. ii. p. 216. Theodoret in Gen. quest. 47. Opp. T. i. p. 58. : ἐμπροσθινεῖν διὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἀγαν ἠλθοι, ἀγγέλους τούτους ἀπελάβοι, and fab. hær. ep. v. 7. Opp. iv. p. 402. : Παραπληγίας γα ἢ ισχάτης τοῦ ἀγγέλου προσάφαι τῆς τῶν ἀδημότων ἀπελασίας. Cyrill Al. contra Anthropomorphitas c. 17. (Opp. T. vi. p. 384.) contra Julian l. ix. p. 296. 97. Aug. de civ. Dei xv. 23. quest. 3. in Gen. Cassian Coll. viii. c. 20. 21. Hilary (in Ps. xxxii. p. 403.) mentions the earlier interpretation but without approval. Philastrius, on the contrary, numbers it among the heresies, hær. 107. (de gigantibus tempore Noé.)

Inst. ii. 8. Previous to the creation of the world God created a spirit like unto himself (the Logos), who possessed the attributes of the Father; but after that he created another spirit, in whom the Divine seed did not remain (in quo indoles divinae stirpis non permansit.) Moved by envy he apostatized, and changed his name (contrarium sibi nomen ascivit.) The Greek writers call him διάβολος, the Latin criminator, quod criminata, in quo ipse illicit, ad Deum deferat (hence the appellation obtrectator.) He envies especially his predecessor (the first-born), because he continued to enjoy the favour of God.—Lactantius thus agrees with the other theologians in supposing that envy had been the cause of the fall. But his peculiar manner of representing Satan, as it were, as the second Son of God, and of drawing a parallel between him and the first-born, certainly reminds us of Gnostic-Manichean notions. In another passage (which though now wanting in many MSS., was probably at an early period omitted to save the reputation of Lactantius) he calls the Logos the right, and Satan the left hand of God. If the passage in question were genuine, it would go to prove very clearly, that the views of Lactantius on this subject were essentially Manichean, though the unity of the Father would be
still preserved above the contrast of Logos and Satan; but the
notion last mentioned would justly expose its author to the
charge of Arianism. This seems to have been felt by those cri-
tics who omitted the above passage. Comp. the note of Cella-
where the term Antitheus occurs. (Arnob. contra gent. iv. 12.
and Orelli on that passage.) Augustine opposed the Manichæan
notion c. Faust. 21. 1. and 2."

(3.) Gregory of Nazianz. Orat. xl. 10. p. 697. makes special
mention of the water of baptism, and the Spirit as the means,
by which to quench the arrows of the wicked. Satan had no
power over Christ; deceived by his human appearance, he took
him for a mere man. But the Christian who is united to Christ
by faith, can likewise resist him. Orat. xxiv. 10. p. 443.: παραδίτηια γάρ αἱ καθαραὶ ἕνωσι καὶ Καθειώστε σφός Ἡμῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦτος,
καὶ διὰ μάλιστα σοφιστικὸς ἢ καὶ τυχίλος τὴν ἐπιχείρησαν. The assertion
of Hilary in Ps. cxli. p. 541.: quidquid inquinatum homines
gerunt, a Diabolo suggeritur, met with opposition on the part
of Gennadius de eccles. dogm. c. 48.: Non omnes malæ cogita-
tiones nostræ semper Diaboli instinctu excitantur, sed aliquties
ex nostri arbitrii motu emergunt. Comp. also Chrys. de
prov. c. 5. Opp. iv. p. 150. Aug. de advers. leg. ii. 12. and else-
where.

iv. p. 325. in commenting on 1 Pet. iii. 22. merely said, that
Christ had accomplished the work of redemption for all ra-
tional beings (cuncta rationalia). Gregory of Nyssa expressed
himself more explicitly, orat. catech. c. 26. (see in Münscher
von Collini i. p. 97), but Germanus contested the genuineness of
the passage in Photius Cod. 233. Even Orosius complained in
a letter to Augustine (Opp. Aug. T. viii.), that some men revived
the erroneous views of Origen on this point.

(5.) Cyrill of Jerusalem Cat. iv. p. 51. ascribed to the devil an
obstinate heart and incorrigible temper; comp. Augustine ad
Orosium contra Priscillian. et Orig. c. 5. ss. Opp. T. viii. p. 433.
ss. de civ. D. xxi. 17.: . . . Qua in re misericordior profecto
fuit Origenes, qui et ipsum Diabolum atque angelos ejus post

a The sense of the very appropriate passage quoted by Baumgarten-Cru-
sius p. 987: Diabolus non simpliciter Deus est, sed illis Deus existit, qui
illum Christo anteponunt (according to 2 Cor. iv. 4.) is the same, but not the
words.
graviora pro meritis et diuturniora supplicia ex illis cruciatibus erundos atque sociandos sanctis angelis creedit. Sed illum et propter hoc et propter alia nonnulla. . . . non immerito reprobavit. He shows, that the final deliverance of the devil necessarily follows from the doctrine of the remission of the punishments of hell; but this notion is the more incorrect (in reference to the word of God), the more agreeable and charitable it appears to men.—Concerning the final condemnation of Origen's opinion, see Mansi T. ix. p. 399. 518.

(6) Eus. præp. ev. iii. c. 14—16. Aug. de civ. D. ii. c. 24. x. 21.: Moderatis autem praefinitisque temporibus, etiam potestas permissa daemonibus, ut hominibus quos possident excitatis, inimicitias adversus Dei civitatem tyrannice exerceant.—Posidonius, a physician, asserted (according to Philostorgus hist. eccl. viii. c. 10.), in opposition to the current opinion that madness proceeds from demoniacal influences, that: οὐχὶ δαμαί-

νων ἵστι μια τούς ἄμερώτους ἐκβαγχώμεθαι, ἵνα ὁ ἐκ τῶν κακοχρῆμα τὸ σάκας ἴσειάζωαι, μηδὲ γὰρ ἐνας χαρέσσαν ἴσχυν δαμαίων, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς φθον ἵστημαζουσαν. The popular view nevertheless continued to be defended in most theological systems.


διαν γάρ ἱδώσα τὸν σταυρὸν, ὑπομνημάτισσαν τῷ ἱσταυρωμένῳ φοβεῖται τὸν συντρίβοντα τὰς κεφαλὰς τοὺς δράκοντος. Cassian Coll. viii. 19. distinguishes the true power of faith which defeats the demons, from the supernatural power, which even the ungodly may exert upon evil spirits, since these obey them as servants (familiars). The poem of Severus Sanctus Endelechius de mortibus bonum contains a lively description of the supernatural efficacy of the sign of the cross against demoniacal influences, even in reference to the animal kingdom. (Comp. the edition of Piper, Gött. 1835. 8; a number of other passages referring to the point in question are quoted from the works of the Fathers in the introduction to the said edit.)

V. 105. ss.: Signum, quod perhibent esse crucis Dei, Magnis qui colitur solus in urribus,

Christus, perpetui gloria numinis,

Cujus filius unicus:

Hoc signum mediis frontibus additum

Cunctarum pecudum certa salus fuit.
REDEMPTION THROUGH CHRIST.

Sic vero Deus hoc nomine præpotens
Salvator vocitatus est.
Fugit continuosa sæva lues greges,
Morbis nil licuit. Si tamen hunc Deum
Exorare velis, credere sufficit:
Votum sola fides juvat.

§ 134.

The doctrine of Satanic agency occupied during this period a prominent place in the doctrine of salvation, inasmuch as Gregory of Nyssa and other theologians, some of whom belonged to the western church, adopted the former notion that God, in order to save men, had defrauded the devil by a dishonest exchange. This idea however met with decided opposition on the part of Gregory of Nazianzum, though he too admitted that the devil was deceived by God. But the notion of a debt paid to God, which was first propounded by Athanasius, gained increasingly ground. It was still farther carried out by some rhetorical theologians, who asserted, that Christ had more than paid the debt. The idea in question however was not as yet received in a doctrinal form. Others looked at the death of Christ from what we might call the subjective point of view, i.e. they either interpreted it in a mystico-symbolical way, or they showed its importance in its bearing upon morals. In connection with such views it was moreover supposed, that the redemption of the world was effected not only by the death of the Saviour, but by the entire manifestation and life of the Son of God. Free scope was as yet left to investigations respecting the particular mode of redemption.
Gregory of Nyssa Orat. cat. c. 22—26. The train of his argument is as follows: Men have come under the dominion of the devil by sin. Jesus offered himself as a ransom to the devil, for which he should release all others. The crafty devil assented, because he cared more for the one Jesus who was so much superior to him, than for all the rest. But notwithstanding his craft he was deceived, since he could not retain Jesus in his power. It was, as it were, a deception on the part of God* (ἀπάντησις ἐν ἰδιοτερία τινά,) that Jesus veiled his Divine nature, which the devil would have feared, by means of his humanity, and thus deceived the devil by the appearance of flesh. But Gregory allows such a deception according to the just retaliation; the devil had first deceived men, for the purpose of seducing them; the design of God in deceiving the devil was to redeem mankind. (Gregory's argument looks very much like the well-known maxim "that the end sanctifies the means."—This somewhat dramatic representation of the present subject includes that other more profound idea carried out with much ingenuity in many of the odd legends of the middle ages, that the devil notwithstanding his subtility is at last outwitted by the wisdom of God, and appears in comparison with it as a stupid devil.)

Comp. Ambrose in Ev. Luc. Opp. iii. Col. 10. i.: Oportuit hanc fraudem Diabolo fieri, ut susciperet corpus Dominus Jesus, et corpus hoc corruptibile, corpus infirmum, ut cruciferetur ex infirmitate. Rufinus, expos. p. 21.: Nam sacramentum illud susceptae carnis hanc habet causam, ut divina filii Dei virtus velut hamus quidam habitu humano carnis obiectus......principem mundi invitare possit ad agonem: cui ipsae carnis suam velut escam tradidit, ut hamo eum divinitatis intrinsecus teneret insertum et effusione immaculati sanguinis, qui peccati maculam nescit, omnium peccata deleret, eorum duntaxat, qui cruore ejus postes fiduci suae significassent. Sicuti ergo hamum esca conspectum si piscis rapiat, non solum escam cum hamo non removet, sed ipse de profundo esca alis futurus educitur: ita et is, qui habebat mortis imperium, rapuit quidem in mortem corpus Jesu, non sentiens in eo hamum divinitatis inclusum; sed ubi devoravit, hæsit ipse continuo, et disruptis inferni claustris, velut de profundo extractus traditur, ut esca ceteris fiat (in allusion to

* The close affinity between this assertion and Docetism, which ever and anon endeavoured to make its appearance, is very plain. See Baur l. c. p. 82. 83.
certain passages of Scripture, especially to Job, he says: ad-
pal. Sent. lib. iii. dist. 19. (illisus est Diabolus morte Domini quasi avis) quoted by Baur, p. 79.

The theologians of this period differed in so far in their opin-
ions, as some adopted only the more general notion of the power
which the devil possessed over men, while others (especially August
ine) conceded to the devil a real right; comp. Baur, Versöhnungslehre, p. 68 ss.

(2) Orat. xlv. p. 862. 63.: “We were under the dominion of
the wicked one, inasmuch as we were sold unto sin, and ex-
changed pleasures for vileness. If it now be true that a ransom
is always paid to him who is in the possession of the thing for
which it is due, I would ask, to whom was it paid in this case?
and for what reason? Perhaps to Satan himself? But it would
be a shame to think so (ποῦ τῆς ὑπάτης.) For in that case the
robber had not only received from God, but God himself (in
Christ) as a ransom and an exceedingly great recompense of his
tyranny......Or is it paid to the Father himself? But in the first
place, it might be asked, how could that be, since God did not
hold us in bondage? And again, how could we satisfactorily
explain that the Father delighted in the blood of the only be-
gotten Son? since he did not even accept the offer of Isaac, but
substituted the sacrifice of a ram in the place of a rational being?
Or is it not evident, that the Father received the ransom, not
because he demanded or needed it, but on account of the Di-
vine economy (ὅτι σινονομία), and because man is to be sanctified
by the incarnation of God; that having subdued the tyrant, he
might deliver and reconcile us to himself by the intercession of
his Son?” See Ullmann, p. 456. 57. Gregory was neverthe-
less disposed to admit some artifice on the part of Christ in the
contest in which he conquered Satan. “This consisted in this,
that Christ assumed the form of man, in consequence of which
the devil thought, that he had only to do with a being like our-
selves, while the power and glory of the Godhead dwelt in him.”

(3) De incarnat. c. 6. ss. God had threatened to punish trans-
gressors with death, and thus could not but fulfill his threaten-
ing: οἵτινες ἀδικήσεις γὰρ ἦν ὁ Θεός, εἰ, εἰπότος αὐτῷ ἀποθνήσκων ἡμᾶς, μὴ ἀπί-
But on the other hand it was not in accordance with the character of God that rational beings, to whom he had imparted his own spirit (Logos), should fall from their first state in consequence of an imposition practised upon them by the devil. This was quite as contrary to the goodness of God (οὐκ ἔξειν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἀγαθότητος τοῦ Ἱησοῦ,) as it would have been contrary to his justice and veracity, not to punish the transgressor. When the Logos perceived, that nothing but death could save man from ruin, he assumed a human body, because the Logos himself, i.e. the eternal Son of God, could not die. He offered his human nature as a sacrifice for all, and fulfilled the law by his death. By it he also destroyed the power of the devil (ἡράνες τὸν Ἰάκωβον τῇ σφαγῇ τοῦ κατακλήσων. c. 9. p. 54.) etc. Comp. Möhlers Athanasius i. p. 157. Baur, p. 94 ss. Concerning the similar, though more general notions of Basil the Great (Hom. de gratiar. actione—Hom. in Ps. xlvi. and xxviii.—de Spir. Sancto 15.) comp. Klose, p. 65. Cyril also says Cat. xiii. 33: ἐκδεικνύμεν Ἰησοῦν δι’ ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἄμων ὁ Ἰησός τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα ἀποθνῄσκειν ἵκερ εὖν ἐν οἷς ὁ δύο γείσσαι, ἢ ἀλληλούων Ἰησόν πάντας αἰνεῖν ἡ φιλαθροπεμένη ἀπελώρουσε τῇ ἁμαρτασίᾳ. ἄλλα θήτην Ἰησοῦ σοφίαν ἀνέψήκαν καὶ τῇ ᾑποφάσιν τὴν ἀλληλείαν. de Spir. Sancto 15.) comp. Klose, p. 65. Cyril also says Cat. xiii. 33. Concerning similar ideas of Leo the Great, as well as concerning his entire theory of redemption see Griesbach, Opuscula, p. 98 ss.

Thus Gregory of Nazianzum says, Orat. xxiv. 4. p. 439.: He has ascended the cross, and taken me with him, to nail my sin on it, to triumph over the serpent, to sanctify the tree, to overcome lust, to lead Adam to salvation, and to restore the fallen image of God."......Orat. xlv. 28. p. 867. “God became man, and died, that we might live: we have died with him, to be purified; we are raised from the dead with him, since we have died with him; we are glorified with him, because we have

(2) It is worthy of notice, that especially Augustine on practical grounds, brought this ethical import of the death of Christ very prominently forward (to counterbalance, as it were, the theory of salvation which is so easily misunderstood:)

Tota itaque vita ejus disciplina morum fuit, (de vera rel. c. 16.) Christ died, in order that no one might be afraid of death, nor even of the most cruel manner of putting persons to death, de fide et symb. c. 6. de divers. quæst. qu. 25. (Opp. T. vi. p. 7.) The love of Christ displayed in his death shall constrain us to love him in return, de catech. rud. c. 4: Christus pro nobis mortuus est. Hoc autem ideo, quia finis præcepti et plenitudi legis charitas est, ut et nos invicem diligamus, et quemadmodum illo pro nobis animam suam posuit, sic et nos pro fratribus animam ponamus......Nulla est enim major ad amorem invitatio, quam prævenire amando, et nimis durus est animus, qui dilectionem si nolebat impendere, nolit rependere. Comp. Lact. Inst. div. iv. 23 ss. Bas. M. de Spir. S. c. 15.

(2) Comp. the passage quoted from Athanasius in note 3. Gregory of Nyssa also says, (Orat. catech. c. 27.), that not only the death of Christ had effected the redemption of man, but also the circumstance that he preserved a pure disposition in all the moments of his life: ...

Augustine de vera rel. c. 26. represents Christ as the second Adam, and contrasts him as the homo justitiae with the homo peccati; as sin and ruin are the effects of our connection with Adam, so redemption is the effect of a living union with Christ. Comp. de libero arbitrio iii. 10. de consensu evang. i. c. 35. where he places the real nature of redemption in the manifestation of the Godman. Hence Baur says l. c. p. 109. 10.: “The reconciliation of man to God, the incarnation of God in Christ, and the union of the Divine with the human which is realized by it, were laid down as the general principle including all particular definitions, which was ever and anon adopted by the theologians of that age.... Thus a view was formed of the atonement which we may term the mystical,
inasmuch as it is founded on a general comprehensive view of the subject, rather than on philosophical definitions."

(3) Thus Gregory of Nazianzum Orat. xxxiii. p. 536. numbered speculations on the death of Christ among those things, on which it is useful to have correct ideas, but not dangerous to be mistaken, and placed them on the same level with questions concerning the creation of the world, the nature of matter and of the soul, the resurrection, general judgment, etc. Comp. Baur, p. 109.—Eusebius of Cæsarea demonstr. evang. iv. 12. merely enumerates various reasons for the death of Christ, without bringing them into connection. Christ died, 1. In order to prove, that he is Lord both over the quick and the dead; 2. To redeem from sin; 3. To atone for sin; 4. To destroy the power of Satan; 5. To give his disciples a visible evidence of the reality of the life to come (by his resurrection); and, 6. To abrogate the sacrifices of the Old Test. dispensation.

The more anxious theologians were to adduce the reasons which induced Christ to lay down his life, the more natural was it, to ask whether God could have accomplished the work of redemption in any other way? Augustine rejects such idle questions in the manner of Irenæus, de agone christiano c. 11: Sunt autem stulti, qui dicunt, non poterat aliter sapientia Dei homines liberare, nisi susciperet hominem et nascetur ex femina et a peccatoribus omnia illa pateretur? Quibus dicimus, poterat omnino, sed si aliter faceret, similiter vestra stultitia disipiceret. Further particulars may be found in Münser, Handbuch-iv. p. 292 ss. Baur p. 85. Rufinus gives a mystical interpretation of the various separate sufferings of Christ, expos. symb. ap. p. 22 ss.

Concerning the extent of the atonement it may be observed, that Didymus of Alexandria (on 1 Peter, in Galland Bibl. PP. T. iv. p. 325: Pacificavit enim Jesus per sanguinem crucis sae quae in coelis et quae in terra sunt, omne bellum destruens et tumultum), and Gregory of Nyssa in some sense (Orat. catech. c. 25. where he speaks of χαίρεται λεγών revived the idea of Origen, that the effects of Christ’s death were not limited to this world, but extended over the whole universe; Gregory also asserted, that the work of redemption would not have been necessary, if all men had been as holy as Moses, Paul, Ezekiel, Elijah and Isaiah, (contra Apollin. iii. p. 263.) The opposite view was taken by Augustine who, in accordance with his theory, thought that all men stood in need of redemption, but limited the extent of the atonement; comp. the former sections on the doctrine of original sin, and on predestination, and contra Julian vi. c. 24. Leo the Great on the contrary enlarged the extent of the atonement. Ep. 134. c. 14.: Effusio sanguinis Christi pro injustis tam fuit doves ad pretium, ut si universitas captivorum in redemptorem suum crederet, nullum diaboli vincula retinenter.—
A dramatic representation of the *descensus ad inferos* in imitation of the Evang. Nicodemi is given in the discourse: *de adventu et annunciatione Joannis (Baptisto) apud inferos*, commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emisa; comp. also Epiphanius in *seplur. Christi*, Opp. ii. p. 270. Augusti’s edition of Euseb. of Emisa, p. 1 ss. On the question whether the system of Apollinaris caused the introduction of the said doctrine into the Apostles’ Creed? as well as concerning the relation in which they stood to each other, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 923.

Lastly, the appropriation of the merits of Christ on the part of the individual Christian is connected with what has been said before, and with the anthropological definitions (§ 107—114.) Comp. Münscber, Handbuch iv. p. 295. 319.

§ 135.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

Two causes contributed to determine the doctrine of the church: 1. The external history of the church itself, its victory over paganism, and its rising power under the protection of the state. 2. The victory of Augustinism over the doctrines of the Pelagians,¹ Manichaeans,² and Donatists,³ which in different ways threatened to destroy ecclesiastical unity. The last mentioned resembled the followers of Novatian in the preceding period, by maintaining that the church was composed only of saints. In opposition to them *Optatus of Mileve*,⁴ as well as *Augustine*, asserted that the church consists of the sum total of all who are baptized, and, spiritualizing that which existed in reality, they advanced the idea of a universal Christian church. The bishops of Rome applied this idea to the papal system,⁵ and thus prepared the way for the hierarchy of the middle ages. But however different the opinions of the men of those times were respecting the place and nature of the true church, the proposition laid down by former theologians: that *there is no salvation out of the church*, was firmly adhered to, and carried out in all its consequences.⁶

¹ The Pelagians were in so far opposed to the church, as they considered only the *individual* Christian as such, and
overlooked the mysterious connection between the individual and the totality. Their strict notions of morality led necessarily to Puritanism; hence the synod of Diospolis (A.D. 415) blamed them for having said, ecclesiam hic esse sine macula et ruga. Aug. de gestis Pelagii c. 12. Before this time some Christians in Sicily who, generally speaking, agreed with the Pelagians, had asserted: Ecclesiam hanc esse, quae nunc frequentatur populis et sine peccato esse posse. Aug. ep. clvi.

(2) The Manichæans by separating the Electi from the rest (Auditores) gave countenance to the principle of an ecclesiola in ecclesia; besides the great body of the Manichæan church itself formed, as the one elect world of light, a contrast with the vast mass of darkness. "The Manichæan church is in relation to the world what the limited circle of the Electi is in relation to the larger assembly of the Auditores; that which is yet variously divided and separated in the latter, has its central-point of union in the former." Baur, Manich. Religionssystem. p. 282.

(3) On the external history of the Donatists comp. the works on ecclesiastical history. Sources: Optatus Milevitanus (about the year 368) de schismate Donatistarum, together with Monumenta vett. ad Donatist. hist. pertinentia ed. L. E. du Pin. Par. 1700 ss. Opp. Aug. T. ix. Valesius, de schism. Donat. in an appendix to Eusebius. Norisius (edited by Ballerini brothers) Ven. 1729. iv. fol. Walch Ketzergeschichte, vol. iv. Concerning the derivation of the name (whether from Donatus a casis nigris, or from Donat. M. ?) see Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 1. p. 407. The question at issue, viz. whether Cecilian could be invested with the episcopal office, having been elected by a traditor, and the election of another bishop in the person of Majorinus, led to further dogmatic discussions on the purity of the church. The church in their opinion ought to be pure (sine macula et ruga.) It must therefore exercise no forbearance towards any unworthy members (1 Cor. v. and especially many passages from the Old Test.) When the opponents of the Donatists appealed to the parable of the tares and the wheat (Matth. xiii.) the latter applied it (according to our Saviour's own interpretation) to the world, and not to the church. Augustine however asserted, mundum ipsum appellatum esse pro ecclesiae nomine.

(4) Concerning the opinions of Optatus (which are stated in
the second book of his treatise: *de schismate Donatistarum*; see *Rothe*, Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche p. 677 ss. He further developed the views of Cyprian. There is but one church. It has five ornamenta or dotes: 1. Cathedra (the unity of episcopacy in the Cathedra Petri), 2. Angelus (the bishop himself), 3. Spiritus Sanctus, 4. Fons (baptism), 5. Sigillum, i.e. Symbolum catholicum (according to Sol. Song. iv. 12.) These dotes are distinguished from the sancta membra ac viscera of the church, which appear to him of greater importance than the dotes themselves. They consist in the sacramentis et nominibus Trinitatis.

(A) Augustine composed a separate treatise entitled *de unitate ecclesiae*, on this subject.—Comp. contra Ep. Parmeniani and de baptismo. He proceeded no less than the Donatists on the principle of the purity of the church, and advocated a rigorous exercise of ecclesiastical discipline; but this should not lead to the depopulation of the church. Some elements enter into the composition of the house of God which do not form the structure of the house itself; some members of the body may be diseased without its being thought necessary to cut them off at once, though the disease itself belongs no more to the body than the chaff which is mixed up with wheat forms a part of it. Augustine makes a distinction between the corpus Domini verum and the corpus D. permixtum seu simulatum (de doctr. christ. iii. 32.) which stands in connection with his negative view concerning the nature of evil. The grammarians *Tichonius* adopted an intermediate course, see Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 445. The necessity of being externally connected with the church is set forth by Augustine in the same manner as by Tertullian and Cyprian, de unit. eccles. c. 49: Habere caput Christum nemo poterit, nisi qui in ejus corpore fuerit, quod est ecclesia. Ep. c. xli. § 5: Quisquis ab hac catholica ecclesia fuerit separatus, quantumlibet laudabiler se vivere existimet, hoc solo scelere quod a Christi unitate disjunctus est, non habebit vitam, sed Dei ira manebit super eum.

(A1) Leo M. Sermo. i. in natale Apostolorum Petri et Pauli: Ut inenarrabilia gratiae per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia praeparavit, etc. Comp. Sermo ii.: Transivit quidem in Apostolos alios vis illius potestatis, sed non frustra unui commendatur, quod omnibus intime tur. Manet ergo Petri privilegium, etc.
Lactantius makes the same assertion, though he does not in all respects agree with the Catholic church: Instit. div. iii. 30.—iv. 14. ab init.: Hæc est domus fidelis, hoc immortale templum, in quo si quis non sacrificaverit, immortalitatis premium non habebit. Rufinus however does not yet advocate fides in Ecclesiam, and thus most clearly distinguishes faith in the church from faith in God and Christ. Expos. fid. 26. 27. Heretics were thought beyond the pale of the church, but not beyond that of Christianity. Augustine calls them quoquomodo Christiani. Aug. de civ. Dei 18. c. 51. Comp. Marheinecke (in Daubs Studien, l. c.) p. 186.

§ 136.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The holy sacraments, the idea of which was more precisely defined and circumscribed in this period, were regarded as the instruments by means of which the church exerts an influence upon the individual Christian, and transmits the fulness of Divine life, which dwells within it, to the members. Augustine saw in them the mysterious union of the (transcendent) Word with the external (visible) element, but expressed no definite opinion respecting the number of sacraments. Pseudo-Dionysius (who lived in the fifth century) spoke of six ecclesiastical mysteries; but even during the present period the greatest importance was still attached to baptism and the Lord's Supper.


(2) Augustine reckoned not only matrimony ("sacramentum nuptiarum") holy orders, ("sacramentum dandi baptismum"), but occasionally also other ceremonies among the sacraments (the
word taken in a more comprehensive sense), since he understood by sacramentum omne mysticum sacramque signum. Thus he calls de peccat. orig. c. 40. exorcism, the casting out, and the renunciation of the devil at baptism, and even the rites of the Old Testament sacraments: circumcisionis carnis, sabbatum temporale, neomenia, sacrificia atque omnes hujusmodi innumeræ observationes. Expos. epist. ad Galat. c. iii. 19. (Opp. iii. P. ii. p. 692.) Comp. Wiggers, Augustin und Pel. vol. i. p. 9. note. That he so constantly adopted the number four may perhaps be explained from the general preference which he gave to Aristotelianism (c. ep. Parm. ii. c. 13.) Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1382. 83.

(3) De hier. eccles. c. 2—7. 1. Baptism (μ. φωνίσματος), 2. The Lord's Supper (μ. συνάξεως, ὕπ' αὐν καινωνίας), 3. Unction (confirmation? μ. τελεσθής μύρου), 4. Holy Orders (μ. τῶν ἱερατικῶν τελεσθέων), 5. Monachism (μ. μοναχικῆς τελεσθέως), which afterwards ceased to be reckoned among the sacraments, 6. The rites performed on the dead (μ. ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κεκοιμημένων) (they were not the same with the unctio extrema, as the unction in question was not applied to dying persons, but to the corpse; yet there was some analogy between the one and the other.) Matrimony, on the other hand, which Augustine mentioned, was wanting in this list.

(4) This was done, e. g. by Augustine, Sermo 218. 14: quod latus, lancea percussum, in terram sanguinem et aquam manavit, procul dubio sacramenta sunt, quibus formatur ecclesia. (de Symb. ad catech. c. 6.), and by Chrysostom in Joh. hom. 85. (Opp. T. viii. p. 545.) who adopted the same interpretation. On the relation in which the sacraments of the New Testament were supposed to stand to those of the Old, see Augustine de vera rel. c. 17.

§ 137.

BAPTISM.

The notions formed in the preceding period concerning the high importance and efficacy of baptism were more fully developed in the present, especially by Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of
Nyssa, and defined with more dogmatic precision by Augustine.

Neither the baptism of blood, nor that of tears lost its significance. The theologians of the Greek church zealously defended infant-baptism, while Augustine brought it into more intimate connection with the doctrine of original sin (in opposition to the Pelagians), and adduced it as an additional proof of the said doctrine. Salvation was denied to unbaptized children.

Concerning the baptism of heretics Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzum followed the views of Cyprian on this point, though Gregory did not make the validity of baptism depend on the dignity of the person that performs the ceremony of baptism. But by the exertions of Augustine the mode adopted by the Romish church became with certain modifications the prevalent one. The Donatists continued to insist upon the necessity of re-baptizing heretics. The baptism of the Manichæans consisted in a kind of lustration altogether different from the baptism of the Catholic church. Among the strict Arians the Eunomians were distinguished from the orthodox church by baptizing not in the name of the Trinity, but in the name of Christ.

BAPTISM.

He also repeated the appellations formerly used, such as λούτρον, σφαγίς, etc. "The following is the principal thought, on which this abundance of names is founded: all the blessings of Christianity appear concentrated in one point in baptism, and are dispensed, as it were, all together in one moment; but all these names can only in so far be applied to baptism, as the person to be baptized possesses the right disposition, without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven." Ullmann, p. 461., where the other passages bearing on this subject are given. In order to prove the necessity of baptism, Gregory further speaks of a three-fold birth of man, (Or. 40. 2. ab init.), viz. natural birth (τῆς ζωμάτων), that through baptism, and that through the resurrection. The first of these is brought about in the night, is slavish and connected with lusts (νυκτερινῇ τῇ ἀπειρῇ καὶ δολῇ καὶ ἰμπαθής), the second is as clear as daylight and free, delivers from lusts, and elevates to a higher, spiritual life (ὅ δέ ἡμερῇ καὶ ἠλιακῇ καὶ λυτικῇ παρών, τῶν το αὐτὸ γενέσθως κάλυμμα περιτίμιωσα, καὶ φῶς τῆν ἀνω ζωὴν ισανάγονα.) On Basil the Great comp. Klose, p. 67 ss.; on Gregory of Nyssa see Rupp, p. 232 ss. comp. also Cyrill Hier. Cat. xvii. c. 37; he ascribed to baptism not only the virtue of taking away sin (from the negative point of view), but also that of elevating the powers of man to a miraculous height. Cat. iii. 3. xix. xx. Cyr. Alex. Comm. in Joh. Opp. T. iv. p. 147.

(2) Aug. Ep. 98. 2.: Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiae et spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiae, solvens vinculum culpae, reconcilians bonum nature, regenerant hominem in uno Christo, ex uno Adam generatum. Concupiscencia remains even in those who are baptized, though their guilt is pardoned, de nupt. et concup. i. 18. (c. 25.)—He who is not baptized cannot obtain salvation. As for the thief who was admitted by Christ into paradise without baptism, Augustine supposed that he was baptized with blood, instead of water; or he might have been baptized with the water which flowed from the side of Jesus (!), unless it were assumed that he had received baptism at some former time; de anima et ejus origine i. 11. (c. 9.) ii. 14. (c. 10.) 16. (c. 12.) According to Leo the Great the baptismal water which is filled with the Holy Ghost, is in relation to the regenerate man, what the womb of the Virgin filled with the same Spirit was in relation to the sinless Redeem-
er, to whom she gave birth. Sermo 24. 3. 25. 5. (in Griesbach, p. 153.)

(4.) Thus Gregory of Nazianzum adds a fourth baptism to the three already mentioned (viz. the baptisms of Moses, John, and Christ), that of martyrdom and of blood with which Christ himself was baptized; this baptism surpasses the others, in proportion as it is free from sin. Yea (he adds) I know even a fifth, viz. that of tears (τὰ τῶν δακρύων), but it is still more difficult, because it is necessary to wet one's couch every night with tears. Orat. xxxix. 17. p. 688. But......“ how many tears have we to shed, before they equal the flood of the baptismal bath?” Orat. lx. 9. p. 696. Ullmann, p. 459. 465. 480.

(4) Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. lx.) opposed the delay of baptism, which was founded partly on deference paid to the sacrament, partly on incorrect views and immoral tendencies, partly on absurd prejudices. Comp. Ullmann, p. 466 ss. Concerning the baptism of infants, he declared (Ullm. p. 713.) “ that it was better that they should be sanctified without their own consciousness, than that they should depart being neithersealed, norconsecrated,” (ἡ ἀπελθών ἀπεφάγησα καὶ ἀπίλεντα.) In support of his view he appealed to the rite of circumcision which was performed on the eighth day (comp. the opinion of Fidus § 72. 6.), the striking of the blood on the door-posts, etc. Gregory nevertheless thought that healthy children might wait till the third year, or somewhere there about, because they would be able then to hear and to utter something of the words (µυστικῶν τι) used at the performance of the rite, though they might not perfectly understand them, but get rather a general impression of them. His judgment however was mild concerning those children who die before baptism, because he well distinguished between intentional and unintentional delay. Yet he did not think that they would obtain perfect salvation. Comp. Ullmann, l. c.

(5) That Gregory did not, like Augustine, suppose an intimate connection between baptism and original sin, is evident from

* Comp. e. g. the Confession of Augsburg, i. c. 11. Gregory of Nyssa also opposed the delay in a separate discourse πεὶς τῶν βεβλήσων εἰς τὰ βαπτισμάτων. Opp. T. ii. p. 215. Chrysostom uses similar language. Comp. Neander, Chrysostomus, i. p. 6. and 74—77. A. F. Büsching, de procrastinatione baptismi apud veteres ejusque causis. Halæ, 1747. 4.
his assertion (Orat. 40. quoted by Ullmann, p. 476.), that sins committed by children from ignorance, could not be imputed to them on account of their tender age. Comp. what Chrysostom said on this subject according to the quotation of Julian given by Neander Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 138.: hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coquinitati peccato, ut eis addatur sanctitas, justitia, adoptio, hereditas, fraternitas Christi, ut eis membra sint; the opinions of Theodore of Mopsuestia are also stated there. Augustine did not combat the Pelagians because they rejected baptism, but because they did not draw the same inferences from the rite in question, which he drew from it. The Pelagians admitted that the design of baptism was the remissio peccatorum, but they understood by it the remission of future sins. Julian went so far as to anathematize those who did not acknowledge the necessity of infant-baptism. Opus imp. contra Jul. iii. 149. "Though the Pelagians might have been easily induced by their principles to ascribe a merely symbolical significance to baptism, as an external rite, yet in this, as well as in many other respects, they could not develop their system entirely independent of the ecclesiastical tradition of their age; they endeavoured therefore to reconcile it in the best possible manner with their principles, which owed their origin to quite different causes." Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1389.

Concerning infants that die without being baptized, Pelagius expressed himself in cautious terms (quo non eant, scio, quo eant, nescio). Ambrose de Abrah. ii. 11. had previously taught: Nemo ascendit in regnum caelorum, nisi per sacramentum baptismatis......Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Utique nullum excipit, non infantem, non aliqua preventum necessitate. Habebat tamen illam opertam pœnarum immunitatem, nescio an habebant regni honorem. Comp. Wiggers i. p. 422. Augustine's views on this point were at first milder; de libero arb. iii. c. 23. but afterwards he was compelled by the consequences of his own system to use harsher expressions. His line of argu-

*a* Neander traces the difference of opinion existing between the eastern and the western church with regard to baptism, to their different mode of viewing the doctrine of redemption; the former regarded rather the positive, the latter the negative aspect.
ment is as follows: Every man is born in sin, and stands therefore in need of pardon. He obtains it by baptism; it cleanses children from original sin, and those who are baptized in later years, not only from original sin, but also from actual transgressions. (Enchir. ad Laurent. 43.) Since baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation (comp. note 2.), it follows that unbaptized children are condemned (this fully accorded with his views on predestination). He was nevertheless disposed to look upon this condemnation as mitissima and tolerabilior (Ep. 186. 27. [c. 8.] de pecc. mer. i. 28. [c. 20.]), though he opposed the doctrine condemned by the synod of Carthage (A. D. 419.) of an intermediate state in which unbaptized infants were said to be. Comp. Sermo 294: Hoc novum in ecclesia, prius inauditum est, esse salutem aeternam praeter regnum caelorum, esse salutem aeternam praeter regnum Dei. With regard to baptized children, Augustine, as well as the catholic church in general, supposed (the former in accordance with his idealistic doctrine of the church) that the church represents (by means of the godfathers and godmothers) the faith of the children. "His view seems to have been somewhat as follows: As the child is nourished by the natural powers of his mother after the flesh, before his bodily, independent existence is fully developed, so is he nourished by the higher powers of his spiritual mother, the church, before he has attained unto independent spiritual development and self-consciousness. This idea would be true to a certain extent, if the visible church corresponded to its ideal." Neander, Kirchengesch. p. 1394.

(7.) Basil Ep. can. i. declared the baptism of heretics void at least when its mode differed from that of the catholic church, or when a different meaning was attached to it; thus he rejected the baptism of the Montanists, because they understood Montanus to be the paraclete. But he was disposed to admit dissenters without baptism, and as a general rule advised to comply with the custom of each separate church.—Gregory of Nazianzum rejected the baptism of notorious heretics (τῶν παρακλητῶν κατηγορούμενων.) Generally speaking he did not make the efficacy of baptism depend on the external merit of the church, or the inherent moral desert (ἀξιωτικία) of the person to be baptized.—He illustrated this by the case of two rings, the one made of gold, the other of brass, both of which bear the same stamp. Orat. 40. in Ullmann p. 473—75.
De baptismo contra Donatistas lib. vii. (in Opp. Ben. Tom. ix.). It is interesting to see how Augustine seeks to justify Cyprian, from whom he differs; the passages are given in Münscher edit. by von Cölln p. 477.— The limitation spoken of was, that the rite of baptism, if performed out of the catholic church, might be considered valid, but that so far from proving a blessing to the baptized, it would increase their guilt, if they did not afterwards join the catholic church. Thus "the exclusiveness of the catholic church, which seemed to be objected to on the one hand, was carried to an extreme length on the other." Rothe, Anfänge der christlichen Kirche p. 685— The ceremony of laying up of hands was also performed on the converts. Leo the Great insisted upon this point, Ep. 159, 7. 166, 2. 167, 18. (Griesbach p. 155.)

(a) They were condemned by the Conc. Arcl. 314. can. 8. Opt. Mil. de schism. Donat. v. c. 3:...Quid vobis (Donatistis) visum est, non post nos, sed post Trinitatem baptisma geminare? cujus de sacramento non leve certamen innatum est, et dubitatur an post Trinitatem in eadem Trinitate hoc iterum licet facere. Vos dicitis: licet; nos dicimus: non licet. Inter licet vestrum et non licet nostrum natant et remigant animae populorum.

(10) Concerning the baptism of the Manicheans, on which we have but scanty information, comp. Baur, manich. Religions-system, p. 273.

(11) Socrat. v. 24 blamed the Eunomians, because........ το βάπτισμα σαρκοχάραξαν ο γὰρ εἰς τρίαδα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν Χριστοῦ βαπτιζομενόν. They probably avoided the use of the common formula, which Eunomius elsewhere adduces as a proof that the Spirit is the third person, in order to prevent the unlearned from forming any incorrect views concerning the Trinity. Comp. Klose, Eunomius p. 32. Rudelbach, über die Sacraments-worte, p. 25. According to Sozom. vi. 26. the Eunomians are said to have re baptized all who joined their party.
§ 138.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.


The mysterious connection supposed to exist between the two natures of Christ, corresponded to the idea of a mystical connection subsisting between the body of Christ and the bread used in the Lord's Supper on the one hand, and between his blood and the wine on the other.\(^1\) This idea, which had taken its rise in the preceding period, was now farther carried out by means of the more fully developed terminology of the church, and by the introduction of liturgical formulae, which substituted mystical ceremonies for the simple apostolical rite.\(^2\) The doctrine of the consubstantiality of Christ's body and blood with the visible elements, was generally held during this period both by the Greek and Latin churches, though some writers spoke of a real change from the one into the other.\(^3\) Theodoret brought most prominently forward the symbolical import of this ordinance—a view which some other Fathers adopted along with the realistic mode of interpretation,\(^4\) while Augustine sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical.\(^5\) He also offered a firm opposition\(^6\) to the superstitious reverence which many writers of the present age seemed disposed to pay to the sacrament in question.\(^7\) Gelasius, bishop of Rome, spoke very decidedly against the idea of a real change.\(^8\) The notion of a daily repeated sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of Gregory the Great.\(^9\)

\(^{1}\) The controversy respecting the natures of Christ may be said to be repeated in the different views on the Lord's Supper
but the human nature in the former, is represented by the visible element (the bread) in the latter, and the Divine nature in the former, by the body of Christ in the latter, which, properly speaking, formed a part of his humanity.—The doctrine of transubstantiation properly speaking, (as it was afterwards held by the Romish church), is essentially Docetic, inasmuch as the elements are nothing but a mere deception of the senses. That view of the ordinance in question which considers it as a purely external and symbolical rite, (the notion of the Socinians in later times) savours of Ebionitism. The speculative distinction between the sign and the thing which it is meant to teach (the view taken by the Reformed church), is allied to Nestorianism (especially the mode in which it was represented by Zuingle). The doctrine of consubstantiation which prevailed in the present period, and was afterwards in substance adopted by Luther, would remind us of the orthodox doctrine as propounded in the canons of the synod of Chalcedon, if it might not with more propriety be compared with Eutychianism and Monophysitism, which were in their time but the extremes of orthodox christology. In the said controversy, as well as in the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, attempts at harmonizing the various modes of interpretation might easily lead to heretical notions (thus the Calvinistic view.)

(a) On such names as καιρεία ἀνάμακτος, Ἰσια τοῦ ἰλασμοῦ (Cyrill Myst. V.), ἰςουγία, μετάλης τῶν ἄγιαμάτων, ἄγια τράπεζα, ἱρόδιον (in reference to the administration of the Lord’s Supper to the sick), as well as on the formulae commonly used in connection with the rite of consecration, comp. Suicer, Thesaurus sub vocib. ; Toutée in Diss. ad Cyr. Hier. 3. p. cexxxiii. ss. Marheinecke l. c. p. 33. ss. Augusti, Archæologie vol. viii. p. 32 ss.

(a) Cyrill of Jerusalem so connected (Cat. xxii. § 6.) the miracle performed at the marriage at Cana with the μεταβολή of the elements used in the Lord’s Supper, that we cannot help thinking that he believed in a real and total change, the more so as he added: οἱ γὰς καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις σοι τοῦτο ὑπεδάλλη ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σοι βιβαίωτων μὴ ἀνὰ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πράγμα, ἀλλ’ ἀνὰ τῆς πίστεως θηρωφορίας ἀνευδόκισθες, αἵματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθής; and yet he said § 3.: ἵν τοῦτο ἄρτου διδοτι σοι τὸ αἷμα etc. But as he spoke (Cat. xxii. 3.) of a similar change effected in the oil which was used at the performance of the rite of consecration, with-
out intimating his belief in a real metaphysical change of the substance of the oil into the substance of the Holy Spirit, we may suppose, that his highly rhetorical language meant to teach nothing, but that the inferior is changed into the superior. Comp. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1396. But Cyrill undoubtedly supposed a real union of the communicants with Christ (σύναψαν καὶ σώματι Χριστοῦ, χριστοφόρον γινώμεθα), and thought that we participate in the nature of Christ by the assimilation of his body and blood to our members, etc. Cat. xxiii.—Gregory of Nyssa draws a parallel between the physical preservation of man by physical food, and his spiritual subsistence by the participation of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It is the most effectual antidote of the consequence of sin, viz. mortality. The passages bearing on this point (from Cat. 37.) are given by Müncher ed. by von Cölln i. p. 499. 500. Rupp, p. 238 ss. Gregory used the terms μετασκευάζομαι, μετατρέπομαι, μεταστρογχυωνυῖα τῆς φύσεως τῶν φανερῶν in a sense similar to that of Cyrill. comp. Rupp p. 240 note, and Neander l. c. p. 1397. 98.

—Chrysostom regards the institution of the Lord's Supper as a proof of the highest love of the Redeemer to mankind, inasmuch as he not only gave them an opportunity of seeing him, but also enabled them to touch him, and to partake of his body, hom. 45 in Joh. (Opp. T. viii. p. 292.) He too teaches a real union of the communicants with Christ: ἀναφέρω εἰςην οὐ, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως μονον, ἐκλαυντὸς τῷ πράγματι σῶμα ἠμᾶς αὐτῷ κατακεκνᾶς. Hom. 83 in Matth. (Opp. T. vii. p. 869). comp. hom. 24. in Ep. ad Cor. (Opp. T. ix. p. 257) and other passages quoted by Marheinecke l. c. p. 44. Yet the manner in which Chrysostom speaks of the relation in which the spiritual (νοητὰ) stands to the sensuous (αἰσθητὰ), and the comparison which he draws between the Lord's Supper and baptism, seem to be opposed to the notion of a real change. “If we were incorporeal, Christ would nourish us with incorporeal things (ἀσώματα); but since the soul is tied to the body, God gives us in αἰεθητοῖς τὰ νοητά.” Comp. the passage on Matth. before cited, and Müncher ed. by von Cölln p. 502. Hilary de Trin. viii. 13. says in reference to Christ: naturam carnii suse ad naturam steternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit, that which Irenæus calls ἐν σώματι αἰεθητοῖς. Ambrose (de initiandis mysteriis c. 8. and 9.) regards the Lord's Supper as the living bread which came down from heaven (John vi. 51.), and is none
other but Christ himself. If blessings pronounced by men (viz. the prophets of the Old Test.), possessed the power of changing the natural elements, how much more must the same be true in reference to the sacrament? Quod si tantum valuit Sermo Elia ut ignem de coelo promeret, non valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum? All things are created by the Word (Christ); to effect a simple change (mutatio) cannot be too difficult to him, who is the author of creation. The body which was in a miraculous way brought forth by the Virgin, is at the same time the body of the sacrament. Nevertheless he says (in contradiction to the assumption of a real change): Ante benedictionem verborum coelestium species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus Christi significatur, and in reference to the wine: ante consecrationem alius dicitur, post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur. (But it ought not to be forgotten, that critical doubts have been raised respecting the genuineness of this book).

The above passages sufficiently show that the symbolical interpretation accompanied the realistic, or rather that they passed over into each other, without the sign and the thing represented by it being always distinctly separated. Eusebius of Cesarea however was led by his Origenistic principles to distinguish between the figurative and the real, Demonstr. evangel. i. 10. and Theol. eccles. iii. 12. Neander, Kirchengesch. p. 1403. Athanasius too attempted a spiritual interpretation of the eating of the body and the drinking of the blood of Christ, ep. iv. ad Serap. (in Neander l. c. p. 1399.); and Gregory of Nazianzum called the bread and wine symbols and types (avrwyra) of the great mysteries, Orat. xvii. 12. p. 325. Ullmann p. 484. Neander quotes p. 1397. a fragment of a letter addressed by Chrysostom to Cesarius, a monk, the authenticity of which he questions. If it were genuine, it would prove that Chrysostom, as well as his disciple Nilus, made a clear distinction between the symbol and the thing represented by it. The latter compared, Lib. i. ep. 44. (see Neander l. c.) the bread which has been consecrated, to a document which having been confirmed by the emperor, is called Sacra. The distinction made by Theodoret between the sign and the thing

* Comp. Suicer, Thes. T. i. p. 383 ss. and Ullmann l. c. who oppose the interpretation of Elias Cretensis.
signified, was intimately connected with the similar distinction, which he drew between the human and the Divine natures of Christ, (comp. note 1.) Dial. ii. Opp. iv. p. 126.: 

(5) Augustine, in interpreting the words pronounced by our Saviour at the institution of this ordinance, reminds us of their figurative import, contra Adimant. c. 12. 3. According to him the language of John vi. is highly figurative, contra advers. leg. et prophetar. ii. c. 9. (The controversy in which he was engaged with the Manichaeans led him to defend the figurative style of the Old Test. by adducing similar examples from the New.) He even supposed that the characteristic feature of the sacraments consists in this, that they are symbolical rites, Ep. 98, 9.: 

Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quorum sacramento sunt, non habercnt, omnino sacramenta non essent. 

Ex hac autem similitudine plerunque etiam ipsarum rerum nominia accipiunt. The sacrament in question is the body of Christ secundum quendam modum, but not absolutely, and its participation is a communicatio corporis et sanguinis ipsius (Ep. 54, 1.), comp. de doctr. chr. iii. 10. 16. Marheinecke, p. 56 ss. Neander l. c. p. 1400.—On the connection subsisting between the notions of Augustine concerning the Lord's Supper, and those respecting baptism, comp. Wiggers ii. p. 146; on the connection subsisting between the former opinions and his views on the sacraments in general comp. § 137. note 2.

(6) Aug. de trin. iii. 10.: possunt habere honorem tamquam religiosa, sed non stuporem tamquam mira.

(7) Thus Gregory of Nazianzum himself believed in the supernatural effects of the Lord's Supper. Orat. viii. 17. 18. p. 228. 229. and Ep. 240. Ullmann, p. 483. 84.—On the communion of children, which was common in the Latin church, comp. the works on antiquities.

(8) Gelas. de duab. natur. in Christo, Bibl. max. PP. T. viii. p. 703. (quoted by Meyer, p. 34. Mün scher edit. by von Colln, p. 504.): Certe sacramenta, que sumimus, corporis et sanguinis
Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinae effici-mur participes nature et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in indivam transeant, Sancto Spiritu periciente, substantiam, permanente tamen in sue proprietate natura, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter representant. (3)

After the example of Cyprian, the idea of a sacrifice is distinctly set forth by most of the Fathers of this period. Thus by Gregory of Nazianzum Orat. ii. 95. p. 56. Ullmann, p. 483. and Basil the Great, Ep. 93. (though without any more precise definition Klose, p. 72.) But Gregory the Great speaks more distinctly Moral. Lib. xxii. 26. of a quotidianum immolationis sacrificium.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.

§ 139.

MILLENNARIANISM.—THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

The contest which Origen had fought against the advocates of Millenarianism, was soon after his death decided in his favour. It was his disciple, Dionysius of Alexandria, who succeeded more by persuasion, than by force, in imposing silence on the followers of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, who, adhering to the letter of Scripture, were opposed to all allegorical interpretation, and had the presbyter Coracion for their leader after the death of Nepos. (1) Millenarianism was from that time supported by but a few of the eastern theologians. (2) In the West the millenarian notions were advocated by Lactantius, (3) but combated by Augustine, who had once himself entertained similar views. (4) It was very natural that Christianity should confidently expect a longer ex-
istence on earth, after it had become connected with the state, and been permanently established. Thus the period of Christ’s second coming, and the destruction of the world, was deferred from time to time, and it was only extraordinary events that caused men for a season to look forward to these events as nigh at hand.—The notion of Marcellus, that Christ’s heavenly kingdom itself will at some period come to an end (according to 1 Cor. xv. 25.), forms a remarkable parallel to Millenniumism. (a)


(3) Methodius, who was in part an opponent of Origen, proposed millennial notions in his treatise entitled the feast of the ten virgins (a dialogue on chastity), which was composed in imitation of Plato’s Symposium. Orat. ix. § 5. (in Combesii Auctuar. noviss. Bibl. PP. Græc. Pars. i. p. 109.) Neander, Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1233. According to Epiph. haer. 72. p. 1013. (comp. Hier. in Jes. Lib. xviii.) Apollinaris too held millennial notions, and wrote a treatise in 2 books against Dionysius, which met with great success at the time: Quem non solum (says Jerome l. c.) suas sectae homines, sed nostrorum in hac parte duntaxat plurima sequitur multipuludo. Concerning the millennial views of Bar Sudaili, abbot of Edessa in Mesopotamia towards the close of the fifth century, comp. Neander l. c. ii. 3. p. 1181.

(3) Inst. vii. 14—26. c. 14: Sicut Deus sex dies in tantis rebus fabricandis laboravit, ita et religio ejus et veritas in his sex millibus annorum laboravit necesse est, malitia prævalente ac dominante. Et rursus, quoniam perfectis oporibus requievit die septimo eumque benedixit, necesse est, ut in fine sexti millesimi anni malitia omnis aboleatur et terra et regnet per annos mille justitia, sitque tranquillitas et requies a laboribus, quos mundus jamdiu perfert. In the subsequent part of the chapter he gives a full description of the state of the political, the physical, and
the religious world antecedent to the millennial kingdom, and
appeals both to the Sibylline oracles and to the work of Hystaspes. Comp. Corrodi ii. p. 410. 423. 441. 455.

(4) Sermo 159. (Opp. T. v. p. 1060.) which may be compared
with de civ. Dei xx. 7......Quæ opinio esset utcunque tolerabilis,
si aliquæ deliciae spiritales in illo sabbato adfuturse sanctis per
Domini præsentiam crederentur. Nam etiam nos hoc opinati
fuimus aliquando. Sed cum eos qui tunc resurrexerint, dicant
immoderatissimis carnalibus epulis vacaturos, in quibus cibus sit
tantus ac potus, ut non solum nullam modestiam teneant, sed
modum quoque ipsius incredulitatis excedant: nullo modo ista
possunt, nisi a carnalibus credi. Hi autem, qui spiritales sunt,
istos ista credentes κηνονοὺς appellant greco vocabulo, quos ver-
bumb e verbo exprimentes, nos possumus Milliarios nuncupare.
The passages in the book of Revelation bearing on this subject
are expounded in the subsequent chapters.

(4) Comp. the works on Marcellus quoted § 92. 6. Klose, p. 42.
es, and the passages cited by him. Cyrill of Jerusalem Cat. xv.
27. (14. Milles) combating this opinion, appeals to the words of
the angel (Luke i. 33.), and of the prophets (Dan. vii. 13, 14.
etc.); in reference to 1 Cor. xv. 25. he asserts that the term
includesthe terminus ad quem.—Klose, p. 82. questions
whether Photinus adopted the views of Marcellus.

§ 140.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The notion of a two-fold resurrection founded on the
language of the book of Revelation, was still held by
Lactanius, (1) but afterwards shared the fate of Millen-
narianism.(2) Though Methodius had combated Origen's
idealistic doctrine of the resurrection,(3) yet several of the
eastern theologians adopted it,(4) till the zealous follow-
ers of the Anti-origenist party succeeded in the ensuing
controversies in establishing their doctrine, that the body
raised from the tomb is in every respect the same as that
which formed in this life the organ of the soul. Jerome
even went so far as to make this assertion in reference
Augustine's views on this point were during the earlier part of his life more in accordance with the Platonico-Alexandrian mode of thinking; but afterwards he gave the preference to more sensuous notions, though he was at much pains to clear the doctrine in question as far as possible from all gross and carnal additions. Later definitions have reference rather to unessential points.

1. Inst. vii. 20.: Nec tamen universi tunc (i. e. at the commencement of the millennial reign) a Deo judicabuntur, sed ii tantum, qui sunt in Dei religione versati. comp. c. 26:...Eodem tempore (i. e. at the end of the world after the millennial reign) fier secunda illa et publica omnium resurrectio, in qua excita-buntur injusti ad cruciatus sempiternos.


4. Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, and partly also Basil the Great adopted the views of Origen. Thus Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. ii. 17. p. 20. and in other places) rested belief in immortality principally on this, that man, considered as a spiritual being, possesses a Divine, and consequently an immortal nature. The mortal body is that which perishes, but the soul is the breath of the Almighty, and the deliverance from the fetters of the body is the most essential point of future happiness. Ullmann, p. 501. 2. Similar expressions were used by Gregory of Nyssa de anima et resurrectione, Opp. T. iii. p. 181. (247.) Rupp. p. 187 ss. and Münscher, Handbuch. iv. p. 439. Both Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa compared e. g. the body of man to the coats of skins with which our first parents were clothed after the fall. Concerning the more indefinite views of Basil (Hom. viii. in Hexaëmeron, p. 78. and in famem p. 72.) see Klose, p. 77. Titus of Bostra (fragm. in Joh. Damasceni parallelis sacrí Opp. T. ii. p. 763.) propounded a more refined doctrine of the resurrection. Chrysostom, though
asserting the identity of the body, hom. x. in 2. Ep. ad Cor. (Opp. T. ix. p 603.), kept to the Pauline doctrine, and maintained in particular the difference between the present and the future body: οὐ δὲ μοι σκέτων χως δια τῶν ἱσομάτων δίκιως (ὁ Ἀπ.) τὴν ἰσόροιξ τῶν μικροτότων πρὸς τὰ παράνομα. εἰπὼν γὰς ἑστήμου (2 Cor. v. 1.) ἀντίσησε τὴν ὁμοιανίαν κ. κ. λ. Synesius, a Christian philosopher of Cyrene, frankly acknowledged that he could not adopt the popular notions on this point, (which some interpreted as a complete denial of the doctrine of the resurrection.) Comp. Evagr. hist. eccl. i. 15. and Ep. 105. ad Euoptium fratrem in the note of Vales on that passage.

Epiphanius, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Jerome may be considered as the representatives of this zealous party. The last two had themselves formerly entertained more liberal views, nor did Theophilus even afterwards hesitate to ordain Synesius to the office of bishop; see Münscher, Handbuch. iv. p. 442. But they opposed with especial vehemence John of Jerusalem and Rufinus. Jerome was by no means satisfied (Apol. contra Ruf. lib. 4. Op. T. ii. p. 145.) with the language of Rufinus, who asserted the resurrection hujus carnis, and still less with the cautious of John, who distinguished (rightly in the exegetical point of view) between flesh and body. Jerome therefore makes the following definite assertions (adv. errores Joann. Hier. ad Pam- mach. Opp. T. ii. p. 118 ss.) which he founds especially on Job xix. 26: caro est proprie, quae sanguine, venis, ossibus nervisque constringitur. Videbo autem in ista carne, quae me nunc cruciat, quae nunc prae dolore distillat. Idcircum Deum in carne conspiciam, quia omnes infirmitates meas sanavit.—And thus he says in reference to the resurrection-body: Habent dentes, ventrem, genitalia et tamen nec cibis nec uxoribus indigent. From the stridor dentium of the condemned he infers that we shall have teeth; the passage: Capilli capitis vestri numerati sunt, proves, in his opinion, that not even our hairs will be wanting. But his principal argument is founded on the identity of the body of believers with that of Christ. In reference to 1 Cor. xv. 50 he lays great stress upon the use of the term possidere regnum Dei, which he distinguishes from the resurrectio.

Augustine propounded the more liberal view: de fide et symb. c. 10: tempore immutationis angelicæ non jam caro erit
et sanguis, sed tantum corpus—in coelestibus nullo caro, sed corpora simplicia et lucida, quae appellat Ap. spiritualia, nonnulli autem vocant ætheria; the opposite view is set forth in his Retractiones p. 17. The whole doctrine is fully developed in: Enchirid. ad Laur. 84—92. and de civ. Dei xxii. c. 11—21: Erit ergo spiritui subdita caro spiritualis, sed tamen caro, non spiritus, sicut carni subditus fuit spiritus ipse carnalis, sed tamen spiritus, non caro. In reference to the general aspect of the doctrine he says ad Laur. c. 88 ss.: non perit Deo terræ materies, de qua mortalium creatur caro, sed in quemlibet pulvere solvatur, in quoalibet halitus aurasque diffugiat, in quamcunque aliorum corporum substantiam vel in ipsa elementa vertatur, in quorumcunque animalium etiam hominum cedat carnemque mutetur, illi animae humanæ puncto temporis redit, quæ illam primitus, ut homo fieret, cresceret, viveret, animavit; but this admits of some limitation: Ipsa itaque terræ materies, qua discendente anima fit cadaver, non ita resurrectione reparabitur, ut ea, quæ dilabuntur et in alias atque alias aliarum rerum species formasque vertuntur (quamvis ad corpus reedant, unde lapsa sunt) ad easdem quoque corporis partes, ubi fuerunt, redire necesse sit, (this would be impossible especially in the case of hairs and nails.) Sed quamadmodum si statua cujuslibet solubilis metalli aut igne liqueceret, aut contereretur in pulverem, aut confunderetur in massam, et eam vellet artifex ex illius materie quantitate reparare, nihil interesse ad ejus integritatem, quæ particula materiae cui membro status redderetur, dum tamen totum, ex quo constituta fuerat, restituta resumeret. Its Deus mirabiliter atque ineffabiliter artifex de toto, quo caro nostra constiterat, eam mirabiliter ineffabiliter celeritate restituet. Nec alicui attinebit ad ejus integrationem, utrum capilli ad capillos reedant et ungues ad ungues: an quicquid eorum perierat mutetur in carnem et in partes alius corporis revocetur, curante artificis providentia, ne quid indecens fiat. Nor is it necessary to suppose, that the differences of size and stature will continue in the life to come, but every thing will be restored in accordance with the Divine image. Resurgent igitur Sanctorum corpora sine ullo vitio, sine ulla deformitate, sicut sine ulla corruptione, onere, difficultate, etc. All will have the stature of the full-grown man, and as a general rule, will be thirty years old (the age of Christ), de civ. Dei lib. i. c. 12. He gives particular rules respecting
children, de civ. Dei lib. i. c. 14; the difference of sex, c. 17; concerning children born prematurely and lusus naturæ, ib. c. 13. and ad Laur. 85. 87. Nevertheless he says: Si quis in eo corporis modo, in quo defunctus est, resurrecturum unumquemque contendit, non est cum illo laboriosa contradictione pugnandum, de civ. Dei l. i. c. 16.

(c) The opinion of Origen having been condemned by the decisions of synods (Mansi ix. p. 399 and 516), orthodoxy admitted but of slight modifications. We may mention, e. g. the controversy which arose between Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople, who maintained that the resurrection-body was impalpabilis, and Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, who denied it (Greg. M. Moral. in Jobum lib. xiv. c. 29. Münscher, Handbuch p. 449); and the controversy which took place between the Monophysite Philoponites and the Cononites respecting the question, whether the resurrection was to be considered as a new creation of matter, or as a mere transformation of the form? Comp. Timoth. de recept. haæret. in Cotelerii monum. eccles. grææ. T. iii. p. 413 ss. Walch, Historie der Ketzerien. vol. viii. p. 762 ss. Münscher, Handbuch iv. p. 450. 51.

§ 141.

GENERAL JUDGMENT.—CONFLAGRATION OF THE WORLD.— PURGATORY.

Höpfner, de origine dogmatis de púrgatorio. Hal. 1792.

The notions concerning the general judgment were still substantially founded on the representations of Scripture, but more fully developed and variously adorned by the theologians of the present period. (1.) We have already seen that the Fathers of the preceding age believed in a general conflagration which was to accompany the general judgment, as well as to destroy the world, and that they ascribed to it a purifying power. (2.) But according to Augustine this purifying fire (ignis purgatorius) had its seat in Hades, i. e. the place in which the souls of the departed were supposed to remain until the
This idea, as well as further additions on the part of other theologians, especially Cesarius of Arles, and Gregory the Great, prepared the way for the doctrine of purgatory. This doctrine being brought afterwards into connection with the notion of the mass, was made subservient to the selfish purposes of the Romish hierarchy, and contributed to obscure the evangelical doctrine of salvation.

The end of the world will be preceded by signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars; the sun will be changed into blood, the moon will not give her light, etc. Comp. Basil the Great, Hom. 6. in Hexaëm. p. 54. (al. 63.) Lact. vii. 19 ss. c. 25. (he has regard to the Sibylline oracles.) Short descriptions of the general judgment are given by Greg. of Nazianz. Orat. xvi. 9. p. 305 ss. and xix. 15. p. 373. According to Basil, Moral. Regula 68. 2. the coming of our Lord will be sudden, the stars will fall from heaven, etc., but we ought not to think of his second manifestation as τοσικι ἡ σαφεια, but ἵνα ὁ πατὴρ κατὰ τάσεις τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀνάφως. See Klose p. 74. Comp. Hom. in Ps. xxxiii. p. 184. (al. 193. 94.) Ep. 46. According to Cyril of Jerusalem, the second coming of our Lord will be announced by the appearance of a cross in the air; Cat. xv. 22; comp. the whole description 19—33.—Augustine endeavoured dogmatically to define the facts which are represented in figurative language,* instead of giving rhetorical descriptions, as the Greek theologians used to do; he therefore sought to reconcile the doctrine of retribution with his doctrine of predestination; see de civ. Dei xx. 1: Quod ergo in confessione ac professione tenet omnis Ecclesia Dei veri, Christum de coelo esse venturum ad vivos ac mortuos judicandos, hunc divini judicii ultimum diem dicitur, i. e. novissimum tempus. Nam per quot dies hoc judicium tendatur, incertum est: sed scripturarum more sanctarum diem poni solere pro tempore, nemo qui illas litteras quamlibet negligenter legerit, nescit. Ideo autem cum diem judicii dicitur, addimus ultimum vel novissimum, quia et nunc judicat.

* He points out (de gestis Pel. c. 4. § 11.) the variety of figurative expressions used in Scripture in reference to this subject, which can hardly be so united as to give one idea.
et ab humani generis initio judicavit, dimittens de paradiso, et a ligno vitae separans primos homines peccati magni perpetratores; imo etiam quando angelis peccantibus non pepercit, quorum princeps homines a se ipso subversus invidendo subvertit, procul dubio judicavit. Nec sine illius alto justoque judicio et in hoc aerio caelo et in terris, et daemonum et hominum missima vita est erroribus ærumnisque plenissima. Verum etsi nemo peccasset, non sine bono rectoque judicio universam rationalem creaturam perseverantissimam Domino suo haerentem in aeterna beatitudine retineret. Judicat etiam non solum universaliter de genere daemonum atque hominum, ut miseri sint propter primorum meritorum peccatorum: sed etiam de singulorum operibus propriis, quae gerunt arbitrio voluntatis, etc. — Concerning what he says on the transaction of the general judgment itself, see ibid. c. 14.

(5) Comp. § 77. 6. This idea of a purifying fire is very distinctly set forth by Gregory of Nazianzum, Orat. xxxix. 19. p. 690. (Ullmann, p. 504.) His language is less definite in Orat. xl. 36. p. 730. (Ullmann, p. 505.) Roman-Catholic commentators have inferred too much in support of their theory from the general expression πυρί καθαρρίμαιν which Gregory of Nyssa makes use of in his treatise de iis, qui prematur abripiuntur (Opp. iii. p. 322.); see Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte xiv. p. 135. Basil the Great supposes (Hom. 3. in Hexaëmeron, p. 27.), that the fire which is to destroy the world has existed from the beginning of creation, but that its effects are neutralized by a sufficient quantity of water, until the consumption of the latter: see Klose, p. 73.

(5) Augustine agrees with other theologians in his general views concerning the conflagration of the world, de civ. Dei xx. 18.; in the same place he endeavours to give a satisfactory reply to the question where the righteous will be during the general conflagration? Possimus respondere, futuros eos esse in superioribus partibus, quo ita non ascendet flamma illius incendii, quemadmodum nec una diluvii. Talia quippe illis inerunt corpora, ut illic sint, ubi esse voluerint. Sed nec ignem conflagrationis illius pertimescent immortales atque incorruptibles facti: sicut virorum trium corruptibilis corpora atque mortalia in camino ardentivivere illæa potuerunt. Like the earlier theologians Augustine brings the idea of a purification wrought
by the fire in question, into connection with 1 Cor. iii. 11—15; see Enchirid. ad Laur. § 68. In the next section he continues as follows (in reference to the disposition manifested by so many to cling too much to earthly goods): Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit, quaerere. Et ut aut inveniri aut latere, nonnullus fideles per ignem purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona perueniunt dileixerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari: non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quod regnum Dei non possideant, nisi convenienter penitentibus eadem crimina remittantur. Comp. de civ. Dei l. i. c. 24. 26. quæst. ad Dulc. § 13. On the question, whether Pelagius rejected the doctrine of a purifying fire? comp. the acts of the synod of Diospolis quoted by Wiggers, i. p. 195. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 1199. 1225 and 1404.—Concerning the views of Prudentius see Schröckh, Kirchengesch, vii. p. 126.

(4) Sermo viii. 4. in August. Opp. T. v. Append.; the passage is quoted by Münchener ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 62. He makes a distinction between capitalia crimina and minuta peccata. None but the latter can be expiated either in this life by painful sufferings, alms, or placability manifested towards enemies, or in the life to come by the purifying fire (longo tempore cruciandi.)

(5) Gregory the Great may rightly be called the "inventor of the doctrine of purgatory," if we may call it an invention. On the one hand, he lays down (dial. iv. 39.) the doctrine of purgatory as an article of faith by saying: de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, and rests his opinion on Matth. xii. 31. (He thinks that some sins are not pardoned till after death, but to that class belong only what are called minor sins, such as talkativeness, levity, and a dissolute life.) On the other hand, he was the first writer who clearly propounded the idea of a deliverance from purgatory by intercessory prayer, by masses for the dead (sacra oblatione hostiae salutaris) etc., and adduced instances in support of his view, to which he himself attached credit. Comp. Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xvii. p. 255 ss. Neander, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 271. ss. If

* According to Gregory the passage before alluded to in 1 Cor. iii. may be referred to the tribulations in hac vita, but he prefers himself the usual interpretation, and understands by the wood, hay, and stubble mentioned in iii. 12. unimportant and slight sins.
we compare Gregory's doctrine with the former (rather idealistic) notions concerning the efficacy of the purifying fire, we may adopt the language of Schmidt (Kirchenges. iii. p. 280.): "The belief in a lasting desire after a higher degree of perfection, which death itself cannot quench, degenerated into a belief in Purgatory."

§ 142.

THE STATE OF THE BLESSED AND THE DAMNED.

Gregory of Nazianzum and a few other theologians, supposed that the souls of the righteous are at once admitted into the presence of God (without going to Hades and prior to the resurrection of the body), while the majority of the ecclesiastical writers of this period imagined that men do not receive their full reward till after the general judgment and the resurrection of the body. According to Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, and other theologians who adopted the views of Origen, the blessedness of the redeemed in heaven consists in more fully developed knowledge, in intercourse with all the saints and righteous, and partly in the deliverance from the fetters of the body; Augustine added that the soul would obtain its true liberty. But all writers admitted the difficulty of forming just views on this subject. The sufferings of the damned were thought to be the opposite of the pleasures of the blessed, and in the descriptions of the punishments of hell prominence was commonly given to sensuous representations. Many were disposed to regard the fire in question as a material fire; thus Lactantius depicted it in very lively colours, and others indulged in still more terrible descriptions. There were yet some theologians who favoured the idea of degrees both in heaven and in hell. Concerning the duration of the punishments of hell the prevailing opinion was, that they are eternal, though
some of the advocates of Origenism still hesitated to deprive the damned of every glimpse of hope. Jerome at least admitted, that those among the damned who have been orthodox, enjoy a kind of privilege. And, lastly, it is a remarkable fact, which however admits of a satisfactory solution, that Augustine entertained milder views on this point than Pelagius, who, as well as Chrysostom, maintained the eternal duration of the punishments of hell, in accordance with his strict doctrine of moral retribution. The doctrine of the restoration of all things shared the fate of Origenism and made its appearance in after ages only in connection with other heretical notions, and especially with Millenarianism.


[2] According to Gregory of Nyssa orat. catech. c. 40. the blessedness of heaven cannot be described by words. Gregory of Nazianzum Orat. xvi. 9. p. 306. supposes it to consist in the perfect knowledge of God, and especially of the Trinity (Σωτιὰ τριάδος); such a view is in full accordance with the intellectual, and contemplative tendency predominant in the eastern church.
at that time. Gregory however does not restrict the enjoyment of eternal happiness to the intuitive vision and knowledge of God; but inasmuch as this knowledge itself is brought about by a closer union with God, the blessedness of the redeemed in heaven will also consist in this very inward union with God, in the perfect peace both of the soul and of the heavenly habitations, in the intercourse with blessed spirits, and in the knowledge of all that is good and beautiful. Orat. viii. 23. p. 232. Other rhetorical descriptions will be found Orat. vii. 17. p. 209. vii. 21. p. 213. Ullmann, p. 502. Basil the Great depicts this blessedness for the most part in a negative way; Homil. in Ps. cxiv. p. 204. quoted by Klose, p. 76. Augustine also says de civ. Dei xxii. 29. 30.: Et illa quidem actio, vel potius quies atque otium quale futurum sit, si verum velim dicere nescio; non enim hoc unquam per sensus corporis vidi. Si autem mente, i.e. intelligentia vidisse me dicam, quantum est aut quid est nostra intelligentia ad illam excellentiam?—According to Augustine the happiness of the blessed consists in the enjoyment of heavenly peace which passes knowledge, and of the intuitive vision of God, which cannot be compared with bodily vision. But while Gregory of Nazianzum assigned the first place to theological knowledge, Augustine founded his theory upon anthropology. The blessed obtain true liberty, by which he understood that they can no longer sin; nam primum liberum arbitrium, quod homini datum est, quando primum creatus est rectus, potuit non peccare, sed potuit et peccare; hoc autem novissimum eo potentius erit, quo peccare non poterit. Verum hoc quoque Dei munere, non sua possibilitate naturae. Aliud est enim, esse Deum, aliud participem Dei. Deus natura peccare non potest; particeps vero Dei ab illo accipit, ut peccare non possit....Sicut enim prima immortalitas fuit, quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit, non posse mori. Augustine moreover thought, that the blessed retain the full recollection of the past, even of the sufferings which befell them while on earth; but they do not feel what was painful in them. They also know the torments of the damned without being disturbed in their own happiness (similar views were expressed by Chrysostom, hom. x. in 2 Ep. ad Corinth. Opp. T. xi. p. 605.) God is the essential substance of the blessedness in question, no less than the end and object of every desire. Ipse erit finis desideriorum nostrorum, qui sine fine videbitur, sine fastidio amabil.

(3) Lact. vii. 21:...quia peccata in corporibus contraxerunt (damnati), rursus carne induentur, ut in corporibus piaculum solvant; et tamen non erit caro illa, quam Deus homini superfecerit, huic terrenae similis, sed insolubilis ac permanens in aeternum, ut sufficere possit cruciatibus, et igni sempiterno, cuius natura diversa est ab hoc nostro, quo ad vitce necessaria utimur, qui, nisi alicujus materiae somite alatur, extinguitur. At ille divinus per se ipsum semper vivit ac viget sine ulla alimentis, nec admixtum habet fumum, sed est purus ac liquidus et in aquae modum fluidus. Non enim vi aliqua sursum versus urgetur, sicut noster, quem labes terreni corporis, quo tenetur, et fumus intermixtus exsiliare cogit et ad caelestem naturam cum trepidatione mobili subvolare. Idem igitur divinus ignis una cadetque vi atque potestia et cremabit impios et recreabit, et quantum e corporibus absuet, tantum reponent, ac sibi ipsi aeternum pabulum subministrabit. Quod poetae in vulturem Tityi transtulerunt, ita sine ullo revirescentium corporum detrimento aduret tantum, ac sensu doloris afficiet.—Gregory of Nazianzum supposed the punishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separation from God, and the consciousness of their own vileness (Orat. xvi. 9. p. 306.): τοις δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βάσανοι, μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ ἀπιέξθεια Ἰωη, καὶ ἐν τῷ συνιδότι αἰσχρὴν πίπας οὐκ ἱχευσα. Basil the Great, on the contrary, gives a more vivid description of that punishment, homil. in Ps. xxiii. Opp. T. i. p. 151. and elsewhere. Comp. Klose, p. 75. 76. Münscher, Handbuch, iv. p. 458. Chrysostom eloquently represents the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures, in Theod. lapsum i. c. 6. (Opp. T. iv. p. 560. 561.) Nevertheless in other places, e. g. in his ep. ad Rom. hom. xxxi. (Opp. x. p. 396.) he justly observes, that it is of more importance to know how to escape hell, than to know where it is, and what is its nature. Gregory of Nyssa (orat. catech. 40.) endeavours to divest the idea of hell of all that is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an ἵππειον Ἰηθον.) Augustine too imagines, that separation from God is in the first instance to be regarded as the death and punishment of the damned (de mo-
rib. eccles. cath. c. 11.) But he leaves it to his readers to choose between the more sensuous, or the more spiritual mode of perception; it is at all events better to think of both; de civit. Dei xxi. 9. 10. comp. Greg. M. Moral. xv. c. 17.

Gregory of Nazianzum founds his idea of different degrees of blessedness on John xiv. 2. comp. Orat. xxvii. 8. p. 493. xiv. 5. p. 260. xix. 7. p. 367. xxxii. 33. p. 601. Ullmann, p. 503. Basil the Great sets forth similar views in Eun. lib. 3. p. 273. Klose, p. 77. Augustine too supposed the existence of such degrees de civ. Dei xxii. 30. 2. He admits that it is impossible to say in what they consist, quod tamen futuris sint, non est ambigendum. But in the absence of any feeling of envy whatever, no one’s happiness will be the less because he does not enjoy so high a position as others. Sic itaque habebit donum alius alio minus, ut hoc quoque donum habeat, ne velit amplius. Jerome even charged Jovinian with heresy, because he denied the degrees in question, adv. Jov. lib. ii. Opp. T. ii. p. 58 ss.—According to Augustine there are also degrees of condemnation, de civ. Dei xxi. 16.: Nequaquam tamen negandum est, etiam ipsum aeternum ignem pro diversitate meritorum quamvis malorum aliis leviorem, aliis futurum esse graviorem, sive ipsius vis atque ardur pro penit digna cujusque varietur (he thus admitted that, relatively speaking, the punishment is not eternal) sive ipse æqualiter ardeat, sed non æqualiter molestia sentiatur. Comp. Enchir. ad Laur. § 113. Greg. M. Moral. ix. c. 39. lib. xvi. c. 28. The opinions of the Fathers were most indefinite respecting children that die without being baptized. (Comp. § 137. 5.)

This opinion was principally founded on the use of the word aiōn in Matth. xxv. 41. 46: it must have the same meaning in reference to both life and punishment. Thus Augustine says de civ. Dei xxi. 23.: Si utrumque æternum, profecto aut utrumque cum fine diuturnum, aut utrumque sine fine perpetuum debet intelligi. Paria enim relata sunt, hinc supplicium æternum, inde vita æterna. Dicere autem in hoc uno codemque sensu, vita æterna sine fine erit, supplicium æternum finem habebit, multum absurdum est. Unde, quia vita æterna Sanctorum sine fine erit, supplicium quoque æternum quibus erit, finem procul dubio non habebit. Comp. Enchirid. § 112. It is superfluous to quote passages from other Fathers, inasmuch as they all more or less agree.
Some faint intimations of a belief in the final remission of punishments in the world to come, are to be found in those writings of Didymus of Alexandria, which are yet extant, especially in his treatise de trinitate, edited by Mingarelli A.D. 1769; comp. Neander, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 1407. Gregory of Nyssa speaks more distinctly on this point, orat. cat. c. 8. and 35., in his λόγος πειραμάτων και κατακρίσιμος, and in his treatise de infantibus, qui mature abripiuntur; Opp. T. iii. p. 226-29 and 322 ss. He points out the corrective design of the punishments inflicted upon the wicked. Comp. Neander, l. c. Münscher, Handbuch iv. p. 465. (Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, endeavoured to suppress these passages, see Münscher l. c.) Rupp p. 261. Gregory of Nazianzum entertained (Orat. xl. p. 665. Ullmann p. 505.) but faint hopes of a final remission of the punishments of hell (as φιλανθρωπίνη και τῶν κελανήσων ἐπαξίως.) He makes an occasional allusion to the notion of Origen concerning an ἀποκατάστασις Orat. xxx. 6. p. 544.—Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia adopted these milder notions. (The passages may be found in Assemanni bibl. orient. T. iii. p. 1. p. 223—24. Phot. bibl. cod. lxxxi. p. 200. Mar. Mercator Opp. p. 346. ed. Balluiz.) Comp. Neander l. c. p. 1409. Augustine (Enchirid. § 112.) and Jerome (ad Avit. Opp. T. ii. p. 103 ad Pammach. p. 112.) refer to these milder views which to some extent prevailed in the West. The language of Jerome shows that he was still under the influence of the system to which he formerly adhered, though it is in every respect contrary to the spirit of Origen, when he says (Comment. in Jes. c. lxvi.): Et sicut diaboli et omnium negatorum et impiorum, qui dixerunt in corde suo: non est Deus, credimus æterna tormenta, sic peccatorum et impiorum et tamen [!] Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atque purganda, moderatam arbitramur et mixtam clementissententiam. “This impious opinion, according to which all who were not Christians, were condemned to everlasting torments, but all slothful and immoral Christians lulled asleep in carnal security, could not fail to gain many friends.” Münscher, Handbuch, iv. p. 473.

Augustine indeed firmly maintained the eternity of punishments; but as Pelagius had asserted at the synod of Diospolis: judicii inquis et peccatoribus non esse parcendum, sed æternis eos ignibus esse exurrendos, et si quis aliter credit,
Origenista est (comp. § 141. note 3.) he urged milder principles in opposition to him (de gestis Pelagii c. 3. § 9—11) in accordance with the highest principle: judicium sine misericordia fiet illi, qui non fecit misericordiam. (Comp. also what is said note 4.)

(a) We might have expected that the milder disposition of Chrysostom would have induced him to adopt opinions more in accordance with those of his master Diodore of Tarsus; in Hom. 39. in ep. 1. ad Cor. Opp. x. p. 372. he alludes indeed to the opinion of those who endeavour to prove that 1 Cor. xv. 28. implies an ἀνάξιος τῆς καχίας, without refuting it. But his position in the church, and the general corruption of morals, compelled him to adopt more rigid views. Comp. in Theodori lapsum 1. c.— in epist. 1. ad Thessal. Hom. 8.: μὴ τῇ μελλήσῃ παράμυθῳ ἰαντούσι δεν γὰρ πάντως δὴ γενέσθαι, οὔδεν ἡ μελλήσῃ ώριμῇ σῶσος ὁ τέμως; σῶσος ὁ φόβος τοῦ; x. v. λ. in ep. 2. hom. 3. and other passages. (On the notions of Origen concerning this point, see § 78. 6.)

(b) Comp. the acts of the Synod of Constantinople (A. D. 544.) Can. xii. quoted by Mansi T. ix. p. 399.
A new period in the history of doctrines may be said to commence with the publication of the work of John Damascenus, a Greek monk, inasmuch as from that time a greater desire was manifested, to arrange systematically, and to prove dialectically that which had been obtained by a series of conflicts. The structure of ecclesiastical doctrine was completed with the exception of a few parts, e. g. the doctrine of the sacraments. But its main pillars, viz. Theology and Christology, were firmly established by means of the decisions of councils held during the preceding period, and Augustinism had given (at least in the West) a definite character to
Anthropology, to the doctrine of salvation connected with it, and lastly, to the doctrine of the church. The merit of those theologians who still made the doctrine of the church the object of their study, consisted partly in the collection and completion of existing materials, partly in the endeavour to sift them, and partly in the effort made to prove dialectically particular points. Nevertheless they were not devoid of originality and a spirit of investigation.


(2) We found traces of a systematic treatment during the former two periods in the writings of Origen (πηγὴ ἀγρια), and of Augustine (Enchiridion and de doctrina christianæ), but they were only traces. "John Damascenus is undoubtedly the last of the theologians of the eastern church, and remains in later times the highest authority in the theological literature of the Greeks. He may himself be considered as the starting-point of the scholastic system of the Greek church, which is yet too little known." Dorner, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Christologie p. 113. (Tafel, Supplementa histor. eccles. Græcor. sec. xi. xii. 1832. p. 3 ss. 9 ss.) On the importance of John Damascenus in relation to the West, see Dorner l. c.

§ 144.

THE RELATION OF THE SYSTEMATICAL TENDENCY TO THE APOLOGETICAL

The labours of apologists, which had been of less importance even in the preceding period, were naturally limited to a still narrower circle during the present, since Christianity had become almost exclusively the religion
of the civilized world. It only remained to combat Mohammedanism and Judaism.\(^1\) German and Slavonic paganism appeared in comparison with Christian civilization as a sort of barbarism, which was opposed not so much with the weapons of scientific discussion, as by the practical efforts of missionaries, and sometimes by physical force.\(^2\) But as Christian philosophers, especially towards the close of the present period, raised doubts concerning the truth of revelation in a more or less open way, apologists were again compelled to enter the lists.\(^3\)

\(^1\) The Jews were combated in the ninth century among others by Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in his works: de insolentia Judæorum—de judaicis superstitionibus. Compare Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xxi. p. 300 ss. Amulo (Amularius), archbishop of Lyons, in his treatise: contra Judæos; Schröckh, l. c. p. 310. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries they were opposed by Gislebert of Westminster; he wrote: Disputatio Judæi cum Christiano de fide christiana, in Anselmi Cantuar. Opp. p. 512—523. Par. 1721. fol. Schröckh, xxv. p. 358; by Abelard in his work: dialogus inter Philos. Judæum et Christianum (Rheinwald, Anecdota inter hist. eccles. pertinent. Berol. 1835. T. 1.); by Itupert, abbot of Duyc: Annulus seu Dialogus Christianii et Judæi de fidei sacramentis. Schröckh, l. c. p. 363 ss.; and by Richard of St. Victor, who wrote de Emmanuele libros duos, Schröckh, l. c. p. 366 ss. In the thirteenth century they met with an opponent in the person of Raimund Martini, who composed the treatises: pugio fidei, capistrum Judæorum, Schröckh, l. c. p. 369 ss. etc. The Mohammedans were combated by Euthymius Zigabenus (in the 24th chapter of his work entitled: πανσύγκλαστη, which was edited by Beurer in Frid. Sylburgii Saracenicis, Heidelb. 1595. 8; Raimund Martini in his treatise: pugio fidei. Schröckh xxv. p. 27 ss.; the venerable Peter of Clugny in his work: advers. nefandam sectam Saracenorum. (Martène Collect. ampl. monum. T. ix. p. 1121.), Schröckh, l. c. p. 34. and xxvii. p. 245; and still later by Æneas Sylvius (Pope Pius II.) who wrote: Ep. 410. ad Mahom. II. Schröckh, xxxii. p. 291 ss.
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(1) Concerning this point compare the works on ecclesiastical history (the chapters on the spread of Christianity.) The same method was partly adopted with reference to the Jews and Mohammedans.


§ 145.

THE POLEMICS OF THIS PERIOD.—CONTROVERSIES WITH HERETICS.

Engelhardt, Dogmengeschichte, vol. ii. ch. 3. p. 51 ss.

The heresies which made their appearance during the present period, differed from former heretical tendencies in being opposed to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines. With regard to their doctrinal tenets they adopted for the most part the heretical notions of the Gnostics and Manichæans, but sometimes professed to return to the simple and unadulterated doctrine of the Gospel. (1) There were some few heresies of a doctrinal character, e. g. the Adoptian heresy, or the theories of Gottschalk and of Berengar, as well as some bold assertions on the part of scholastic theologians (such as Roscelinus and Abelard), which gave rise to controversies within the church, and called forth decisions of synods. (2) It was not until the close of the present period, that struggles against the existing order of things prepared the way for a change in the religious views of the age, and thus introduced the period of the Reformation. (3)

(1) To the heretical sects belong in the East the Paulicians (comp. § 85. note 4.) and the Bogomiles (concerning their doctrinal tenets compare: Mich. Psellus, πιστεύει παραδόθεν διαλήκτικα.)
cd. Hassenmüller. Kil. 1688.—Euthym. Zigabenus, Panoplia P. ii. tit. 23. Wolf, J. Ch., hist. Bogomilorum Des. iii. vit. 1712. 4. *Engelhardt, kirchenh. Abhandlungen, Erl. 1832. No. 2.); in the West the Cathari (Leonistæ), Manichæans (Paterini, Publicani, Bugri, boni homines), the followers of Peter of Bruis, and Henry of Lausanne (Petrobrusiani, Henriciani); and in later times, the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Turlupines, the Beghards, Beguines, Fraticelli, Spirituales, etc. Compare the works on ecclesiastical history, especially Fusslin, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie der mittlern Zeiten. Frankfort and Leipzig 1770 ss. iii. (The history of doctrines can consider these sects only in general.) Mosheim, de Beghardis et Beguinabus. Lips. 1790. 8.

(2) Comp. the sections on Trinity, Christology, Predestination, and the Lord’s Supper, in the special history of doctrines.
(3) See the works on ecclesiastical history, and Flathe, Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. Leipz. 1835. ii. (comp. § 155.)

§ 146.

THF GREEK CHURCH.

*Ullmann, Nicolaus von Methone, Euthymius Zigabenus und Nicetas Choniates oder die dogmatische Entwickelung der griechischen Kirche im 12ten Jahrhundert. (Studien und Kritiken 1833. part 3. p. 647 ss.)

After the appearance of Augustine in the preceding period, the Greek church had ceased to be more important than the western church in the dogmatic point of view; in the present it made no further advance after the death of John Damascenus. The theologians who followed John Damascenus, such as Euthymius Zigabenus, Nicholas, bishop of Methone, and Nicetas Choniates, were but the shadows of former grandeur, and may be compared to the scholastic divines of the West. The principal doctrinal writers among the Chaldean Christians (the followers of Nestor), were Ebed Jesu,
among the Jacobites (Monophysites), Jacob, bishop of Tagritum, and Abulfaradsh.

He is also called Zigadenus, and died after the year 1118, a monk at Constantinople. At the request of the Emperor Alexis Comnenus, he wrote his principal work: πανοπλία δογματική τῆς διδασκάλου πίστεως ἦσοι ὀπλωθήκη δογμάτων, see Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xxix. p. 332 ss. 373. and Ullmann, l. c. p. 19 ss. The original work was only once printed at Tergovisto, in Wallachia, in the year 1711. Comp. Fabric. Bibl. gr. vol. vii. p. 461. There is a Latin translation of it by Pet. Franc. Zino, Venet. 1555. fol., which was reprinted in Maxima Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. xix. p. i ss.—He also composed exegetical treatises.

(2) Methone was a town in Messenia. Concerning his life little is known. Some maintain that he lived in the eleventh century, others assert with more probability that he lived in the twelfth; comp. Ullmann, l. c. p. 57. His principal work is the refutation of Proclus, a Platonic philosopher, entitled: 'Ανάστυψις τῆς θεωλογίας στοιχείωσις Πέργαμων Πλατωνικών; it was edited by Director Vemel, Frankf. am Main 1825. 8. To this must be added: Nicol. Meth. Anecdoti P. i. et ii. 1825. 26. "The work of Nicolas of Methone is undoubtedly among the best writings of that time." Ullmann, l. c. With regard to the history of doctrines his discussions on the atonement are of the greatest importance, (§ 179.)

(3) His family name was Acominatus. He was called Choniates after his native town Chone (formerly Colosse) in Phrygia; he died after the year 1206.—Of his Ἐθνομυθῆς διδασκαλίας in 27 books, only the first five (and probably the most important) are known in the Latin translation of Morelli, published Par. 1569. 8.; and reprinted in Max. Bibl. PP. T. xxv. p. 54 ss. This work was intended to complete the Panoplia of Euthymius. Comp. Schröckh xxix. p. 338 ss. Ullmann, p. 30 ss.

(4) He was bishop of Nisibis, and died A. D. 1318. Concerning his treatise: Margarita sive de vera fide, comp. Assemani Bibl. orient. T. iii. P. i. (An extract of it is given by Pfeifer, vol. ii. p. 407.)

(5) He was bishop of Nisibis, and died A. D. 1318. Concerning his treatise: Margarita sive de vera fide, comp. Assemani Bibl. orient. T. iii. P. i. (An extract of it is given by Pfeifer, vol. ii. p. 407.)

He died A. D. 1231. On his work: Liber Thesaurorum see Assemani l. c. T. ii. p. 237. (Pfeifer, vol. i. p. 250.)

He occupied the metropolitan see of Edessa, was also
called Barhebræus, and died A. D. 1286. On his work: Candelabrum Sanctorum de fundamentis see Assemani l. c. p. 284.

§ 147.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.


During the former two periods the western church was principally represented by the ecclesiastical writers of Gaul and Italy, as well as by the theologians of the African school. When the renown of the latter writers, as well as the glory of the Roman and Greek empires had passed away, a new system of Christian theology developed itself among the Germanic nations. We have here to distinguish three leading periods: I. The age of the Carlovingians, inclusive of the periods before and after until the commencement of the scholastic period. II. The age of Scholasticism proper (from the eleventh century to the middle of the fifteenth.) III. The period of transition to the Reformation (the fifteenth century, and especially the second half of it.)

It is of course impossible to draw distinct lines of separation. Thus scholasticism is represented in the period mentioned as the first by John Scotus Erigena; the second period merges so gradually into the third, that for some time both tendencies (the scholastic, which was fast disappearing, and that which manifested itself in the writings of the Reformers) accompanied each other.
The collection of sentences composed by Isidore of Sevilla, and others of similar import, presented the rough material, while the schools and colleges founded by Charlemagne contributed to call forth spiritual activity. The venerable Bede, and Alcuin were distinguished for the clearness of their views among the number of those who exerted more or less influence upon the age of the Carlovingians, though they did not go so far as to set forth any connected system of theology. Claudius, bishop of Turin, and Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, also exerted a greater influence by arousing the minds of the people, and promoting practical reforms, than by investigations of a strictly doctrinal character. It was only the ecclesiastical controversies of the age which called forth a more distinct display of theological ingenuity. John Scotus Erigena however shone as a bright star in the theological firmament. Being possessed of high spiritual originality, he endeavoured, after the manner of Origen, to demonstrate theology in a philosophical manner, but his speculative tendency led him at the same time into dangerous errors.

(1) Comp. § 82. note 30. In addition to Isidore we may mention as compilers of the seventh century: Tajo of Saragossa, who lived about the year 650, and Ildefonsius of Toledo, who lived between a. d. 659. and 669. Comp. Münscher ed. by von Cölln. ii. p 5.

(2) He was born about the year 672., and died a. d. 735., in England. He is celebrated as a historian, and by his efforts for the promotion of education among the clergy. His com-

(3) He is also known by the names Flaccus Albinus, and Alschwinus; he was born in the county of York, became tutor of Charlemagne, and died A. D. 804. His work entitled: de fide sanctae et individuae Trinitatis in 3 books, contains a complete system of theology. Comp. Bossuet, transl. by Cramer, vol. v. sect. 2. p. 552—59. Concerning the part which he took in the Adoptian controversy, etc. see the special history of doctrines. Comp. Alcuins Leben von F. Lorenz. Halle 1829. 8. Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xix. p. 77 ss. 419 ss. xx. p 113 ss. 217 ss. 348. 585 ss. Neander, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 154. and elsewhere. His works were published by J. Frobenius, Ratisb. 1777. ii. fol.

(4) He was a native of Spain (perhaps a disciple of Felix of Urgella), adopted the doctrinal tenets of Augustine, was a teacher during the reign of Lewis the Pious, and died A. D. 840. His commentaries contain much dogmatical matter. Comp. Schröckh l. c. xxiii. p. 281. Neander, l. c. iv. p. 325 ss.

(5) He was born A. D. 779. and died A. D. 840. He opposed, like Claude, many of the superstitions of the age. Concerning his polemical writings against the Jews, see §44; on his refutation of Felix of Urgell, comp. the special history of doctrines. Comp. also Schröckh, l. c. xxiii. p. 249. Neander, l. c. iv. p. 322—24. His works were published Par. 1605. 8.

(6) This was the case with Rabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbert, Ratramnus, Servatus Lupus, Hinkmar of Rheims, Florus Magister, Fredegis of Tours, and others in the controversies concerning predestination, the Lord's Supper, etc. On their writings see the works on ecclesiastical history, and Münsscher edit. by von Cölln, ii. p. 6 and 7.

(7) He was also called Scotigena, lived at the court of Charles the Bald, and died after the year 877. Comp. Hiort, Scotus Erigena oder von dem Ursprung einer christlichen Philosophie Kopenh. 1823. 8. Schröckh, l. c. xxi. p. 208 ss. xxiii. 481—84. Neander, iv. p. 388 ss. Staudenmaier, l. c. and his essay: Lehre des Joh. Scot. Erig. über das menschl. Erkennen, mit Rücksicht auf einschlägige Theorien früherer und späterer Zeit,
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in the Freiburger Zeitschr. für Theol. iii. 2. *Frommüller, die Lehre des Joh. Scot. Erigcna vom Wesen des Bösen. Tüb. Zeitschr. für Theol. 1830. part i. p. 49. ss. part 3. p. 74 ss. His principal writings are: Dialogus de divisione naturae lib. v. ed. *Th. Gale. Oxon 1681.—De prædestinatione Dei.—Of his edition of Pseudo-Dionysius: Opera S. Dionysiï latine versa, only the hierarchia cælestis is extant in the first volume of the works of Hugo of St. Victor. “His profound views concerning the Divine omnipresence and universal revelation, and his opinions on philosophy and religion, which he regarded only as different manifestations of the same spirit, are unequalled, and assign to him so high a place above the times in which he lived, that he was not condemned by the church until the thirteenth century.” (Hase.)

§ 149.

SCHOLASTICISM IN GENERAL.


The exceedingly bold attempts of Scotus Erigcna to effect a union between philosophy and theology, remained for some time without imitators, till the efforts of later theologians in the same direction, though in a less free spirit, led to what is commonly called Scholasticism. (1) The scholastic divines had not, like the theologians of the earlier Alexandrian school, to trace the philosophical ideas that lay at the basis of that new and vigorous form of religion (Christianity), for the systematical development of which little had been done. On the contrary, it was their task to lay the foundation of a system of modern Christian philosophy, or a system of doctrines.
which had been handed down from antiquity in a partially corrupt form.\(^{(2)}\) But in the absence of an independent philosophical system they had again recourse to ancient philosophy, and formed an alliance with Aristotelianism,\(^{(3)}\) quite as unnatural as that, which former theologians had formed with Platonism. Their philosophical inquiries had more regard to form, than to matter, and were of a dialectic rather than of a speculative kind. Hence they were not so much exposed to the danger of letting loose their imagination, and entering upon vague and indefinite discussion (like the Gnostics),\(^{(4)}\) as to the adoption of narrow views, and to the danger of wasting their energies upon trifles and minutiae. Thus a refined and subtle philosophy gradually brought about the downfall of scholasticism. On the other hand, it may be observed, that the endeavours of theologians to arrive at precise theological definitions, their scientific treatment of the doctrines, and the noble confidence which they displayed in the reasonableness of Christianity (notwithstanding existing prejudices), constituted the favourable aspect and the merit of scholasticism.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) On the appellations Scholasticism, etc. see du Fresne, p. 739. The derivation of the term in question however is not etymological, but historical. Comp. Schleiermacher, Kirchengesch. p. 466 ss.

\(^{(2)}\) During the preceding period Cassiodore had given a summary of the dialectics of Aristotle, and Boëthius had translated a part of his work entitled Organon. But it was not until the present period that theologians became more generally acquainted with Aristotelianism, see § 151. Platonism, on the other hand, forms as it were the morning and the evening of the philosophy of the middle-ages; the one is represented by Scotus Erigena, the other by Marsilius Ficinus and others.

\(^{(3)}\) "Scholasticism is the progress of the church towards a school, or as Hegel expresses it, though in other words: the Fathers have made the church, because the mind once developed re-
quired a developed doctrine; in after ages there were no more patres ecclesiae, but doctores. The theologians of the primitive church had to create the material, or to expound that which was expressed in its simplest and most direct form in the Christian dogma; they had further to set forth this material in distinct doctrines and formulae, to present it to the religious world, and to procure its general adoption. Scholasticism, on the contrary, presupposed all this. The material and the contents were given; it became now the task of theologians to effect a union between that which, having acquired the nature of an object (in relation to the mind), had been subsequently separated from it, and the mind itself—a union such as would constitute a subjective unity.” Baur, Versöhnungslehre, p. 147. 48. Comp Baumgarten-Crusius, Lehrbuch i. p. 445. Hegel, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. iii. p. 138.

(4) “Those who compare the systems of Christian theologians with those of the gnostics, for the most part forget that the systems of the latter are not founded upon philosophical reasoning, but upon the fancies of imagination.” Staudenmaier, Erigena, p. 370.

(5) As early as the time of Semler complaints were made of the unjust treatment which the scholastic divines had to suffer; Semler himself says: “The poor scholastici have been too much despised, and that frequently by people, who would not have been good enough to be their transcribers.” And Luther himself wrote to Staupitz, though he contributed much to the downfall of scholasticism: Ego Scholasticos cum judicio, non clausis oculis lego......Non rejicio omnia eorum, sed nec omnia probo, see de Wette, i. p. 102. Comp. also Möhlers Schriften und Aufsätze. vol. i. p. 129 ss. Ullmann (Joh. Wessel. p. 12.) calls the scholastic theology: “in its commencement a truly scientific advance upon the past, in its entire course a great dialectic preparatory school of Christianity in the West, in its completion a grand, and highly finished production of the human mind.”
§ 150.

THE PRINCIPAL SCHOLASTIC SYSTEMS.

a. I. Period of Scholasticism to the time of Peter Lombard.

Scholasticism took its rise in the monastic schools founded by Charlemagne and his successors. It was principally cultivated in the monastery called Bec in Normandy, where Lanfranc was a teacher. His disciple, Anselm of Canterbury, setting out from belief in the positive creed of the church, sought to attain the elevation of philosophical knowledge, as is manifest from his theory of satisfaction, no less than from his proof of the existence of God. His views on those points, as well as on the reality of general ideas, were opposed by Roscelinus, and Peter Abelard, the former of whom rested faith (in opposition to the theory of Anselm) on the evidence of perception, while the latter defended nominalism in opposition to realism. Hildebert a Lavardino (first bishop of Mans, and afterwards archbishop of Tours,) adhered, like Anselm, with whom he was contemporary, to the positive creed of the church. Gilbert of Poitiers, on the contrary, was (like Roscelinus and Abelard) charged with heterodoxy. — A peculiar tendency which connected mysticism with scholasticism, manifested itself in the writings of William of Champeaux, the tutor of Abelard, as well as in those of Hugo of St. Victor, and Richard of St. Victor. After Robert Pulleyn and other theologians beside those already named had endeavoured to prove philosophically the doctrine of the church, Peter Lombard (who lived in the twelfth century) collected the existing materials in his "Sentences," and by his peculiar mode of treatment gave rise to that stiff and heavy method which was
for a considerable time adopted by theologians in general. (1)

(1) He died a.d. 1089. He came into notice principally by his controversy with Berengar, as will be more fully shown in the special history of doctrines. His works were published by d'Achery, Paris 1648 fol. Comp. Mührer, gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze. Regensburg 1839. i. p. 39.—On the foundation of the monastery Bec, comp. Mührer, l. c.

(2) He was born at Aosta in Piedmont about the year 1034 occupied the see of Canterbury from the year 1093 (whence he is called Cantuariensis), and died a.d. 1109. Of his philosophical writings the most important is the work entitled : Monologium et Prologium (it contains a proof of the existence of God, and the doctrine of the Trinity.) Extracts from it are given by Cramer v. 2. p. 341—372. Among his theological works we may mention: de casu Diaboli, but especially the treatise: Cur Deus homo ? lib. ii. (which contains a theory of the incarnation of Christ, and the redemption of man.) In addition to these works he wrote: de conceptu virginali et originali peccato, de libero arbitrio, de concordia prescientiae et praedestinationis nec non gratiae Dei cum libero arbitrio etc.—Opp. ed. *Gabr. Gerberon. Par. 1675 f. 1721. ii. f. (Ven. 1744.) A manual edition of the treatise: Cur Deus homo, was published by Heyder, Erl. 1834. 8. Concerning his life and works comp. *†Mührer, gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze. Regensb. 1839. i. p. 32 ss.; on his doctrines comp. Mohler, l. c. p. 129 ss.—Billroth, I. G. F. de Anselmi Cantuariensis Proslogio et Monologio. Lips. 1832. 8.

(2) He is also called Rucelinus or Rüzelin; he was born in Lower Brittany, and was canon at Compiègne in the eleventh century. He is commonly regarded as the founder of the nominalists; see Chladenii Diss. hist. eccles. de vita et hæresi Roscelini. Erl. 1756. 4. On the contrast between nominalism and realism, which is more fully discussed in works on the history of philosophy, see: Baumgarten-Crusius, de vero Scholasticorum Realium et Nominalium discrimine et sententia theologica. Jen. 1821. 4. Engelhardt, Dogmengeschichte p. 16. 17. This contrast was not without some importance for theology, as will be more particularly seen in the doctrino-
the Trinity. The part which theologians took in the work of 
reformation (e. g. in the times of Huss), depended, generally 
speaking, more or less on the views which they adopted with 
regard to either of the said systems.

(4) He was born A. D. 1079 at Palais near Nantes. Concerning 
the history of his eventful life, see Bayle, Dictionnaire, 
Gervaise, Berington, Schlosser and others; Neander der 
heilige Bernhard p. 112 ss. His works were published: Opp. 
Abalardi et Heloisa. ed. Andr. Quercetanus (Duchesne) Par. 
1616. 4. they contain: de fide S. Trinitatis s. Introductio ad 
Theologiam in 3 libros divisa.—His Libri V. Theologiae 
Christianæ were first edited by Edm. Martene, Thesaur. Ancdd. 
T. v. Concerning his Dialogus, see § 144. note 1. The un 
published works of Abelard were edited by Cousin in the Col 
lection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, publiés 
par ordre du Roi et par les soins du ministre de l'instruction 
publique. Deuxième série: Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard, pour 
sevîr à l'histoire de la philosophie scolastique en France. Paris 
1836. 4. Comp. also: Lewald, E. A.: Commentatio de operibus 
Petri Abælardi, quæ e codicibus manuscriptis Victor Cousin 
edidit. (Heidelb. 1839. 4.) The judgment of Cousin concerning 
Abelard is as follows: "As St. Bernard represents the con 
servative spirit and Christian orthodoxy no less by his faults 
and the narrowness of his views, than by his admirable good 
sense, his depth without subtilty, and his pathetic eloquence, so 
Abelard and his school represent in some sense the liberal and 
innovating spirit of the time, with its frequently deceitful promises, 
and the unavoidable mixture of good and evil, of sobriety and 
extravagance."—Comp. also Franck, ein Beitrag zur Würdigung 
Abälards, in the Tübinger Zeitschrift 1840. 4. p. 4.

(1) He was born either A. D. 1055 or 57, and died A. D. 1134. 
Though a disciple of Bereuagar, he did not adopt all his views. 
He was bishop of Mans from the year 1097, and raised to the 
archiepiscopal dignity A. D. 1125. For some time he was 
thought to be the author of the Tractatus theol., which modern 
researches have assigned to Hugo of St. Victor (see note 8.) 
Comp. Liebner in the theolog. Studien und Kritiken 1831. part 
2. p. 254 ss.—His opinions on the Lord's Supper are also of im 
portance, as will be seen in the special history of doctrines.

(2) He was also called Porretanus or Porseta, and died A. D. 
1154. Concerning his life and works comp. Otto Fresing. de
gestis Friderici Lib. i. c. 46. 50—57. Cramer vi. p. 530-552.

His principal opponent was St. Bernard, abbot of Clairval (Clairvaux), who had also combated Roscelinus and Abelard. See Neander, der heilige Bernhard p. 217 ss.

(7) Guilelmus de Campellis; he died A. D. 1121. He was the founder of the school of St. Victor in one of the suburbs of Paris (A. D. 1109), from which, generally speaking, the mystical scholastics came. Respecting his person and dialectics see Schlosser, Abhandlung über den Gang der Studien in Frankreich, vorzüglich von der Schule zu St. Victor, in his Vincenz von Beauvais. Frankfurt a. m. 1819. vol. 2. p. 35. and the edition of Abelard’s works by Cousin, and comp. also Engelhardt in the work mentioned note 9. p. 308 ss.


(10) He was cardinal, and died between the years 1144 and 1150. He wrote: Sentientiar. libr. viii., published by Mathoud, Par. 1655. fol. Comp. Cramer l. c. vi. p. 442—529.

(11) Magister Sententiarum. He was born at Novara, raised to the episcopal see of Paris in the year 1159., and died A. D. 1164. His work: Sententiarum libri iv. was edited by J. Aleaume, Venet.1477. Louvain 1546. “It was not so much on account of the ingenuity and depth displayed in the work in question, as in consequence of the position which its author occupied in the church, of his success in removing contrasts, and of its general perspicuity, that it became the manual of the twelfth century, and the model of the subsequent one.” Hase. A specimen of his method is given by Semler in his introduction to Baumgarten’s Glaubenslehre, vol. ii. p. 81 ss. Heinrich, Geschichte der dogmatischen Lehrarten p. 145 ss. The first book treats: de
mysterio Trinitatis s. de Deo uno et trino; the second: de rerum corporalium et spiritualium creatione et formatione aliisque pluribus eo pertinentibus; the third: de incarnatione verbi aliisque ad hoc spectantibus; and the fourth: de sacramentis et signis sacramentalibus. Comp. Engelhardt, Dogmen-geschichte p. 22.— "The period of systematizing scholasticism, and of endless commenting on the sentences of the masters commences with Peter Lombard. This period is at the same time the one in which there was no end of questioning and answering, of laying down theses and antitheses, arguments and counter-arguments, of dividing and splitting up the matter of the doctrines ad infinitum" Baur. l. c. p. 214.

§ 151.

b. II. Period to the End of the Thirteenth Century.

The dogmatical works of Robert of Melun (1) (Folioth) and Alanus of Ryssel (2) (ab Insulis) appeared about the same time, while Peter of Poitiers, (3) a disciple of Peter Lombard, followed in the steps of his master. But their opinions also met with opposition, especially on the part of Walter of St. Victor, (4) and John of Salisbury. (5) Nevertheless scholasticism gained ground, partly in consequence of external contingencies. In the first place, the orders of the mendicant friars acquired a greater influence over the philosophical and theological studies pursued in the universities. And, secondly, by means of that more extensive intercourse with the East, which followed the crusades, the western theologians, from the thirteenth century onwards, became acquainted with a more complete edition of the works of Aristotle, which had been translated and commented on by the Arabs, and exerted from that time a still more decided influence upon their systems. (6) The works called "Sums," the first of which was composed by Alexander Hales, (7) now occupied the place of the "Sentences." Albert the Great wrote the first complete commentary on the works of
Aristotle. But when scholasticism had reached its height towards the close of the thirteenth century, a division broke out between the different schools, which continued to exist as long as the system itself. The leader of the one of these schools was Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican monk, the leader of the other was his opponent, John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan monk. The scholastic disputes were connected with the jealousies of the religious orders; but even in the present period the mystical tendency was sometimes united with the scholastic, as in the case of John of Fidanza (Bonaventura), a Franciscan monk.

(1) He was bishop of Hereford from the year 1164, and died A.D. 1195. He composed a Summa Theologiae (hitherto unpublished); comp. Bulæus l. c. T. ii. 264. 585 ss. 772. 73. Cramer l. c. vi. p. 553—586.

(2) He was called Doctor universalis, and died A.D. 1203. He belonged to the speculative school of Anselm, and composed the following works: Summa quadripartita de fide catholica (a controversial writing, in which he opposed the Albigenses, Waldenses, Jews, and Mohammedans.)—Libri V. de arte s. articulis catholicae fidei, edited by Pez. Thesaur. anec. noviss. T. i. p. ii. p. 475—504. (an abridgment of it is given by Cramer, v. 2. p. 445—459.) and Regulae theologicae—Comp. Schleiermacher, Kirchengeschichte p. 527 ss.

(3) He died A.D. 1205. His Libri V. Sententiarum were edited by Mathoud. Paris 1655. fol. together with the sentences of Pulley (see § 150. note 10.) Comp. Cramer vi. p. 754—790.

(4) He lived about the year 1180. and wrote: Libri IV. contra manifestas et damnatas etiam in Conciliis haereses, quas Sophistæ Abælardus, Lombardus, Petrus Pictavius et Gilbertus Porretanus, quatuor Labyrinthus Galliæ, uno spiritu Aristotelico efflati, libris sententiarum suarum acuent, limant, roborant. Extracts from this work (hitherto unpublished) are given by Bulæus, l. c. T. ii. p. 629—660.

(5) Sarisberiensis; he was bishop of Chartres from the year 1176, and died A.D. 1182. About the year 1156 he addressed to Thomas Becket: Policraticus, sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri viii. This work was followed by
8.—Epistolæ cccii. (which were written from 1155—1180.) ed.

(a) Notwithstanding ecclesiastical prohibitions, the study of
Aristotle gained gradually ground. On the historical develop-
ment of these studies see Jourdain, Amad. Recherches critiques
sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote, et sur
les commentaires grecs ou arabes, employés par les docteurs
scholastiques. Par. 1819. 8. and the works on the history of

(7) Alexander Alesius; he was called Doctor irrefragabilis,
and died A.D. 1245. He was the first theologian who made a
general use of the Aristotelian philosophy. His work entitled:
Summa universæ Theologiae (divided into questiones, membra,
and articuli), was edited after his death by Guilelmus de Meli-
tona about the year 1252. by order of Pope Innocent IV. Other
editions are that of Venice 1576. of Colon. 1622. iv. fol. Ex-
tracts from it are given by Semler, l. c. p. 120 ss. Cramer vii. p.

(8) He was the most learned of all the scholastics, a native
of Suabia, taught at Paris and Cologne, was bishop of Re-
gensberg, and died at Cologne 1280. Opp. ed. Petrus Jammy,
Ord. Præd. Lugd. 1651. xxi. T. fol. Among his numerous
works we mention his Commentaries on Aristotle and Peter
Lombard, as well as his Summa theol. (ex edit. Basil. 1507. ii.)

(9) He is known by the name Doctor angelicus; he was born
A.D. 1224. in the kingdom of Naples, taught at Paris, Rome,
Bologna, and Pisa, and died A.D. 1274, on his journey to the
council of Lyons. He was canonized by Pope John XXII. A. D.
1323. His principal works are: Commentarii in libros iv. Sen-
tentiar. Petri Lombardi c. notis J. Nicolai Par. 1659. iv. fol.—
Summa totius theologiae in 3 partes distributa. Extracts from
these works are given by Semler, l. c. p. 58 ss. Cramer, vii. p.
For further particulars see Münscher edit. by von Cölln, ii. p. 19.

(10) Duns Scotus, surnamed Doctor subtilis, was born at Duns-
ton in Northumberland, lectured on theology at Oxford from
the year 1301, at Paris from the year 1304, and died at Cologne
A.D. 1308. He introduced a number of barbarous technical
DECLINE OF SCHOLASTICISM.

terms, such as quidditates, hæceitates, incircumscriptibilitates, etc., and was thus the originator of all the scholastic subtilties. His complete works were edited by Luc. Wadding, Lugd. 1639. xii. fol. His principal work is: Quodlibeta et Commentaria in libros iv. sententiarum. To this may be added: Qæstiones quodlibeticæ. Comp. Semler l. c. p. 68—73. Cramer vii. p. 295—308. Heinrich, p. 226 ss. Schröckh xxix. p. 237 ss.

John of Fidanza, surnamed Doctor seraphicus, and called Eutychius, or Eustachius by the Greeks, was Doctor Theol. Parisiensis and Præpositus generalis of the order of the Franciscans, died a. d. 1274 as cardinal, and was canonized a. d. 1482 by Pope Sixtus IV.—Opp. Romæ 1588—96. viii. f. Mogunt. 1609...His principal works are: Commentarius in libros iv. Sententiarum, Breviloquium, Centiloquium. He is also said to be the author of the work entitled: Compendium theologicaë veritatis (de natura Dei.) He wrote several mystical tracts: Speculum animæ, Itinerarium mentis in Deum—de reductione artium ad Theologiam. Comp. Semler l. c. p. 52—58. Heinrich, p. 214 ss.

§ 152.

C. III. PERIOD.—The decline of Scholasticism in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.

During the last period of scholasticism, which was now on the decline, we meet with but few independent thinkers, among whom the most distinguished were Durand of St. Pourçain,(1) Raimund of Sabunde,(2) and William Ockam,(3) a nominalistic sceptic. Gabriel Biel,(4) a disciple of the last mentioned, but possessed of less originality than his master, was the last of the scholastic divines, though the corrupt tendency of scholasticism itself continued to exist, and called forth a stronger desire for an entire reformation in theology.(5)

(1) Durandus de Sancto Portiano (a village in the diocese of Clermont,) surnamed Doctor resolutissimus, was from the year 1312 professor of theology at the university of Paris, and after-
wards bishop of Annecy and of Meaux. He wrote: Opus super sententias Lombardi Par. 1508. Venet. 1571 fol. (it is now scarce.)—Though a Dominican monk, he ventured to oppose Thomas, on which account he was looked upon as an apostate by the genuine followers of Thomas; see Cramer vol. vii. p. 801 ss.

(2) He was teacher at Toulouse about the year 1436, and composed a work on natural theology under the title: Liber creaturarum, seu Theol. naturalis. Argent. 1496 fol. Fcf. 1635. 8. It was republished in a somewhat altered form by Amos Comenius under the title: Oculus fidei. Amst. 1661. 8. Comp. Montaigne, Essais L. ii. c. 12.

(3) Ockam died A. D. 1347. Though a Franciscan monk, he differed from Duns Scotus, as Durand did from Thomas: in both these cases therefore the strict connection before spoken of between the spirit of the order, and the spirit of the school, is destroyed. Ockam took an independent position even in opposition to the Popes (John XXII.), by defending the doctrine of the poverty of Christ; on this point see the works on ecclesiastical history. Respecting his merits as a scholastic divine, he brought nominalism again into repute. Of his works the following are dogmatical: Compendium errorum Joh. XXII., in Goldast. monarchia. Han. 1612. p. 957. Quodlibeta vii. Tract. de sacramento altaris—Centiloquium theologicum (the last of which in particular contains a great many subtleties.) See Cramer vii. p. 812 ss. On his ironical scepticism, which he knew how to conceal under the mask of the most rigid orthodoxy, see Rettberg in the Studien und Kritiken 1839. 1. His works abound with absurd questions, (such as those mentioned in note 5.) Comp. Rettberg, p. 80

(4) He was born at Spire, was professor of philosophy and theology at Tübingen, and died A. D. 1495.—He wrote:—Collectorium s. Epitome ex Guilelmo Occam in iv. libros Magistri sententiarum ed. Wend. Steinbach. Tub. 1502. ii. f. Biel was followed by Antoninus Florentinus and Paul Cortesius, see Münscher ed. by von Cölln, p. 30. Cajetan, Eck and others, who lived at the time of Luther, were also perfect scholastics.

(5) Thus it was asked: Num possibilis propositio, Pater Deus odit filium? Num Deus potuerit suppositare mulierem, num diabolum, num asinum, num cucurbitam, num silicem? Tum quemadmodum cucurbita fuerit concionatura, editura miracula.
MYSTICISM.

§ 153.

The influence of scholasticism was beneficially counterbalanced by mysticism, which in effusions of the heart rich indeed, though at times indistinct, restored to theology those vital streams of which it had been deprived by the all-absorbing influence of dialectic philosophy. Theologians whose tendency was of a positive kind, such as Bernard of Clairval, had before this asserted the importance of a pious disposition, holding fast the orthodox faith, and of a devout turn of mind, in opposition to a speculative tendency. Some of the scholastic divines themselves had endeavored to reconcile the claims of a
pious mind with the demands made by the scientific development of the age, on which account they are commonly called either mystical scholastics, or dialectical mystics. But about the time of the decline of the scholastic philosophy mysticism made its appearance in a much more vigorous and independent form, though under very different aspects. As had been the case with the scholastics, so some of the mystics adhered more closely to the doctrine of the church, while others, departing from it, adopted heretical notions. Respecting the scientific treatment of mysticism it may be said, that one class of its advocates manifested a more philosophical turn of mind, and displayed more of the results of preparatory philosophical studies, than was shown by the other. The doctrines of Master Eckart had much in common with the enthusiasm of pantheistic sects, and were consequently condemned by the see of Rome. Among those who followed more closely (though with various modifications) the doctrine of the church we mention: John Tauler, Henry Suso, John Ruysbroek, the (anonymous) author of the "Büchlein von der deutschen Theologie" (i.e. the little book on German theology), Thomas à Kempis, and John Charlier Gerson; the last mentioned also endeavoured to establish a scientific system of mysticism.

(1) He was surnamed Doctor mellifluus and died A.D. 1153. His works were edited by Mabillon. Par. (1666—1690.) 1719 ii. fol. Ven. 1726. iii. fol. He wrote epistles, sermons, and mystical tracts: de consideratione, ad Eugenium iii. Papam. Libros v. de gratia et libero arbitrio etc. Comp. *Neander, der heilige Bernhard und sein Zeitalter. Berlin 1813. 8. Ellendorf, der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux und die Hierarchie seiner Zeit. Essen 1837. H. Schmid l. c. p. 187 ss. de Wette, Sittenlehre, ii. 2. p. 208 ss.—Practical activity was also displayed by Berthold, a Franciscan monk, who lived between the years 1247 and 1272; he bordered upon mysticism. See his sermons, edited...
by Kling, Berl. 1824. and the review of Jac. Grimm in the Wiener Jahrbücher 1825. p. 194 ss.

To these belong especially William of Champeaux, and the theologians of the school of St. Victor, as well as Bonaventura. Comp. §§ 150 and 151.

The ideas of the orthodox mystics rest on the positive foundation of the creed, and all the spiritual transactions described by them are most intimately connected with the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, the influence of the Spirit promised by Christ, and the mystery of the Lord's Supper. The abstract theory of the heretical mystics seeks to fathom the depth of the soul, which in their opinion is nothing but God himself; they teach that sanctification is the work of man himself, and regard the said positive doctrines as at most the symbols of those spiritual transactions on which the accomplishment of the design of our life depends. It is of special importance in an exposition of the history of this period, distinctly to separate these two kinds of orthodox and heterodox mystics." Engelhardt, Richard von S. Victor, p. 2.

Amalrich of Bena and David of Dinanto had previously developed the fanatical aspect of the mystico-pantheistic system of John Scotus Erigena, and given to it that dangerous practical direction, which is exhibited to a singular extent by some later sects of the middle ages. Comp. H. Schmid l. c. p. 387 ss. Engelhardt, kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen. Erlang. 1832. p. 251. Mosheim de Beghardis et Beguinabus p. 211. ss. p. 255.—Among the mystics of the fourteenth century Master Eckart (Aichard), a native of Saxony and provincial of the order of the Dominicans in Cologne, bears most resemblance to the aforesaid theologians, though he surpasses them by a more spiritual perception and a more scientific culture of mind. "His sense of the nearness of God, and his ardent love are overwhelmed by the contemplation of an abyss of lusts and blasphemy." (Hase.) His doctrines were condemned A. D. 1329 in a bull of Pope John XXII. Comp. Schmidt, Charles, Essai p. 51—57. and Studien und Kritiken 1839. 3. Mosheim l. c. p. 280. Sprüche deutscher Mystiker in Wackernagels Lesebuch, i. Sp. 889—92. [Meister Eckart. Eine theologische Studie von H. Martensen. Hamb. 1843.]

He was called Doctor sublimis et illuminatus, lived as a monk of the order of the Dominicans at Cologne and Strasburg,
and died a. d. 1361. He was a clever preacher. A Latin translation of his works was edited by Laur. Surius, Col. 1548. He wrote among others: Nachfolge des armen Lebens Christi.—Medulla animæ (a collection of divers tracts,) Sermons iii Leipz. 1826 etc. Comp. Wackernagels deutsches Lesebuch Sp. 857 ss. [Schmidt, Carl, Johannes Tauler von Strasburg. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Mystik und des religiösen Lebens im 14. Jahrhundert.] Luther wrote concerning him to Spalatin (14 Dec. 1516.): Si te delectat puram, solidam, antiquæ simillimam theologiam legere, in germanica lingua effusam, sermones Johannis Tauleri, prædicatorææ professionis, tibi comparare potes...... Neque enim ego vel in latina vel in nostra lingua theologiam vidi salubriorem et cum Evangelio consonantiorem. The letter is given by de Wette vol. i. No. 25. p. 46. De Wette on the contrary says (christliche Sittenlehre ii. 2. p. 220 ss.): "His mysticism is very profound and fervent, and at the same time very speculative; but it possesses no intrinsic worth, inasmuch as it is almost exclusively of a negative description, and consists only of a renunciation of all that is earthly and finite. On the contrary, the true, the essential, the divine is, as it were, an empty space, because it is not brought into any definite relation to the life and heart of man," etc.

Henry Suso (Germ. der Seuse, sometimes called Amandus vom Berg) was born at Constance, and died a. d. 1365. His works were translated into Latin by Laur. Surius Col. 1532.—Heinrich Suso's Leben und Schriften, herausgegeben von Melch. Diepenbrock mit einer Einleitung von Görres. 1829. 37. 40. Geistliche Blütchen von Suso. 1834. Wackernagel, deutsches Lesebuch Sp. 871 ss. He is more poetical than profound and speculative, his writings are full of allegories and imagery, frequently fantastical, but often full of religious ardour. A childlike soul!

He was prior of the regular canons in Gruenthal in Brabant, and died a. d. 1381. He was surnamed Doctor ecstaticus. His works (originally written in the Flemish language) were translated into Latin by Laur. Surius. Cologne 1552. 1609. 1692. and into German by Gottfr. Arnold. Offenbach 1701. 4. Comp. *Engelhardt in the work mentioned § 150. note 9.—Ruysbroek holds the medium between the orthodox and the heterodox mystics; Ch. Gerson, who wrote against him, numbered him among the latter; but comp. Engelhardt, l. c. p. 275: The line
of demarcation between heterodox and orthodox mysticism, which we find distinctly drawn in the writings of Ruysbroek, was so fine and might so easily be transgressed, that nothing but a firm adherence to that form of belief which was generally adopted, and sanctioned by the terminology of the Fathers, as well as by the authority of the church, seemed a sufficient guard against errors such as those just mentioned.” — Comp. De Wette, christliche Sittenlehre; he says p. 247.: “In the writings of Ruysbroek [as well as in those of Tauler], the idea of something absolute and of renouncing all that is finite, of being absorbed in the one and undivided, is set forth as that from which all things are derived. Ruysbroek acknowledged even to a farther extent than Tauler, the indwelling of the Divine in man—an admission of much importance. In a moral aspect the writings of Ruysbroek are of more importance than those of Tauler; the former develops more distinctly the nature of a virtuous life, and warns against spiritual sloth, but he has fallen more frequently than Tauler into the error of mystical sensuality and voluptuousness,” etc.

(a) The full title of this work is: Deutsche Theologie, oder ein edles Büchlein vom rechten Verstande, was Adam und Christus sei, und wie Adam in uns sterben und Christus in uns leben soll. It was first published a. d. 1516 by Luther (with a recommendatory preface), afterwards by Joh. Arnd 1631., by Grell 1817., by Detzer, Erl. 1827., and by Troxler, St. Gallen 1837. Comp. Luther's opinion on this work in de Wette's collection of Luther's letters, No. 60. p. 102: “This noble book, though simple and destitute of adornment of language and of human wisdom, is much richer and more precious in art and that wisdom which is Divine. And to praise according to my old fashion, next to the Bible and St. Augustine, I do not know of any book from which I have learnt better, and assert that it could be learnt better what God, Christ, man, and all things are.” Extract from Luther's Preface. De Wette (christl. Sittenlehre p. 251.) calls the work in question “a sound and energetic treatise, full of spirit and life, written in a pure and concise style, and worthy of being so strongly recommended by Luther.”

(b) His true name was Thomas Hamerken of Kempen: he was subprior of the Augustinian monks on St. Agnes' mount near Zwoll, and died a. d. 1471. “He was rather a pious, warm-hearted, and edifying preacher, than a mystic properly
speaking; at least he possessed scarcely anything of a speculative tendency,” de Wette, l. c. p. 247. He was the author of several pious tracts: Soliloquia animae, Hortulus rosarum, Vallis liliorum, de tribus tabernaculis, de solitudine, de silentio etc. His most celebrated work (which some however have ascribed to other authors, e. g. to Abbot Gersen, or to John Gerson) is: de imitatione Christi libri iv. Opp. Norimb. 1494. Par. 1520. fol. Antw. 1607. Comp. the critical examination of its authorship by + J. P. Silbert, (who pronounces in favour of Thomas à Kempis), Wien 1828. 8. Gieseler, l. c. ii. 4. § 146. notes 1 and m. Ch. Schmidt Essai sur Jean Gerson, p. 121.


§ 154.

SCIENTIFIC OPPOSITION MADE TO SCHOLASTICISM.


Even as early as the thirteenth century Roger Bacon had combated the one-sided, speculative tendency of
OPPOSITION MADE TO SCHOLASTICISM.

scholasticism, and endeavoured to improve the method of studying theology. But far more was done during the second half of the fifteenth century for the restoration of classical studies, by which the minds of men were delivered from that one-sided theological speculation in which both the scholastic and the mystical divines so freely indulged. Attention was directed to a more harmonious development of all the powers of the soul, a more simple and rational mode of perception, and above all, to a treatment of all spiritual subjects distinguished by a better taste. Laurentius Valla, John Reuchlin, and Desiderius Erasmus may, generally speaking, be considered as the restorers of classical (and to some extent of Hebrew) philology. Marsilius Ficinus and John Picus of Mirandola were the principal advocates of the study of the Platonic philosophy, and thus, on the one hand, limited the excessive authority of Aristotle and the dominion of scholasticism, and on the other showed, how mysticism might be more intimately connected with speculation.

Roger Bacon, surnamed Doctor mirabilis, was a monk of the order of the Franciscans, and professor of theology at Oxford from the year 1240. He wrote (A.D. 1267): Opus majus de utilitate scientiarum ad Clementem IV. Very characteristic extracts from it are given by Gieseler ii. § 74. note x.

If we ask what forms the most obvious contrast with the scholastic philosophy and theology, as well as with the practice of the scholastic divines, we may say, that it is good common sense, experience (both outward and inward), perception of nature and humanity.” Hegel, Geschichte der Philosophie iii. p. 200.

He died a.d. 1457. His works were published at Basle 1540. 43.

John Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnio, lived from 1455 to 1522. Comp. *Mayerhoff, Reuchlin und seine Zeit. Berl. 1830. Meiners L.c. i. p. 44 ss. He furthered especially the study of the Hebrew language as well as that of the Cabbala, and gained a glorious victory over the Viri obscuri of his age.

2 e

Respecting the controversy between the Aristotelians and Platonists see Münscher ed. by von Cülln ii. p. 27. Marsilius Ficinus translated the works of Plato, and wrote de relig. christ. et fidei pietate ad Laur. Med. and de immortalitate animae; his works were published at Paris 1641 fol. He died A. D. 1499.

He was born A. D. 1463, and died 1494. He endeavoured to harmonize Plato with Aristotle. His works were published at Basle 1601 fol.; he wrote among others: in Hexaëmeron libros vii.—Quæstiones 900—de Christi regno et vanitate mundi—in Platonis Convivium libros iii.—Epistolae etc. see Meiners l. c. ii. from the commencement.

§ 155.

PRACTICAL OPPOSITION.—THE FORERUNNERS OF THE REFORMATION.


The spirit of the Reformation manifested itself more and more not only in science, but also directly in the practical life of Christians. John de Wycliffe,¹ John

* The publication of the Polyglott edition of Cardinal Ximenes, about the rise of the German Reformation, is no less important.
Huss\(^2\) and Jerome of Prague, as well as their followers, partly adopted the doctrines of the mystics, partly the scholastic mode of thinking, though their tendency was on the whole more practical. Some of their followers fell into the errors of former fanatical sects.\(^3\) The tendency of Jerome Savonarola is altogether peculiar to himself; his theology has much of the mystical, and many events of his life would lead us to suppose that some of his views were enthusiastic, though he was on the whole a truly evangelical man. John Wessel of Groningen, on the contrary, united in himself the better form of mysticism, and the true spirit of scientific inquiry, which strove to throw off the fetters of scholasticism; he thus became the proper forerunner of Luther.\(^5\)

\(^1\) He was professor of theology at the university of Oxford, and combated from the year 1360 the order of the mendicant friars. Gregory XI. condemned nineteen of his theses (A.D. 1377.) His controversy respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation will come under consideration in the special history of doctrines.—His principal doctrinal work is: Dialogorum libri v. (Trialogus) Bas. 1525. ed. L. Th. Wirth. Francof. et Lips. 1753. 4. Comp. Vaughan, R., life and opinions of J. de Wycliffe. Lond. 1829. ii. 31. ii. Webb, le Bas, life of Wiclif. Lond. 1832.

\(^2\) John Huss of Hussinecz, was from the year 1402 pastor at Prague, and suffered martyrdom A.D. 1415 at Constance. The opposition which he offered to the Pope, partook more of a practical than dogmatical nature. The views of Huss on the Lord's Supper differed less from the doctrine of the church, than those of his colleagues Jerome of Prague and Jacobellus of Misa, as will be shown in the special history of doctrines. Comp. Neander, kleine Gelegenheitsschriften. 3d edit. p. 217 ss.

\(^3\) Concerning the history of the Hussites (they were also called Taborites and Calixtines) see the works on ecclesiastical history.—Lenfant, histoire de la guerre des Hussites. Amst. 1731. ii. 4.—John Rokyzkana was one of their most eminent theologians.—Martin Lokwitz (Loquis,) a native of Moravia, belonged to the fanatical party among the Hussites; see Schr ckh l. c. xxxiv. p. 687.

(5.) His family-name was Gansfort; he was surnamed lux mundi, magister contradictionum, lived and taught theology at Cologne, Heidelberg, Louvain, and Paris, and died a. d. 1489. "Though a scholastic divine himself, he announced that scholasticism would soon cease to exist, asserted that Scripture is the only foundation of faith, faith the sole ground of justification without works, and urged the spiritual nature of a religious life." (Meier, Dogmengeschichte, p. 238.) His works were published at Groningen. 1614. — Comp. Muurling, de Wesseliicum vitaturn mentis in preparanda sacrorum emendationo in Belgio septentrionali. Traj. ad Rhen. 1831. Ullmann, C., Johann Wessel, ein Vorgänger Luthers. Ham. 1834.

And lastly, John Goch of Mechlin, who died a. d. 1475, John of Wesel, professor of theology at Erfurt, and afterwards minister at Worms (he died a. d. 1482) and others, as well as Gerhard Groot and the clerics of community of life must be numbered among this class of men. Comp. Scholtz, J. G. L., Diss. exhibs disquisitionem, qua Thomas a Kempis sententia de re christiana exponitur et cum Gerardi et Wesseli Gansfortii sententiiis comparatur. Gron. 1840. 8.

§ 156.


The present period shows as much, if not more, as any other, the intimate connection subsisting between the de-
velopment of the life of the church, and of mankind in general, and the development of doctrine. Thus a parallel may clearly be drawn between the history of scholasticism on the one hand, and that of papacy and the hierarchy on the other. Monasticism and celibacy not only tended to foster the spirit of subtle speculation manifested by the schoolmen, but also awakened more ardent aspiration on the part of the mystics. The splendour and magnificence of the Roman form of worship created a reacting influence upon the doctrine of the church (especially upon the doctrines of the sacraments and the saints,) in proportion as the former itself owed its existence to the latter. The dogmatic mind of the present period was also symbolically displayed in the architecture of the middle ages. The advantages which the West derived from the crusades, the origin of which may be partly ascribed to the religious excitement of the times, were manifold and of various description. It may also be observed that the great calamities of the fourteenth century so impressed the minds of the people, as to be at least the partial cause of the religious and mystical phenomena of those times. After the exclusive use of the Latin language in all ecclesiastical matters had led to the neglect of a searching and critical examination of the Bible, and the adoption of a barbarous terminology, the spread of Grecian literature from the conquest of Constantinople (A.D. 1453) exerted a beneficial influence both upon the study of the original languages of the Sacred Scriptures, and the treatment of theological subjects. And in the last place, though the terrible institution of the inquisition had for a time succeeded in intimidating the minds of the people, and in preventing the free exchange of ideas, the invention of printing (about the year 1440,) the discovery of America (A.D. 1490,) and the entire revolution which had taken place in the history of nations, prepared the way for a new
period, which rendered a new development of religious life necessary, as the consequence of the great changes which had happened in modes of thought and inquiry.

(1.) Compare the introduction to vol. i.

(2.) It is a somewhat important fact, that scholasticism should have commenced with the age of Gregory VII. During the dispute about the episcopal investiture Anselm supported the pretensions of the papal hierarchy, while shortly afterwards Arnold of Brescia, a disciple of Abelard, practically carried out the more liberal doctrinal principles of his master. In a similar manner Bernard of Clairval united dogmatic orthodoxy with a rigid adherence to papacy. Scholasticism reached its highest point of perfection about the same time that the papacy of the middle ages flourished under Pope Innocent III. and a parallel may be clearly drawn between the disruption of the schools (Thomists and Scotists,) and the papal schism which happened soon afterwards.—While the see of Rome had formerly found a support in the realistic tendency of Anselm, it now met with open opposition on the part of the nominalist Ockam. The history of mysticism may be likewise so represented, as to favour the pretensions of the Roman see in one aspect, and to oppose them in another. Papacy itself had its origin (in an ideal point of view) in a mystical perception of the world, but by its opposition to that idea, i. e. by its externality and worldliness, it frequently called forth opposition on the part even of the advocates of that mystical perception of the world.

(3.) Certain errors of the scholastics, as well as the mystics, can scarcely be comprehended but from the monastic point of view. In earlier times the scholastic divines were monks of the order of the Benedictines, or of that of the regular canons; in later times the monks of the order of mendicant friars occupied the theological chairs (notwithstanding the opposition made by the university of Paris), and conferred degrees and preferments. We must also take into consideration the jealousy already alluded to between the different orders, which stands in intimate connection with the divisions among the scholastics.

(4.) Compare the doctrine of the Saints and of the Lord's Supper in the special history of doctrines.

(5.) It is altogether accidental, that the cities of Strasburg and
Cologne, which are distinguished by their cathedrals, were pre-
eminently resorted to by mystical theologians? see Ch. Schmidt,
Essai p. 45 and 52. There is also an evident connection be-
tween the mystical tendency and romantic poetry, (comp. 
Liebner, Hugo von St. Victor, p. 246.), as well as, on the one
hand, between the old German school of painting and mysticism,
and on the other, between Italian art and the classical tendency
mentioned § 154.

(a) See Heeren, Entwicklung der Folgen der Kreuzzüge für
Europa (historische Schriften, Göttingen 1808. vol. 2.)

(b) Compare Hecker, der schwarze Tod im 14 Jahrhundert.
Berlin 1832. 8.

(b) Compare § 154.

(b) See Llorente, Geschichte der Inquisition. Leipzig 1823.

(10) "Religion has undoubtedly gained the powerful, healthy,
and clear developement of piety, and of Christian piety in
particular, by the invention of typography. The sources of
Christian knowledge and edification have been multiplied by
it ad infinitum, and what was formerly inaccessible has been
placed within the reach of all classes of society," etc. Ull-
mann, Rede am vierten Säcularfeste der Erfindung der Buch-
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FIRST SECTION.

APOLOGETICO-DOGMATIC PROLEGOMENA.

TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.—RELATION BETWEEN REASON AND REVELATION.—SOURCES OF REVELATION.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

§ 157.

TRUTH AND DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

The ground to be taken by apologetical writers of the present period, in opposition to all who were not Christians, was considerably different from that which had been occupied during the first period. On the one hand, the Judaism of the middle ages was not the same with that which Justin M. combated in his dialogue with Tryphon; on the other, the views of the Apologists of the middle ages on doctrinal subjects differed in many respects from those of the earlier Fathers. Other weapons were also required in the controversy with Mohammedanism than those which had been used against the ancient forms of polytheism. But the scepticism and infidelity, which made their appearance, especially towards the close of the present period, within the church itself, both in a more open, and a more concealed manner, rendered a philosophical defence of the Christian religion still more necessary, than those histori-
cal forms of religion which existed along with Christianity.\(^{(3)}\) Generally speaking, the Apologists adopted former methods of argumentation. The arguments derived from miracles and prophecies were retained, inasmuch as tradition had sanctioned them,\(^{(4)}\) though some writers possessed sufficient discernment to see, that the religion of Christ recommends itself by its internal excellencies, without external miracles.\(^{(5)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Compare e. g. the manner in which Agobard upbraided the Jews of that time in his treatise de insolentia Judæorum. Opp. T. i. p. 59—66. See Schröckh xxi. p. 302.

\(^{(2)}\) Compare the writings mentioned § 144. which were directed against Mohammedanism.—The heathen, i. e. the heathen philosophers in particular, were combated by Thomas Aquinas in his work entitled: summa catholicae fidei, which is not to be confounded with his larger work of the same name. Excerpts from it are given by Schröckh xxix. p. 341 ss.

\(^{(3)}\) Anselm himself held the principle: Fides nostra contra impios ratione defendenda est, non contra eos, qui se Christiani nominis honoré gaudere fatentur. Epp. Lib. ii. 41. On the later apologetical writings of Savonarola and Ficinus, see § 154. 155.

\(^{(4)}\) Thus Ficinus appeals even as late as this period to the Sibylline oracles. See Schröckh xxxiv. p. 352.

\(^{(5)}\) Among their number we may mention e. g. Æneas Sylvius, see Platina in Vita Pii II. (towards the end.)

§ 158.

**Reason and Revelation, Faith and Knowledge.**

Though all Christians were convinced of the truth and Divine origin of their religion (even where they knew it only through the impure medium of the doctrine of the church), yet speculative minds were desirous of possessing a clear insight into the relation between that which has regard to mankind in general, and that which refers to Christianity alone, between revelation and rea-
son, between the Christian religion and philosophy. John Scotus Erigena was the first who manifested a leaning towards rationalism, and a union between it and supranaturalism, by considering true religion and true philosophy as one and the same thing, and by looking for the true source of religious knowledge in man himself, i.e. in his rational consciousness. But he did not deny the necessity of a positive revelation which has come from without.\(^{1}\) Abelard also thought that there is such a harmony between philosophy and Christianity, that the universally acknowledged truths of reason, and the moral laws with which the heathen were acquainted, are confirmed and enlarged by the higher authority of Divine revelation.\(^{2}\) According to Anselm it is first of all necessary to receive by an act of faith the truths of revelation which have been sanctioned by the church, but he admitted that reason might afterwards examine the grounds of what is believed. He too proceeded on the supposition that reason and revelation cannot contradict each other.\(^{3}\) Thomas Aquinas endeavoured to prove that the doctrines of Christianity on the one hand may be apprehended by reason, but on the other are above reason.\(^{4}\) The mystics also admitted (though in a manner different from that of the scholastics) the existence of an immediate consciousness; their theory was nearest allied to that of Anselm. There was however this difference, that some of them (viz. those who adhered to ecclesiastical orthodoxy) maintained, that the internal revelations were in accordance with the doctrines of the church\(^{5}\) while in the opinion of others (the fanatical mystics) the new revelations of the Spirit were sometimes openly opposed to the doctrines historically received, and even to Scripture itself.\(^{6}\)

\(^{(1)}\) De divina præd. ap. Mauguin T. i. c. 1. § 1. (quoted by Frommüller l. c. p. 50.): Quid est de Philosophia tractare, nisi
REASON AND REVELATION.

verae religionis, qua summa et principalis omnium rerum causa et humiliter colitur et rationabiliter investigatur, regulas exponere? Confitetur inde veram esse Philosophiam veram religionem conversimque veram religionem esse veram Philosophiam (comp. Augustine de vera rel. c. 5.) He thinks that self-consciousness is the last source of religious knowledge, div. nat. v. 31. p. 268: Nulla quippe alia via est ad principalis exempli purissimam contemplationem præter proximæ sibi sua imaginis certissimam notitiam. But he does not on that account deny the necessity of an external (positive) revelation. On the contrary he says: ii. 31. p. 85: Nisi ipsa lux initium nobis revelaverit, nostræ ratiocinationis studium ad eam revelandam nihil proficiet (comp. § 159 ss.) Thus Scotus Erigena "may in a certain sense be called the author of rationalism; but his rationalism is very different from, and forms the strongest contrast with that perverse form of rationalism which exists at the present day." Staudenmaier, Freiburger Zeit- schrift l. c. p. 241.

De Theol. christ. ii. p. 1211. (ed. Martène): Hinc quidem facilius evangelica prædicatio a philosophis, quam a Judœis suscepta est, cum sibi eam maxime inveniret ad finem, nec fortasse in aliquo dissonam, nisi forte in his quæ ad incarnationis vel sacramentorum vel resurrectionis mysteria pertinent. Si enim diligenter moralia evangelii præcepta consideremus, nihil ea aliud, quam reformationem legis naturæ inveniems, quam secutos esse philosophos constat; cum lex magis figuralibus, quam moralibus nitatur mandatis et exteriori potius justitia, quam interiori abundet; evangelium vero virtutes ac virtia diligenter examinat, et secundum animi intentionem omnia, sicut et philosophi, pensat. Unde cum tanta...evangelicae ac philosophicae doctrine concordia pateat, nonnulli Platonicorum...in tantam proruperunt blasphemiam, ut Dominum Jesum omnes suas sententias a Platone accepsisse dicerent, quasi philosophus ipsam docuisset Sophiam.— None but he who obtains a knowledge of the Divine by means of active investigation, attains unto firm belief. After man has done his duty, Divine love assists his efforts, and grants to him that which he could not acquire by his own researches, etc. "But Abelard was far from imagining

a From this passage it appears, that as early as the time of Abelard a distinction was made between articuli puri et mixti. Comp. also what Thomas Aquinas said, note 4.
that his philosophy could give a full knowledge of Divine things which should leave no scope for desire after more information." Neander, der heilige Bernhard p. 117 ss. Abelard made a distinction between credere, intelligere, and cognoscere; on the relation in which these terms stand to each other, see Neander l. c. (Abelard uses still stronger language on this point in his Introductio, than in his more modified Theologia christiana; see Neander, l. c. p. 127. note 4.) Alanus ab Insulis considered faith superior to opinio, but inferior to scientia, (Art. 17. quoted by Pez. i. p. 482.) Comp. the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, § 34. note 6. On the view of St. Bernard, which was opposed to that of Abelard ("God is found by prayer, not by discussions,") see Neander, der heilige Bernhard p. 147 ss.

(3) Prosl. c. 1:......Desidero aliquatatem intelligere veritatem tuam, quam credit et amat cor meum. Néque enim quæro intelligere, ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam. Nam et hoc credo, quia nisi credidero, non intelligam. De incarne verb. c. 2.: Nullus quippe Christianus debet disputare, quod catholica Ecclesiae corde credit et ore confitetur, quomodo non sit: sed semper eandem fidem indubitanter tenendo, amando et secundum illam vivendo humiliter, quantum potent quærere rationem, quomodo sit. Si potest intelligere, Deo gratias agat: si non potest, non inmittat cornua ad ventilandum, sed submittat caput ad venerandum. Citius enim in se potest confidens humana sapientia impingendo cornua sibi evellere, quam inimendo petram hanc eveliure......Palam namque est, quia illi non habent fidei firmitatem, qui, quoniam quod credunt, intelligere non posseunt, disputant contra ejusdem fidei sanctis patribus confirmatae veritatem, velut sic vespertiliones et noctiss, non nisi in nocte ceulam videant, de meridianis solis radiis discipentes contra aquilas, solem ipsum irrevèlerato visu intuentes. Prius ergo fide mundandum est cor.......prius ea quæ carnis sunt posponentes, secundum spiritum vivamus, quam profunda fidei dijudicando disputiamus......Quanto opulentius nutrimur in Sacra Scriptura, ex his, quæ per obedientiam pascunt, tanto subtillius provehimur ad ea, quæ per intellectum satiant......Nam qui non crediderit, non experietur, et qui experimentus non fuerit, non intelliget. Nam quantum rei auditum superaret experientia, tantum vinct audientis cognitionem experimentis scientia......Nemo ergo se temere mergat in condensa difficillimarum quaestionum, nisi prius in soliditate fidei conquista morum et sapientiae gravitate, ne per multiplicia sophismatum
diverticula in tanta levitate discurrens, aliqua tenaci illaqueetur falsitate. Comp. de sacram. altaris ii. 2: Christianae fidei veritas quasi hoc speciali jure præminet, ut non ipsa per intellectum sed per eam intellectus quærendus sit.........Qui ergo nihil credere vult, nisi ratione vel intellectu præcedente, hic rem confundit et scire omnia volens, nihil credens, fidem, quæ in ipso est, videtur annullare.—Epp. Lib. ii. 41: Christianus per fidem debet ad intellectum proficere: non per intellectum ad fidem accedere, aut si intelligere non valet, a fide recedere. Sed cum ad intellectum valet pertingere, delectatur: cum vero nequit, quod capere non potest, veneratur.—Nevertheless he asserts, that the acquisition of knowledge is a duty imperative upon him who has the power of knowing God. In his treatise entitled: Cur Deus homo i. c. 2. he represents Bosso as speaking as follows (without contradicting him): Sicut rectus ordo exigit, ut profunda christianæ fidei credamus, priusquam ea præsumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentia mihi videtur, si postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere. Comp. ibid. c. 10. 25. Nor does Bosso declare himself satisfied respecting the doctrine of satisfaction, until he has seen the reasonableness of the reasons adduced; ii. 19. and 21. “The Scholastic divines did not think it an extravagant notion, that all the truths contained in the Old and New Testaments might be proved by rational speculation; but it was always presupposed, that what is matter of faith rests on its own grounds, and needs no proof; thus whatever is added by reason, however valuable in other respects, is nothing but an opus supererogationis in reference to all matter of faith.” Baur, Versöhnungslehre, p. 185 note. Comp. Möhler’s Schriften, i. p. 137. 38.

(4) Thom. Aqu. Summ. cath. fid. contra gentiles l. i. c. 3. (quoted by Münsscher edit. by von Colln, p. 100): Et in his, quæ de Deo confitemur, duplex veritatis modus. Quædam namque vera sunt de Deo, quæ omnem facultatem humanae rationis excedunt, ut Deum esse trinunum et unum. Quædam vero sunt ad quæ etiam ratio naturalis pertingere potest: sicut est Deum esse, Deum esse unum, et alia hujusmodi: quæ etiam philosophi demonstrative de Deo probaverunt, duci naturalis lumine rationis. —But even these points must be confirmed by revelation, otherwise the knowledge of God would be a privilege of but a few (viz. of those who think and know); others whom levity prevented during the earlier period of their life from giving heed
to these things, would not acquire a knowledge of them until it was too late. But even in the most favourable case there would be reason for apprehending, lest error should be mixed up with truth. The truths of revelation however, though going beyond reason, do not contradict it, etc. Comp. Schröckh xxix. p. 342 ss.

This was the case, e. g. with Hugo of St. Victor, and Richard of St. Victor. Hugo, de Sacramentis fidei l. i. p. iii. c. 30. (de cognitione divinitatis) quoted by Liebner, p. 173 ss. 186.: Alia enim sunt ex ratione, alia secundum rationem, alia supra rationem et præter hæc quæ sunt contra rationem. Ex ratione sunt necessaria, secundum rationem sunt probabilia, supra rationem mirabilia, contra rationem incredibilia. Et duo quidem extrema omnino fidem non capiunt. Quæ enim sunt ex ratione omnino nota sunt et credi non possunt, quoniam sciantur. Quæ vero contra rationem sunt, nulla similitor ratione credi possunt, quoniam non suscipiunt ullam rationem, nec acquiescit his ratio aliqua. Ergo quæ secundum rationem sunt et quæ sunt supra rationem, tantummodo suscipiunt fidem. Et in primo quidem genere fides ratione adjuvatur et ratio fidei perfitur, quoniam secundum rationem sunt, quæ creduntur. Quorum veritatem si ratio non comprehendet, fidei tamen illorum non contradicit. In iis, quæ supra rationem sunt, non adjuvatur fides rationeulla, quoniam non capiæt ea ratio, quæ fides credit, et tamen est aliqua, quo ratio admonetur venerari fidem, quæm non comprehendit. Quæ dicta sunt ergo secundum rationem, probabilia fuerunt rationi et sponte acquievit eis. Quæ vero supra rationem fuerunt, ex divina revelatione prodiunt sunt, et non operata est in eis ratio, sed castigata tamen, ne ad illa contenderet.—The theory of Richard of St Victor is somewhat more complicated. But he too believed “that Divine revelation and human reason agree in bearing testimony to the one truth.” Engelhardt, Richard von St. Victor, p. 66. Concerning the relation in which contemplation stands to meditation, as well as respecting the six different kinds of the former, see Engelhardt, l. c. p. 60 ss. John of Salisbury, on the contrary, taught that the endeavours of man after knowledge must be aided by God himself, Policrat. Lib. vii. c. 14. (Bibl. max. T. xiii. p. 352.): Quisquis ergo viam philosophandi ingreditur, ad ostium gratiae ejus humiliter pulset, in cujus manu liber omnium sciendorum est, quem solus aperit agnus, qui occisus est, ut ad viam sapientiae et veræ felicita...
citatis servum reduceret aberrantem. Frustra quis sibi de capacitate ingenii, de memorie tenacitate, de assiduitate studii, de linguae volubilitate blanditur.....Est autem humiliati conjuncta simplicitas, qua descentium intelligentia plurimum adjuvatur. Savonarola appeals to the internal testimony, Triumph. crucis proem. quoted by Rudelbach p. 376: Licet fides ex causis principiisque naturalibus demonstrari non possit, ex manifestis tamen effectibus validissimas rationes adducemus, quas nemo sanse mentis insipientes poterit.

\[\text{Comp. § 161. note 5.}\]

\[\text{§ 159.}\]

**SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.**—**BIBLE AND TRADITION.**

Though the Bible was still theoretically regarded as the highest authority in all religious matters, yet it was gradually overshadowed by tradition, which was deemed of equal importance with Scripture. Its doctrines were more and more corrupted and mixed up with the arbitrary traditions of men. In addition to the tradition of the church the book of nature was held in reverence together with the written Word of God. Some of the mystical sects looked upon other writings beside the Bible as Divine gifts and even went so far as to honour their own imaginations as the oracles of God.\[1\]

\[\text{(1) Joh. Dam. de fine orth. i. 1.: Πάντα τοῖν τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν διὰ τι νόμου καὶ στροφῆς καὶ ἀποστάσεως καὶ τῆς κυριεύσεως δεσμῶν καὶ γενόμενοι καὶ σύμβολοι, οίδεν περαιτέρω τούτων ἑιδηγητούσης . . . . . . Ταῦτα ἡμῖν στέξωμαι καὶ ιν αὐτῶι μίνωμι, μὴ μεταλείποντες ὅρια αἰώνια, μηδὲ οὐκεθανάντες τὴν ἁίαν παράδοσιν. Comp. iv. 17. Joh. Scot. Eng. de div. nat. i. c. 66. p. 37: Sanctæ siquidem Scripturæ in omnibus sequenda est auctoritas, quum in ea veluti quibusdam suis secretis sedibus veritas; (he makes however the following limitation): non tamen ina credendum est, ut ipsa semper proprsius verborum seu nominum signis frustatur, divinam nobis naturam insinuans; sed quibusdam similitudinibus variisque translatorum verborum seu nominum modis utitur, inrimitati nostræ condescendens,}\]
nostrosque adhuc rudes infantilesque sensus simplici doctrina erigens. Nor can Scripture contradict reason, c. 68. p. 38.:

Nulla itaque auctoritas te terreat ab his, quae rectæ contemplationis rationabilis suasio edocet. Vera enim auctoritas rectæ rationi non obsistit, neque recta ratio vera auctoritati. Ambo siquidem ex uno fonte, divina videlicet sapientia manere, dubium non est. Comp. c. 69. p. 39. John of Salisbury, on the contrary, used much more unqualified language, Policrat, l. c. (§ 158. note 5.) Serviendum est ergo scripturis, non dominandum. Nisi forte quis se ipsum dignum credat, ut angelis debeat dominari.

(2.) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. iv. 16. : οἵ θεοί καὶ θλίστα οἱ ἄποδεικτοι ἀγάφως παραγινώσκας, γεράς Παύλος ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἱδών ἀπόστολος (2 Thess. ii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 2.) Do imaginibus Orat. i. 23. (Opp. i. p. 318) : ou μόνον γράμματα τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικῆν ἑκομμίαν εὐφέρουσιν (οἱ πατέρες), ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγάφος τοῦ παραδόσεως . . . τὸ ὅτι τοῖς βασιλεῖσι; τὸν τὸν ἀναγόμενος εὐχαριστεῖ; τὸν ἦ τῶν μυστηρίων παράδοσος . . . . τ. l. Comp. Orat. ii. 16. p. 338. John Scotus Erigena, by drawing a parallel between Scripture and reason, seems to subordinate tradition to both of them (and especially to reason) i. c. 71. p. 39 : Omnis autem auctoritas, quae vera ratione non approbatur, infirma videtur esse. Vera autem ratio, quam virtutibus suis rata atque immutabilis munitur, nullius auctoritatis adstipulatione roborari indiget. Nil enim aliud videtur mihi esse vera auctoritas, nisi rationis virtute cooperta veritas et a sacris patribus ad postéritatis utilitatem litteris commendata . . . . Ideoque prius ratione utendum est . . . . ac deinde auctoritate . . . . ibid. iv. 9 : Non sanctorum patrum sententiam, præsertim si plurimum notæ sunt, introducendæ sunt, nisi ubi summa necessitas roborandæ ratiocinationis exegerit propter eos, qui cum sunt rationis insci, plus auctoritati quam ratione succumbunt.—Erigena however was almost alone in his views. Most writers adopted the definitions propounded by Augustine and Vincentius Lerinensis during the preceding period (comp. § 122.) Thus Alcuin admonished to adhere to the doctrine generally received, to abstain from the use of new terms, etc.; in Ep. ad Felic. Opp. i. p. 783. (comp. p. 791 ss.) He said: Porro nos intra terminos apostolicæ doctrine et sanctæ romanæ ecclesiæ firmiter stamus: illorum probatisseam sequentes auctoritatem, et sanctissimis inherentes doctrinis, nihil novi infortentis, nullaque recipientes, nisi quæ in illorum catholicis inve-
Abelard, on the other hand, by his work: *Sic et non*, undermined the authority of the earlier Fathers, and consequently that of tradition. The authority of Aristotle was added in later times to that of the church, till the authority of Scripture was again prominently brought forward as the highest and only true one in the age immediately preceding the Reformation (thus by Wycliffe.)

According to the Theol. naturalis of Raymund of Sabunde, God has granted to men *two* different books, viz. the book of nature, and the book of revelation; they neither can, nor must contradict each other; *the latter however is not accessible to all, but only to the priests*. All knowledge must commence with the former, which is equally within the reach of the laity; every creature is a character written by God himself. But the highest knowledge is the love of God as the only thing which man can offer to the Deity of his own. Comp. Hase, Kirchengeschichte, p. 362. Tennemann viii. p. 964 ss.—In a similar manner St. Bernard asserted, that what he was able to accomplish in the way of interpreting Scripture, and what he understood of Divine things, he had acquired by contemplation and prayer, especially in forests and fields, and that he had had no other teacher than beeches and oaks; see Neander, der heiligo Bernhard, p. 6. Comp. Bruder Bertholds Predigten edited by Kling p. 113., where the same notion of two books (heaven and earth) occurs.

Thus the Spirituales in particular attached great importance to the Evangelium aitcrnum (prophecies of Joachim abbot of Flore in Calabria, who died A. d. 1202.) On the said work comp. Engelhardt, Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, Erl. 1832. No. 1. Extracts from it are given by d'Argentreé, Coll. judiciorum de novis error. Paris 1728. T. i. p. 163 ss.

Some writers went so far as to make the most daring assertions; thus David of Dinanto maintained, that God had made communications by Ovid no less than by Augustine, Engelhardt, l. c. p. 255. The Beguines taught, *quod homo magis tenetur sequi instinctum interiorem, quam veritatem evangelii*, quod

* It is worthy of observation that Scripture is much more firmly established than tradition, which undergoes more or less frequent changes, and is sometimes substituted by something else, as in the above case by nature; John Scotus Erigena introduced reason in the room of tradition, and the mystics did the same with regard to internal revelation.
quotidie prædicatur; see the epistle of John, bishop of Stras-
burg, in Mosheim, l. c. p. 258. Comp. § 161.

§ 160.

THE CANON OF THE BIBLE AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

In accordance with what had been decided in the pre-
ceding period respecting the Canon of the Bible, the
Latin church generally regarded the books commonly
called the Apocrypha of the Old Testament as a part of
it. The Paulicians in the East rejected (like the
Gnostics) the Old Test. and the writings of Peter. But as late as the age of the Carlovingians doubts were
entertained even within the pale of the catholic church
itself respecting the genuineness of various parts of the
Old Testament.

(1) Comp. the Canon of Isidore Hispalensis de eccles. Off. i.
p. 12. and the decisions of synods on this point. See also John
Damasc. iv. 17. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln ii. p. 106.
Concerning the apocryphal writings some western theologians,
such as Odo of Clugny, Hugo of St. Victor, John of Salisbury,
Hugo of St. Caro, and others, appealed to Jerome, but the
Canon of Augustine was more generally adopted. See Münscher,

(2) According to Petrus Siculus, quoted by Wettstein Neues

(3) "The monks of the monastery of St. Gallen ventured to
point out what they thought unworthy of God in the Canon of
the Sacred Scriptures. Concerning the books of Chronicles
and Esther, their opinion was: in eas littera non pro auctori-
tate, tantum pro memoria tenetur. They judged, in like
manner of the book of Judith, and of the Maccabees." Jo-
hannes von Müller, Geschichte der Schweizerischen Eidgenossen,
Book i. ch. 12. p. 287. according to Notker, de interpretat. S. S.
ad Salomonem in Pez. thes. anecld. T. i.
INSPIRATION.

§ 161.

INSPIRATION.

Generally speaking, the notions hitherto entertained respecting inspiration continued to prevail in the church.\(^1\) The assertion of Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, that the sacred penmen had not always adhered to the rules of the grammar, called forth decided opposition on the part of Fredegis, abbot of Tours, against which Agobard defended himself with good common sense.\(^2\) Euthymius Zigabenus met with less opposition on the part of the Greek church, though he did not hesitate to give his opinion respecting the discrepancies respecting the different evangelists.\(^3\) The scholastic divines endeavoured to define more precisely the idea of inspiration,\(^4\) while the mystics more or less confounded the idea of the inspiration of Holy Writ with that of Divine inspiration in general.\(^5\) On the whole, it ought to be borne in mind, that the theologians of the present period, whose tendency was of a poetic nature, continued to believe in the power of Divine inspiration (which they extended beyond the Canon of the Bible), and were far from restricting the fulness of the manifestations of the Divine Spirit within the narrow limits of a single book, however much importance might be attached to its Divine origin.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. iv. c. 17. (Opp. i. p. 282): \\
\textit{diā πείσματος τῶν ἁγίων ὅ τι νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, εὐαγγελισταὶ καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ συμμάχους ἐλάλησαν καὶ διδάσκαλοι. Πάντα τοῖς γάρῃ Ἐσπερινοῖς πάντως καὶ ὑφιλιμοῖς x. t. l.} (1 Tim. iii. 16.)

\(^2\) Agobard ad Fredegisium Abbatem. (Opp. Par. p. 157 ss.) Abbot Fredegis would have extended infallibility even to translators and commentators. Concerning the sacred penmen themselves, Fredegis asserted: \\
\textit{turpe est credere Spir. Sanctum, qui omnium gentium linguas mentibus Apostolorum infudit, rusticitatem potius per eos, quam nobilitatem uniuscujusque}
linguae locutum esse; hence he further maintained: ut non solum sensum prædicationis et modos vel argumenta dictionum Spir. S. eis inspiraverit, sed etiam ipsa corporalia verba extrinsecus in ora illorum ipse formaverit. Agobard replied as follows: Quod si ita sentitis, quanta absurditas sequetur, quis numerare poterit? Restat ergo ut sicut ministerio angelico vox articulata formata est in ore asinae, ita dicatis formari in ore Prophetarum, et tunc talis etiam absurditas sequetur, ut si tali modo verba et voces verborum acceperunt, sensum ignorant; sed absit talia deliramenta cogitare. He quoted several instances from Scripture relative to differences of style, and to confessions on the part of writers themselves, e.g. Exod. iv. and 1 Cor. i.—Laus divinae sapientiae (he continued) in sacris mysteriis et in doctrina spiritus inventur, non in inventiis verborum. Vos sic laudatis, ut laude vestra magis minore tur, quam augeretur (divina majestas), quoniam in his, quæ extrinsecus sunt, dicitis nobilitatem linguarum ministrasse Apostolis Spiritum Sanctum, ut confuse et indifferenter cum Apostolis omnes interpretes et quoscunque expositores laudetis et defendatis. “Near as Agobard was to drawing a precise distinction between the Divine and that which is peculiarly human in the idea of inspiration,” yet he was far from “fully developing it.” Neander, Kirchengeschichte iv. p. 388. (Thus Agobard supposed, p. 164. that the sacred penmen could have written better if they would have done so, but that they accommodated themselves to human infirmities.)

(3) *Comment. in Evang. Matth. c. xii. 8. T. i. p. 465. ed. de Matthæi. Comp. Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xxviii. p. 310. That one evangelist sometimes relates what is omitted by another etc., he simply attributes to the circumstance, that they did not very exactly recollect all the events of the life of Christ, because it was not till a considerable space of time had elapsed that they composed their narratives.

(4) ‘However much the scholastic divines have done in the developement of all the other ideas which determine the sphere of revelation, and however much we owe to them, especially as regards the fact that they defined the objective idea of a miracle, their definitions concerning this point (the doctrine of inspiration) are very scanty. This point was assumed as an águóν, which needed no further proof, inasmuch as the whole Christian church moved in this element.’ Rudelbach, die Lehre von der Inspiration der heiligen Schrift
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(comp. § 32.) p. 48. 49. We find however more precise definitions in the writings of the principal scholastic divines, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.* The former treats of the subject in question in his Summa theolog. Pars i. qu. 1. the latter in his


(a) On this point too the opinions were different. The more considerate mystics, such as the followers of St. Victor, adhered closely to the Sacred Scriptures, and ascribed inspiration to them in a peculiar sense. Comp. Liebner, Hugo von St. Victor p. 128 ss. (little is there said respecting the idea of inspiration itself, but the inspiration of the Scriptures is everywhere presupposed.) Hugo supposed that in some instances the sacred penmen had drawn from their own resources, e. g. the author of Ecclesiastes, see Liebner p. 160.; but in other places he distinguished between the Divine and that which is peculiarly human. Thus he observed concerning Obadiah, that he combined profound ideas with a plain style, and was sparing in words, but rich in thoughts, ibid. p. 163. Savonarola, whose opinions were allied to those of the mystics, also believed that the Sacred Scriptures are strictly speaking inspired by God; but he proceeded on the principle (as Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom had done before him, comp. § 32. note 8. and § 119. note 4.), that the gospels were originally written not so much on tables of stone, or sheets of paper, as into hearts of flesh by means of the finger and power of the Holy Ghost. He admitted at the same time that limitation according to which God did not use the sacred writers as instruments which have no will of their own, but suffered women to talk as women, and shepherds as shepherds etc. see Rudelbach, Savonarola, p. 335. 36. Savonarola however did not limit inspiration to the Sacred Scriptures, inasmuch as it is well known that he ascribed prophetic gifts to himself, though without making any boast of them. Concerning this prophetic gift, as well as that claimed by Joachim and Brigitta, see Rudelbach l. c. p. 297 ss.; the views of

* Similar definitions were set forth concerning the prophets of the Old Test. by the rabbin of the middle ages, Moses Maimonides and others, see Rudelbach l. c. p. 50 ss. And how much attention some of the schoolmen must have given to the subject in question, may be seen from the circumstance that Anselm spent whole nights in meditating on it, see Möhler l. c. p. 52.
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Savonarola himself on this subject are given ibid. p. 303. (they are taken from the Compendium revelationum.)—The fanatic mystics on the contrary maintained, in opposition to Scripture, that being filled with the Holy Spirit, they were above the law, see Mosheim de Beguinis p. 216., or openly taught: multa in Evangelii esse poetica, quae non sunt vera, sicut est illud: Venite, benedicti etc. Item, quod magis homines debent credere humanis conceptibus, qui procedunt ex corde, quam doctrinæ evangelicae. Item, aliquos ex eis posse meliores libros reparare omnibus libris catholicæ fidei etc. quoted by Mosheim l. c. p. 258.—Comp. § 159.

(c) Thomas Aquinas says I. qu. xii. art 13. (the passage refers properly speaking to the visions recorded in Scripture, but admits of a more general application): lumen naturale intellectus confortatur per infusionem luminis gratui et interdum etiam phantasmata in imaginatione hominis formantur divinitus, magis exprimentia res divinas, quam ea, quæ naturaliter sensibilibus accipimus. "Such an extraordinary and direct inspiration was formerly ascribed to Thomas, Scotus and other theologians, when the accounts of frequent appearances and visits on the part of God, as well as other blessed and holy persons were generally believed." Semler, introduction to Baumgarten ii. p. 63. It was the opinion of the mystics that higher divine inspiration was still vouchsafed to the pious. Gerson consid. X.: Intelligentia simplex est vis animæ cognitiva, suscipientes immediate a Deo naturalem quandam lucem, in qua et per quam principia prima cognoscuntur esse vera et certissima terminis apprehensis (quoted by Liebner, Hugo von St. Victor, p. 340., where further details are given respecting the mystical doctrine of revelation as held by Hugo and Richard of St. Victor.) The reader may compare with this opinion the views of Tauler (Predigten i. p. 124.), who made a distinction between active and passive reason. The latter must act upon the former; but it receives its own revelations from God. In accordance with earlier notions inspiration was extended even to worldly subjects, e. g. to poetry. Thus it is said in the biography of St. Elizabeth concerning the singers on the Wartburg: "they contend against each other with songs, and enriched their songs with pretty mysteries which they had borrowed from Holy Writ, without being very learned men: for God had revealed it to them;" see Koberstein, über das Gedicht vom Wartburgkriege. Naum-
§ 162.

INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.—EXTENT OF THE PERUSAL OF THE BIBLE.

A sound interpretation which rests on a grammatico-historical basis, was scarcely known in consequence of the neglect of philological studies, and it was not until the close of this period, that a new light began to dawn. Scripture was interpreted either in close and slavish accordance with the dictates of the church and tradition, or in an arbitrary and allegorical manner; the former was the system adopted by the advocates of subtile scholasticism, the latter that of speculative mystics. John Scotus Erigena taught an infinite sense of Scripture, others adopted Origen's notions of a threefold, or Augustine's idea of a fourfold sense of Scripture, while some even went so far as to speak of a sevenfold or eightfold sense. Principles of interpretation however were not altogether overlooked; some of them were practically useful. The rulers of the church endeavoured (from fear of heresy) to restrict the perusal of the Bible on the part of the people, while private individuals were anxious to recommend it. Sound scriptural views and biblical interpretation are found in the writings of John Wessel, the characteristic feature of whose theology is a biblical tendency.

1. See Liebner, Hugo of St. Victor p. 132. 133.: "They [the commentators of the present period] would either rest satisfied with collecting the interpretations of the Fathers according to the popular notion of a threefold sense of Scripture; or they would pursue an independent course of exegesis, so as to dispense with all investigations of a philosophical and antiquarian character, further to develop the said notion of a threefold
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't sense, and to indulge freely in those speculations to which a
right or wrong apprehension of the Latin version of the Sacred
Scriptures would accidentally give rise. The former method
was almost exclusively adopted till the eleventh century.
But it being found to be unsatisfactory, when from the middle
of that century a new spiritual life began to manifest itself,
and both mysticism and scholasticism were flourishing, the
other method was resorted to. This new kind of mystico-
dialectic exegesis.....seems to have been principally developed,
though not first introduced, and brought into general use by
Rupert of Duytz (he died A. D. 1135.) A wide and fertile
field was thus opened for mystical and subtle investigations.
Both the mystics and scholastics, though each in his own way,
brought now all their contemplations and speculations into
Scripture, and carried this often so far as to leave scarcely any
traces of the simple meaning of holy writ.'

(1) De div. nat. iii. 24. p. 132 [134]: Infinitus conditor
Sacra? Scripturaein mcntibus prophctarum, Spiritus Sanctus,
infinitos in ea constituit intellectus, ideoque nullius expositoris
sensus sensum alterius aufert, dummodo sanes fidei catholiceque
professioni conveniat, quod quisque dicat, sive aliunde accipiens,
sive a se ipso illuminatus, tamen a Deo inveniens. Comp iii.
26. iv. 5. p. 164.

(2) Thus Paschasius Radbert taught a threefold sense of
Scripture, viz. 1. the literal (historical) sense, 2. the spiritual
and mystical, (that which refers to the church), and 3. the moral
(relative to the soul of every individual Christian.) Rabanus
Tropology; 4. Anagogy. Hugo of St Victor (see Liebner l. c.
p. 133 ss.) and Savonarola (see Rudelbach p. 343.) did the
same. Angelom, a monk at Luxeuil, held the notion of a seven-
fold sense: 1. the historical, 2. the allegorical, 3. the inter-
mediate sense which lies between the two preceding ones, 4.
the tropical (that referring to the Trinity), 5. the parabolical,
6. that sense which has regard to the two natures of Christ,
and 7. the moral; see Pez. thesaurus Tom. i. and Schmid,
Mysticismus des Mittelalters p. 76. Concerning the eightfold
sense, see Marrier on Odonis Cluniacensis moralia in Iobum
(Bibl. Max. Patr. T. xvii. p. 315.) 1. Sensus literalis vel his-
toricus, 2. allegoricus vel parabolicus, 3. tropologicus vel ety-
mologicus, 4. analogicus vel analogicus, 5. typicus vel ex-
emplaris, 6. anaphoricus vel proportionalis, 7. mysticus vel apocalypticus, 8. boreademicus vel primordialis (i.e. quo ipsa principia rerum comparantur cum beatitudine æterna et tota dispensatione salutis, veluti loquendo de regno Dei, quod omnia sint ad Deum ipsum, unde manarunt, reditura). The threefold sense of Scripture was itself mystically interpreted, e.g. by St. Bernard (Ser. 92. de diversis.) The bridegroom conducts the bride, 1. into the garden: the historical sense; 2. into the different cellars for spices, fruit and wine: the moral sense; 3. into the cubiculum: the mystical sense. And Hildebert of Mans compared the fourfold sense of Scripture to the four legs of the table of the Lord (Ser. ii. in fest. assumptionis Mariæ.) See Lentz, Geschichte der Homiletik i. p. 275.

(4) Thus Hugo of St. Victor cautioned against indulging in allegorical interpretation, and asserted the equally great importance of literal interpretation, prænot. c. 5. quoted by Liebner p. 142. But his own expositions are sometimes fanciful and trifling, as may be seen from the examples adduced by Liebner p. 163.—Thomas Aquinas laid down the following principle (Summa P. i. Qu. 102. Art. 1.): In omnibus, quæ S. Scriptura tradit, pro fundamento tenenda veritas historica et desuper spirituales expositiones fabricanda.—According to Savonarola the first condition of a productive system of interpretation is to have the same spirit, in which the sacred books are written, i.e. the spirit of faith etc. See Rudelbach p. 339 ss.

(5) See the prohibitions of Pope Innocent III. (A. d. 1199.), of the Concil. Tolosanum (A. d. 1299.) Canon the 14th, Conc. Tarragonense (A. d. 1234.) c. 2. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 109., and the works of Ussher, Wharton, Hegelmaier and Onymus, which are there mentioned.

(6) Thus John Damascenus iv. 17. recommended the perusal of the Sacred Scriptures, though in a rather fanciful manner. He called them τῶν κάλλιστον παραδείσου, τῶν ἐσώτερης, τῶν γυλικύτατω, τῶν ὕψιστατω, τῶν παιδείος τῶν νοερῶν ἐφθέγματι κελαδήμασι περιπχεοῦντα ἡμῶν τὰ ὅτα ἐ. τ. λ. Anselm also strongly recommended the perusal of the Bible in his Tractatus asceticus, quoted by Mühler l. c. p. 62. Bonaventura (Principium in libros sacros) did the same. Comp. Lentz, Geschichte der Homiletik i. p. 290. Concerning the Biblia Pauperum of Bonaventura compare Lentz l. c. Respecting the effects produced by the perusal of
the Scriptures upon the Waldenses see the account given by Rainerius in the thirteenth century, in the Bibl. Patr. Lugd. T. xxv., quoted by Neander, kleine Gelegenheitsschriften p. 162.; concerning the efforts of the friars of common life for the spread of biblical knowledge among the people, see Neander l. c. p. 182 note.—Gerhard Zerbolt, a priest, who was a member of the association of pious Christians at Deventer, composed a treatise: de utilitate lectionis sacrarum litterarum in lingua vulgari: see Jacobi Revii Daventria illustrata p. 41. Extracts from it are given by Neander l. c.

(*) Ullmann, Johann Wessel, p. 190 ss.
SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY.
(INCLUSIVE OF COSMOLOGY, ANGELOLOGY, DEMONOLOGY, ETC.)

§ 163.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The proofs of the existence of God have their proper origin in the scholastic philosophy. That which formerly was but the semblance of an argument, now appeared in the form of a philosophical demonstration. Thus the cosmological proof of Diodore of Tarsus was fully developed by John Damascenus,\(^1\) the ontological proof of Augustine and Boëthius was established with philosophical precision by Anselm of Canterbury.\(^2\) Gaunilo, a monk, resting on a kind of empirical and popular philosophy, raised objections of a somewhat futile nature to the proof of Anselm, which were ingeniously refuted by the latter.\(^3\) The fate which the said proof met with, was various.\(^4\) While Hugo of St. Victor endeavoured to prove the existence of God in a different way, viz. from contingency,\(^5\) the theologians of the thirteenth century in general, and Thomas Aquinas in particular, returned to the argument of Anselm, though they modified it in various ways.\(^6\) Raimund of Sabunde propounded what is called the moral proof, according to which the existence of an eternal author of reward and punishment is inferred from the moral freedom and accountability of rational creatures.\(^7\) And lastly, we
may mention the historical proof of Savonarola and others, who endeavoured to demonstrate the existence of God from the consensus gentium. — There were however those who showed the unsatisfactory nature of the said arguments, or at least abstained from the use of all proofs of such a nature, and simply appealed to the direct manifestations of God in the heart of man. John Duns Scotus and William Ockham belonged to the former, John Wessel and most of all the mystics belonged to the latter.

1. De fide orthod. i. 3. John Damascenus proceeds from the principle: 

2. The method adopted by Diodoro of Tarsus § 123. note 3. Concerning the physico-theological proof he followed the earlier theologians, especially Athanasius, and Gregory of Nazianzum.

3. We can give here only the knots of the argument, the thread of reasoning must be seen from the connection. Monol. i.: Cum tam innumerabilia bona sint, quorum tam multam diversitatem et senaibus corporeis experimur et ratione mentis
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discernimus, estne credendum esse unum aliquid, per quod unum sunt bona quaecunque bona sunt aut sunt bona alia per aliquid?...III.: Denique non solum omnia bona per idem aliquid sunt bona et omnia magna per idem aliquid sunt magna, sed quicquid est per unum aliquid videtur esse....Quoniam ergo cuncta quae sunt, sunt per ipsum unum: procul dubio et ipsum unum est per se ipsum. Quaecunque igitur alia sunt, sunt per aliquid, et ipsum solum per se ipsum. At quicquid est per aliquid, minus est quam illud per quod cuncta sunt alia et quod solum est per se, quare illud quod est per se, maxime omnium est. Est igitur unum aliquid, quod solum maxime et summe omnium est; quod autem maxime omnium est et per quod est quicquid est bonum vel magnum, et omnino quicquid est aliquid est, id necesse est esse summe bonum et summe magnum et summum omnium quae sunt. Quare est aliquid, quod sive essentia, sive substantia, sive natura dicatur, optimum et maximum est et summum omnium quae sunt. Comp. § 123. note 4. The mode of argument which is found Prosl. c. 2. is more original (he there proceeds from the reality of an idea.) The fool may say in his heart: There is no God (Ps. xiv. 1.), but he thereby shows himself a fool, because he asserts something which is contradictory in itself. He has the idea of God in him, but denies its reality. But if God exists in idea, he must also exist in reality. Otherwise the real God, whose existence we may comprehend, would be superior to the one who exists only in imagination, and consequently would be superior to the highest imaginable object, which is absurd; hence it follows, that that, beyond which nothing can be conceived to exist, really exists (thus idea and reality coincide.) Convincitur ergo insipiens, esse vel in intellectu aliquid, quo nihil majus cogitari potest: quia hoc cum audit, intelligit, et quicquid intelligitur in intellectu est. Et certe id, quo majus cogitari nequit, non potest esse in intellectu solo. Si enim vel in solo intellectu est, potest cogitari esse et in re, quod majus est. Si ergo id, quo majus cogitari non potest, est in solo intellectu: id ipsum, quo majus cogitari non potest, est quo majus cogitari potest: sed certe hoc esse non potest. Existit ergo procul dubio aliquid, quo majus cogitari non valet et in intellectu et in re. If therefore the fool says: there is no God, he says it indeed, and may perhaps even think it. But there is a difference between thought and thought. To imagine a thing which is
like a word without meaning, *e. g.* that fire is water (a mere sound, an absurdity!), is very different from conceiving a thought which corresponds to the word by which it is expressed. It is only according to the former mode of thinking (which destroys the thought itself), that the fool can say: there is no God, but not according to the latter.

(a) *Gaunilo* was a monk in the monastery of Marmoutier. He wrote: Liber pro insipiente adv. Anselmi in Proslogio ratiocinationem (in Anselmi Opp. p. 32. Gerb. p. 53.)* The idea of a thing does not necessarily imply its reality; there are many false ideas. Yea, it is very questionable, whether we can at all form an idea of God, since he is above all idea...... If one in speaking of an island which he asserted to be more perfect and lovely than all known islands, would infer its existence from this that it could not be more perfect, if it did not exist, we should hardly know whether to think him the greatest fool who conducted such an argument, or him who gave his assent to it. The opposite method is to be adopted; we must first prove the existence of the island, and may then show that its excellence surpasses that of all others, etc. "*It is easy to perceive that Gaunilo argued against Anselm from the empirical point of view, and consequently took quite a different ground.*" Möhler, l. c. p. 152. Anselm defended himself against Gaunilo in his treatise: Liber apologeticus contra Gaunilonem respondentem pro insipiente (it is also called contra Insipientem, Opp. p. 34. Gerberon, p. 37.) He returns to the above distinction between thought and thought, and rejects the illustration taken from the island as altogether inappropriate. He observes, that if Gaunilo could *really* imagine an island more perfect than could ever be conceived, he would make him a present of it. "In the opinion of Anselm the idea of the most perfect being was a necessary idea, between which, and the arbitrary and imaginary notion of a most excellent island no parallel could be drawn." Möhler, p. 153. (Comp. Hegel, Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften. 2d edit. 1827. p. 61 ss. p. 181.: "Anselm was right in declaring only that to be perfect which exists not only subjectively, but also objectively. In vain we affect to

* Anselm was probably unacquainted with the author of the treatise in question. It is quoted as the work *incerti auctoris* in the earlier editions of Anselm's works. Comp. Gerberon, T. i. p. ii.
despise this proof, commonly called the ontological, and this
definition of the perfect set forth by Anselm; it is inherent in
the mind of every unprejudiced man, and re-appears in every
system of philosophy, though against the knowledge and even
the will of philosophers, as well as in the principle of direct
faith.”) On the question, whether the proof of Anselm can be
properly called a proof, see Möhler, l. c. p. 154. Respecting
the entire controversy comp. Ziegler, W. C. L., Beitrag zur

(4) The theory of Anselm “has gained a considerable histo-
rical reputation. It was not only applied in different ways,
and further developed by eminent writers, but up to the pre-
sent day it has been either opposed or defended, according to
the respective character of every philosophical school.”
Möhler, p. 150.

(5) “Hugo did not perceive the depth of Anselm’s idea, since
he was deceived by the superficial, dialectic reasoning of Gau-
from contingency which Peter of Poitiers afterwards adopted,
is given in Hugo’s treatise: de sacramentis c. 7—9. de tribus
dieb. c. 17. quoted by Liebner, p. 369. 70. It is as follows:
Reason which, as the creature and image of God, is able to
know him, is distinguished from the body in which it dwells,
and from all that is sensuous, as that which is invisible and spi-
ritual. But it is aware that it has not always been either active
or conscious of itself, and that therefore there was a time when
it did not exist: for it is impossible to conceive of a faculty of
perception without beginning and consciousness. It must there-
fore have had a commencement. Possessing a spiritual nature,
it cannot possibly derive its origin from the sensuous, but must
necessarily have been created out of nothing; hence it follows
that it owes its existence to an external author. But the author
himself cannot have been created, for all that is created cannot
give existence to another being. We must therefore assume
the existence of an independent and eternal being as the first
cause. (This proof occupies, as it were, an intermediate posi-
tion between the cosmological and the ontological. The cosmo-
logical proof has the world for its foundation, the ontological
the idea, and the argument of Hugo rests on the basis of the
spirit.) Hugo made also use of the cosmological and physico-
theological proofs, the latter of which was at that time the most
popular. Nor made Peter Lombard use of the proof of Anselm; Sentent. i. dist. 3. comp. Mün scher ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 34.

(6) Summæ, P. i. Qu. 2. Art. i. Münscher ed by von Cölln, p. 35. Schröckh xxix. p. 77. His argument amounts to this, that the proposition: "God exists," may be regarded as established, if considered in itself (quantum in se est), since predicate and subject do not differ; but it is not so in regard to ourselves. Thomas connected the various modes of argumentation with each other on the principle which had previously been adopted by Richard of St. Victor, de Trin. i. c. 6 ss. (comp. Engelhardt Richard von St. Victor, p. 99 ss.) He enumerated five different kinds of proof: 1. that derived from the first moving principle (primum movens), which is not itself moved by any other principle; 2. that derived from the first great cause (causa efficiens); 3. that derived from what is necessary by itself (per se necessarium) (these first three kinds form together the cosmological proof in its dialectic form); 4. that derived from the gradation of things (or the argument from the imperfect to the absolute perfect; Augustine and Anselm had propounded the same proof); 5. that derived from the adaptation of things (the physico-theological, or teleological proof.)

(7) Abelard had previously directed attention to this proof (Theol. christ. v. Martène, p. 1439.), but not so much to a strictly cogent proof (magis honestis, quam necessariis rationibus niti- mur), as to the voice of conscience. Quam honestum vero sit ac salubre omnia ad unum optimum tam rectorem quam condemnare et cuncta potius ratione quam casu fieri seu regi. nullus est ui propria ratio non suggerat conscientia. Qua enim sollicitudo bonorum operum inesset, si quem nec amore nec timore veroremur, Deum penitus ignoraremos? Quae spes aut malitiam refrænaret potentum, aut ad bona eos allicere- ret opera, si omnium justissimus ac potentissimus frustra crede- retur? Ponamus itaque, ut dum bonis prodesse ac placere quaerimus, obstinatos cogere non possimus, cum ora eorum non necessariis obstruamus argumentis. Ponamus, inquam, hoc si volunt; sed opponamus, quod nolunt, summam eorum impudentiam arguentes, si hoc calumniatur, quod refellere nullo modo possunt, et quod plurima tam honestate quam utilitate commendatur. Inquiramus eos, qua ratione malint eligere, Deum non esse, quam esse, et cum ad neutrum cogi necessario possint et alterum multis commendetur rationibus, alterum nullis, ini-
quissimam eorum confundamus impudentiam, qui id quod optimum esse non dubitent, omnibusque est tam rationibus, quam auctoritatibus consentaneum, sequi respuant et contrarium complectantur.—The argument used by Raimund had more of the form of a proof, Theolog. natural. Tit. 83. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln, p. 38. Tennemann, Geschichte der Philos. viii. p. 964 ss. Since man is an accountable being; but can neither reward nor punish himself, it follows, that there must be a being superior to him who bestows rewards and inflicts punishments; for if there were no such being, the life of man would be fruitless, a game of chance. As moreover the irrational creation is subject to man, and exists for his sake, it would follow, that it were a thing to no purpose, if no corresponding higher being were above man. But now we perceive order and harmony in the whole external creation which is subject to man;* how can we suppose that less order exists in the moral world, than in the natural? As the eye corresponds to things visible, the ear to things audible, and reason to things comprehensible, so the moral actions of man must have their corresponding judgment and retribution, and consequently a judge and retributer. But this judge must possess a perfect knowledge of all human actions, and an insight into their moral nature, that is to say, he must be omniscient; it is also evident, that he must be just in the highest sense of the word, and, lastly, he must be possessed of unlimited power to execute his judgments, or in other words, he must be almighty. But such a being cannot but be the most perfect of all beings, i.e. God. (The similarity between this proof and that of Kant has often been pointed out.)

(8.) Comp. Triumph. cruc. Lib. i. c. 6. p. 38 ss. quoted by Meier, p. 245.
(9.) Sentent. 1. Dist. 2. Qu. 2. Art 1. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln, p. 37. Tiedemann, iv. p. 632. An objection was especially made to the proof derived from the necessarium per se, inasmuch as Scotus made a distinction between the ideas of possibility and necessity.

* Richard directs our attention to the gradation of beings. Some of them only exist (inorganic beings); others exist and live (plants); still others exist, live, and are susceptible of sensations (animals); and, lastly, some exist, live, are susceptible of sensations, and think (man.) In man all the other stages are repeated.
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(11) Wessel reasoned as follows: The general and most direct means by which man attains God, is the original consciousness of God which is inherent in every rational spirit. As no place is so dark as not to receive some light or other from a sun-beam, so no rational soul is without some sort of indwelling notion (notitia) of God......(Ps. xix. 6.) This knowledge however is not the same in all men, but develops itself differently in different persons according to their other talents, and their whole moral and intellectual condition; in like manner, the universal light of the sun is differently received by different objects according to their susceptibility, position and distance. Wessel designates the said simple and universal knowledge of God as the name of God, which dwells, as it were, in every spirit, is expressed in every soul, and may therefore in every soul be brought to consciousness; de orat. Lib. v. Ullmann, p. 200.

(12) Tauler, Predigten, vol. i. p. 58.: I possess a power in my soul which is in every way susceptible of God; I am as sure as I live, that no thing is so near to me, as God. God is nearer to me, than I am to myself, etc. Comp. the following § note 3.

§ 164.

GOD AS A BEING WHICH MAY BE COMPREHENDED.

In proportion as men presume to prove the existence of God, they will pretend with more or less boldness to a knowledge of his nature. Hence the scholastic divines made the nature of God the special object of their speculations. Nevertheless they expressly asserted, that God cannot be comprehended, and admitted for the most part, that he can be known but partially by man.(1) (The views of Ockam on this subject bordered upon scepticism.)(2) The mystics on the contrary endevoured, in opposition both to a cold dogmatism and to scepticism, to live a hidden life in God, and thus to obtain an
intuitive vision of God himself in his light, and of all things in God.\(^\text{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) John Damascenus de fide orthod. i. 4. had taught, after the example of some of the earlier Fathers, that God does not come under the category of things (οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὅρων ἵστιν), which amounts to nothing less than the modern speculative idea of God, i. e. to a nonentity. He is ἡμῖν γνώσις τούτων καὶ ἅμα ὁδίκαι, and it is only by way of negation (ὅτε ἀφανίζοντος), that we acquire the knowledge of his attributes (comp. what Clement of Alexandria said in an earlier period § 37 note.) John Scotus Eri- gena went still farther, and assuming more than is lawful for man to do, he maintained, de divis. nat. ii. 28. p. 78.: that God does not know himself. Deus itaque nescit se quid est, quia non est quid; incomprehensibilis quippe in aliquo et sibi ipsi et omni intellectui.—The more modest Anselm, on the contrary, returned to more correct views, by confessing frankly in his Monolog., that God alone knows his own nature, and that no human wisdom can so much as presume, to measure or to comprehend the Divine wisdom. For it is certain that what we ascribe to God only relatively, does not express his nature (si quid de summa natura dicitur relative, non est ejus significativum substantiae.) Compare the passages (from c. 31. 64. 65.) quoted by Münscher ed. by von Colln, p. 44. and Möhler l. c. p. 154. 55. Similar language occurs in Alan. ab Ins. de art. cathol. fidei. 16. 17. quoted by Pez. i. p. 482.—Resting on this basis Thomas Aquinas (Summae P. i. qu. 12-art. 12.) proved that man has no cognitionem quidditativam of God (i. e. he does not know God by himself,) but habitudinem ipsius ad creaturas, while Scotus (Sent. i. Dist. 3. qu. 1. art. 1.) taught the opposite doctrine. The final result of the controversy carried on between the Thomists and Scotists de cognitione Dei quidditativa was, that it was decided, that man has a cognitio quidditatis Dei, but not a cognitio quidditativa, i. e. that he may know the nature of God (in opposition to a mere accidental and superficial notion,) but that he cannot know God thoroughly, i. e. in such a manner as that no part of his nature should be concealed from man.)*

* Cajetanus Summæ P. 1. Qu. 12. de arte et essentia c. 6. qu. 4: Aliud est cognoscere quidditatem s. cognitio quidditatis, aliud est cognitio quidditativa s. cognoscere quidditativa. Cognoscit nempe leonis quidditatem quicun-
Comp. the passages quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 63, 64. and Eberhard, naturliche Theologie der Scholastiker, p. 52—66.—Durandus of St. Pourcain informs us (in Magistri Sentent. i. Dist. 3. Qu. i.) of a threefold way which leads to the knowledge of God: 1. Via eminentiae, which ascends from the excellencies of creatures to the highest excellencies, i.e. to the perfect God. 2. Via causalitatis, which ascends from the phenomena of creation to the first cause. 3. Via remotionis, which begins with changeable and dependent existence, and ends with necessary and absolute existence.—Alexander Hales used similar and still simpler expressions (Summa P. i. Qu. 2. Membr. i. Art. 2.): Dicendum, quod est cognitio de Deo per modum positionis et per modum privationis. Per modum privationis cognoscimus de Deo, quid non est, per modum positionis quid est. Divina substantia in sua immensitate non est cognoscibilis ab anima rationali cognitione positiva, sed est cognoscibilis cognitione privativa. Comp. Münscher ed. by von Cölln l. c. On the endeavours of later Greek theologians, e.g. Nicholas of Methone, (especially after the example of Dionysius the Areopagite) to represent the insufficiency of our knowledge and terminology respecting Divine things, see Ullmann l. c. p. 72—74.: The Divine is in no wise to be confounded and compared with all that exists: on the whole, it would be better to express in an exaggerated and exceptional manner (γεγενημένα xareγαςροι') all that is predicated of the Divine etc.

Ockam founded his definitions, which differed only formally, (like Alexander Hales) upon the positive and negative knowledge of God (Quodl. theolog. 1. Qu. 1.); he has such as the following: Deus est aliquid nobilis et aliquid melius omni alio a se and: Deus est quo nihil est melius, prius vel perfectius. He combated the arguments of the earlier scholastics, Centiloqu. Concl. 2. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 51.

Thus Gerson said (contra vanam curiositatem, lectio secunda t. i. p. 100. quoted by Ch. Schmidt p. 73): fides saluberrima et omnis metaphysica tradit nobis, quod Deus est simplicissimus in supremo simplicitatis gradu, supra quam imaginari sufficitium. Hoc dato, quid opus est ipsam unitissimam essentiam per formas metaphysicam vel quidditates vel rationes ideales vel que novit aliquid ejus prædictatum essentiale. Cognoscit autem quidditativa non nisi ille qui omnia prædictata quidditativa usque ad ultimam differentiam novit. The passage is quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln l. c.
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alias mille imaginandi vias secernere, dividere, constitutere, praescindere ex parte rei, ut dicunt, et non ex intellectus negotiatione circa eam? Deus sancte, quot tibi prioritates, quot instantia, quot signa, quot modeitates, quot rationes aliqui ultra Scotum condistinguunt! Jam mille codices talibus impleti sunt, adeo ut longa aetas hominum eos vix sufficiat legere, ne dicam intelligere.—Gerson's theory of the knowledge of God (viz. the knowledge of God through love) was appropriately designated both by himself and by other theologians as Theologia affectiva. (Tract. iii. super magnificat. T. iv. p. 262.) Suso expressed himself as follows in his treatise: Eine Ausrichtung, wo und wie Gott ist (see Diepenbrock, das Leben und die Schriften von Heinrich von Suso, 1837. p. 212. c. lv.): Most men assert, that the idea of space cannot be applied to God, but that he is all in all. But now open the inner ears of your soul, and open them wide. The same masters maintain in the science called Logica, that we obtain the knowledge of a thing by means of its name. Thus a certain teacher asserts, that the name: being is the first name of God. Consider being in all its simplicity; look at being only as such, and as it is unmixed with nonentity; for all that has no existence is contrary to that which has existence; the case is the same with being as such, for it is contrary to all that has no existence. Any thing which either has already existed, or has yet to exist, does not now exist in essential presence. But now mixed existence or nonexistence cannot be known but by some mark of that being which is in all. For if we wish to comprehend any thing, reason meets first with existence, viz. that being which has made all things. This is the compound existence of some creature or other; for all compound existence is mixed up with something else, viz. the possibility of receiving something. Hence it follows, that the nameless Divine being must be in itself the being which is all in all, and preserves all compound beings by its omnipresence.” Ibidem p. 214: “Now open your inner eyes, and look, if possible, at the [Divine] being in all its simplicity and purity, and you will find that it owes its existence to none, has neither a ‘before’ nor an ‘after,’ and undergoes no change either from within, or from without, because it is a simple being. You will then be convinced that this being is the most real, omnipresent, and most perfect of all beings, in which there is neither defect nor change, because it is a single unity in perfect
simplicity. And this truth is so manifest to the enlightened reason of man, that it cannot conceive of any other. For one thing proves and causes the other. Since God is a simple being, he must necessarily be the first of all beings, created by none, and existing from eternity; since he is the first of all beings, eternal and simple, he must be omnipresent. It is a necessary quality of highest perfection and simplicity, that nothing can either be added to, or taken from it. If you understand what I have said of the simple Godhead, you will know something of the incomprehensible light of the hidden truth of God. This pure, simple being is the first cause of all actual existence; from its peculiar omnipresence it follows that it includes all that has come into existence in time, as the beginning and the end of all things. It is in all things, and out of all things, therefore a certain master says: 'God is a circular ring, the centre of which is everywhere, and the periphery of which is nowhere.' Compare with these expressions the language of Tauler (§ 163. note 11.), of Ruysbroek, quoted by Engelhardt p. 173. (God as such), and of the author of the "deutsche Theologie," cap. 1. where the practical point of view is most prominently brought forward, viz. the necessity of leading a godly life, in order to know God.

§ 165.

THE NATURE OF GOD IN GENERAL.

(Pantheism and Theism.)

The ingenious system of John Scotus Erigena, in which he, for scientific purposes, endeavoured philosophically to establish the contrast between God and the world (nature), was so misunderstood and misused by some of his close imitators, such as Amalrich of Bena, and David of Dinanto, as to give rise to a gross adoration of the flesh. The mystics also exposed themselves to the charge of pantheism by asserting that nothing except God has a real existence. But the more considerate among them retained, in accordance with orthodox theologians,
the theistical principle of a difference between God and his creatures, though they could not always scientifically prove that, to which they practically adhered. (4)

(1) In his work *de divisione naturarum* Erigena divided all nature (which comprehends all existence) into four modes of existence: 1. natura creans, sed non creata, *i.e.* God; 2. natura creans et creatae, *i.e.* the Son of God; 3. natura creatae et non creans, *i.e.* the world; and, 4. natura non creata et non creans, *i.e.* God (as the final object of all things.) Inasmuch as Erigena regarded God as the principle and cause of all things, he arrived at the conviction that the Divine being, the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, could not be created by another being, because there is no higher being from which it could derive its existence. But since he regards, on the other hand, the Divine being as the last object at which all things aim, and which is the end of their motion, he hence concludes, that this nature is neither created nor creating: for as every thing which has gone out from it returns to it, and as all existence depends on it, we cannot say that it creates any thing. What could God be supposed to create as he will be all in all things, and can at the same time represent himself in no other being, but in himself? Therefore he says, *i.e.* p. 42: *Cum audimus, Deum omnia facere, nihil aliud debemus intelligere, quam Deum in omnibus esse, hoc est essentiam omnium subsistere.* Ipse enim solus per se vere est et omne quod vere in his, quae sunt, dicitur esse, ipse solus est.—The following expressions are very beautiful, but might easily be misunderstood, *i.e.* p. 43: *Omne quod-cunque in creaturis vere bonum vereque pulchrum et amabile intelligitur, ipse est.* Sicut enim nullum bonum essentiale est, ita nullum pulcrum seu amabile essentiale prater ipsum solum. Comp. Tennemann, viii. 1. p. 80 ss. Schmid, über den Mysticismus des Mittelalters, p. 123 ss. Frommüller in the Tübingener Zeitschrift 1830. p. 1. p. 58 ss. Staudenmaier, Freiburger Zeitschrift 1840. iii. 2. p. 272 ss.

(2) Comp. § 153. note 4. From the proposition that he who loves, is in God, they inferred the following conclusion: "*that which is done in love is no sin; therefore stealing, robbing, committing lasciviousness, etc. is not sinful, if it be done in love.*" Comp. Ditmars Chronik von Grautoff edited by Hunter, Inno-

(3) Master Eckart approached pantheism nearer than any other mystic. He said: "God is nothing, and God is something. That which is something is also nothing; what God is once, he is at all times."—(Sermon in commemoration of the conversion of St. Paul, fol. 243. b. quoted by Schmidt in the Studien und Kritiken 1839. part 3. p. 692.)—"He (God) has the nature of all creatures in him, he is a being which has all beings in him."—"All that is in the Godhead is a unity, and we must not speak of it. God acts, but not the Godhead; it is not to be expected that the latter should work; since there is no work in it. There is the same difference between God and the Godhead, with that which exists between working and not working." (Sermon in commemoration of the execution of John the Baptist, fol. 302. a. quoted by Schmidt, l. c. 693.)—In Eckart's opinion God becomes God only through the work of creation. "Prior to the creation of the world God was not God, but he was what he was; nor was God in himself God, after creatures had been brought into existence, but he was only God in them." (Second sermon on All Saints' Day, fol. 307. a. Schmidt, l. c. p. 694.)—"Pantheism is a great and noble phenomenon deceiving us by a peculiar charm in the case of those who burn with love, and are, as it were, intoxicated with a sense of God, and the contemplation of Divine things. But where it is only the result of subtle conclusions and doctrinal definitions, or the proud but confused speculation of an indefinite religious feeling, it loses its grand relations, its mysterious poetry, and those faults which we once felt disposed to overlook, now become manifest, together with all the contradictions in which they involve us." Schmidt, l. c.

(4) Suso showed in highly characteristic language that a pantheistic disposition was nothing but a transitory excitement of the mind, which must first of all subside (in a quotation given by Diepenbrock p. 189.)—"I call that state of our mind flourishing, when the inner man is cleansed from sinful carnality, and delivered from remaining imperfections; when he cheerfully rises above time and place, while he was formerly bound, and could not make free use of his natural nobility. When man at that time opens the eyes of his mind, when he tastes other and
better pleasures which consist in the perception of the truth, in the enjoyment of Divine happiness, in insight into the present moment of eternity, etc., and when the created mind begins to comprehend a part of the eternal, uncreated mind both in itself and in all things around it, then man is moved by strange feelings. Examining himself and reflecting on what he once was, and what he now is, he recollects that he was a poor, ungodly, and wretched man, that he was blind, and lived far from God; but now he thinks "that he is filled with the Divine essence, that there is nothing which is not God, that God and all things are one and the same thing. He then goes too hastily to work, he becomes excited in his mind like wine which is in a state of fermentation, and has not as yet formed a sediment," etc. Such men are like bees which make honey; when they are full-grown, and come for the first time out of their hives, they fly about in an irregular manner, not knowing whither to go; some take the wrong direction, and lose themselves, but others come back to the right place. Thus it is with the men before spoken of, when they perceive God to be all in all, without their reason being regulated," etc. Gerson acutely defended the distinction between God and the creature (however highly it may be favoured) in opposition to Ruysbroek and Eckart, though he was not always consistent with himself. Comp. Hundeshagen p. 62 ss. Tauler maintained (Predigten vol. i. p. 61.), that nothing prevented the soul so much from knowing God as time and space; time and space are in his opinion parts, but God is a unity; therefore if the soul will know God, it must know him by going beyond time and beyond space; for God is neither the one nor the other, as those manifold things are, but he is a unity. The assertion of Wessel that "God alone exists, and that all other things are what they are, through him" (de orat. iii. 12. p. 76.), and some other of his propositions might lead us to suppose that he too was a pantheist, but compare on the other hand the appropriate observation of Ullmann p. 230 note.
§ 166.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

a. The Relation of God to Time, Space, and Number. (The Omnipresence, Eternity, and Unity of God.)

The writings of John Damascenus, and his successors in the Greek church contain less ample definitions and classifications on this point, than the more copious works of the schoolmen. Anselm and others endeavoured to point out the importance of the proposition laid down by Augustine, that the attributes of God not only form one whole, but are also identical with the Divine being itself, and cannot therefore be regarded as something foreign and manifold, which is merely attached to God. But the speculative and systematizing tendency of the scholastics frequently induced them to lose sight of this simple truth. Concerning the omnipresence of God some, e.g. Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, defended the omnipresence of the Divine substance in opposition to the doctrine of the omnipresence of a mere Divine influence, while others endeavoured to unite the two. A difference was also made between the eternity of God, and a mere sempiternitas, the latter of which may be possessed even by creatures (e.g. angels and the souls of men.) And lastly, it was asserted that the unity of God, which many of the schoolmen numbered among his attributes, was not to be regarded as a mere mathematical quality. The theologians of the Greek church signified this by extending the idea of a numerical unity to the unity which is above all other things.

(1) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. i. 4 : "Απειρον ουν το Θεον και άκαταληπτον και συναντυμον αυτοι ομοιον, h άπειρον και άκαταληπτον ου δι άλλα τα πρατών ή την φυσιν, άλλα τα πρατών δηλωντ
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God is not only just, but he is justice itself, etc. cap. 16.: Quid ergo, si illa summa natura tot bona est, eritne composita tot pluribus bonis, an potius non sunt plura bona, sed unum bonum tam pluribus nominibus significatum? Cum igitur illa natura nullo modo composita sit et tamen omni modo tot illa bona sit [sint], necesse est, ut illa omnia non plura, sed unum sint. Idem igitur est quodlibet unum illorum quod omnia sunt [sive] simul, sive singula, ut cum dicitur vel justitia vel essentia, idem significet quod alia, vel omnia simul vel singula. Hugo of St. Victor adopted similar views, see Liebner, p. 371. Comp. also Abelard, theolog. christ. iii. p. 1264.: Non itaque sapientia in Deo vel substantialis ei forma vel accidentalis, imo sapientia ejus ipse Deus est. Idem de potentia ejus sentiendum est et de ceteris quae ex nominum affinitate forma esse videntur in Deo quoque sicut in creaturis, etc. Alanus also said, l. c. art. 20. (quoted by Pez. i. p. 484.): Nomina enim ista: potentia potens, sapientia sapiens neque formam, neque proprietatem, neque quicquid talium Deo attribuere possunt, cum simplicissimus Deus in sua natura nihil sit talium capax. Cum ergo ratiocinandi de Deo causa nomina nominibus copulamus, nihil quod non sit ejus essentia praedicans, et si transsummatis nominibus de Deo quid credimus, improprie balbutius.

Hugo of St. Victor de sacram. c. 17: Deus substantialiter sive essentialiter et propriete et vere est in omni creatura sive natura sine definitione et in omni loco sine circumscriptione et omni tempore sine vicissitudine vel mutatione. Est ergo,
ubi est, totum, qui continet totum et penetrat totum; see Liebner p. 372. From the proposition that God is potentialiter in all things, Richard of St. Victor drew the inference that he also exists essentialiter in them, de Trin. ii. 24. see Engelhardt, p. 174. He is above all the heavens, and yet he is at the same time in them, he is in all that is corporeal and spiritual, in all that he has created, and governs according to his will. This notion of an essential presence of God was substantially the same as that of Peter Lombard, though he acknowledged that it was above human comprehension, Sent. i. Dist. 27. 9. According to Alexander Hales God is in all things, but he is not included in the same; he is without all things, but he is not excluded from them. God exists in things in a threefold manner: essentialiter, præsentialiter, potentialiter; these three modes however do not differ in themselves, but only in our idea of them. God does not exist in all things in the same manner, e. g. in those whose sins are pardoned, in the sacraments, etc. The question was also started: Can the indwelling grace of God be in the body of a man prior to its union with his soul? etc. see Cramer vii. p. 295. 7. The definitions of Thomas Aquinas are based on the system of Alexander, Summa 1. qu. 7. art. 1. (quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln, l. c.): Deus est in omnibus rebus, non quidem sicut pars essentiae, vel sicut accidens, sed sicut agens adest ei in quod agit. Oportet enim omne agens conjungi ei in quod immediate agit et sua virtute illud contingere. Art. 2: Deus omnem locum replet, non sicut corpus...... imo por hoc replet omnia loca, quod dat esse omnibus locatis, quæ replent omnia loca. Art. 3.: Substantia sua adest omnibus ut causa essendi etc. The dynamic (virtualis) scheme of the Thomists was opposed by the ideal view of the Scotists. See Münscher ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 50.—Bonaventura Comp. Theol. (Edit. Mogunt. 1609. p. 695) said: Ubique Deus est, tamen nusquam est, quia nec abest ulli loco, nec ullo capitur loco. (August.) Deus est in mundo non inclusus, extra mundum non exclusus, supra mundum non elatus, infra mundum non depressus. Ex his patet quod Deus est intra omnia, et hoc quia omnia replet et ubique præsens est. Ita extra omnia est, quia omnia continet, nec usquam valet coercari. Sed nota, quod hæc propositio, extra, dicit ibi non actualem præsentiam ad locum, sed potentialem, quæ est Dei immensitas, quæ infinitos mundos potest replere, si
essent. Idem ipse est supra omnia, quia omnibus praebat nec aliquid ei aequatur. Item infra omnia est, quia omnia sustinet et sine ipso nihil subsisteret. Dicimus etiam quod ubique est, non ut indiget rebus, quod ex eis sit, sed potius res sui indigent, ut per eum subsistant......Sciendum est ergo, ut aliquid est in loco circumscripotive et diffinuitive, ut corpus; aliquid diffinuitive, non circumscripotive, ut angelus; aliquid nec sic, nec sic, ut Deus, et hoc ideo, quia non individuat per materiam, ut corpus, neque per suppositum, ut Angelus. Aliquid est etiam in loco, partim circumscripotive, partim diffinuitive, ut corpus Christi in sacramento......Corpus autem Christi......in pluribus tamen locis est......sed non ubique......Nota quod Deus est multipliciter in rebus, scilicet per naturam, et sic est ubique potentialiter, praeessentialiter, essentialiter. Item per gratiam, sic est in bonis......Item per gloria, sic est in rationali virtute animae, ut veritas, in concupiscibili, ut bonitas, in irascibili, ut potestas. Item per unionem, sic fuit in utero virginis unitas humanae naturae, et in sepulcro unitas carni et in inferno unitas animae Christi etc. He even went so far as to ask, whether and in what manner God was in the devil? and to reply in the affirmative, inasmuch as the devil is composed of nature and spirit. St. Bernard said in his meditations (cap. I. quoted by Bonaventura, I. c.): Deus in creaturis mirabilis, in hominibus amabilis, in angelis desiderabilis, in se ipso incomprehensibilis, in reprobis intolerabilis, item in damnatis ut terror et horror. Tauler also made a distinction between the presence of God in things, and that in men: God is no less present in a piece of wood and a stone, than in men, but the former are not conscious of it. If the piece of wood knew God, and felt his nearness, even as the highest angels know him, the one would be quite as happy as the other. Man is happier than a piece of wood, because he recognizes God, etc. (Predigten, vol. i. p. 58. 59.)

This was done, e. g. by Alexander Hales, see Cramer, I. c. p. 209 ss. Comp. Bonaventura Comp. i. 18. He defined aeternitas (after the example of Boethius) as interterminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio (terminabilitas.)

John Damascenus de fide orth. i. 5. Nich. of Methone Refut. p. 25. (quoted by Ullmann, I. c. p. 72.) said: “When we call the unity [God] beginning, we do not mean to draw a comparison between it and that which is posterior to the beginning; for the same reason we do not merely use the term “begin-
ning" without further qualifying it, but we say over-commencing beginning, nor do we restrict ourselves to the term "unity" as such, but we call it the over-all-one; and instead of the first and first of all we say the over-first, instead of the great or the greatest, we make use of the term over-great." He called God the ὑπερωνόμας and even used the expression ὑπερωνόμας καὶ συνήθως. (Refut. 26.) Comp. Hugo of St. Victor, quoted by Liebner, p. 371.; he understood by unity not the numerical unity, but also simplicity (vera unitas), and immutability (summa unitas.)

§ 167.

b. THE RELATION OF GOD TO EXISTENCE—OMNIPOTENCE AND OMNISCIENCE.

The application of the Divine knowledge and power to things out of God gave easily rise to anthropomorphitic notions and absurd questions,(1) which were best removed by regarding the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience not as separate attributes, but in their connection with the Divine being. Anselm(2) and Abelard(3) agreed in asserting that God can do everything which may be done without interfering with his infinite perfection; Peter Lombard, Hugo of St. Victor, Richard of St. Victor and some others adopted the same view.(4) The knowledge of God was farther looked upon as being immediate and omnipresent, and a distinction was made between that aspect of the knowledge in question which refers to things (as habitus), and that which has regard to God himself (as actus).(5) Respecting the Divine omnipotence some, e. g. Abelard, maintained that God could make nothing else and nothing better, than what he really makes;(6) others, e. g. Hugo of St. Victor, thought this assertion blasphemous, because the infinite power of God is restricted by it within certain limits.(7)

(1) E. g. whether God could make undone that which is done? whether he could change a harlot into a pure virgin? and si-
milar absurd questions; see the passages quoted § 152. note 5. from the work of Erasmus.

Thus Anselm asserted, in reply to the question, whether God could lie, if he would? (Cur Deus homo i. 12.) : Non sequitur, si Deus vult mentiri, justum esse mentiri, sed potius Deum illum non esse. Nam nequaquam potest velle mentiri voluntas, nisi in qua corrupta est veritas, immo quæ deserendo veritatem corrupta est. Cum ergo dicitur: si Deus vult mentiri, non est aliud, quam: si Deus talis est natura, quæ velit mentiri etc. Comp. ii. 5: Denique Deus nihil facit necessitate, quia nullo modo cogitatur aut prohibetur aliquid facere. Et cum dicimus Deum aliquid facere, quasi necessitate vitandi inhostatem, quam utique non timet, potius intelligendum est, quia hoc facit necessitate servandæ honestatis, quæ scilicet necessitas non est aliud, quam inmutabilitas honestatis ejus, quam a se ipso et non ab alio habet; et idcirco improprir dicitur necessitas. ib. 18: Quoties namque dicitur Deus non posse, nulla negatur in eo potestas, sed insuperabilis significatur potentia et fortitudo. Non enim aliud intelligitur, nisi quia nulla res potest efficere, ut agat ille, quod negatur posse. Nam multum usitata est hujusmodi locutio, ut dicatur res aliqua posse, non quia in illa, sed quoniam in alia re est potestas; et non posse, non quoniam in illa, sed quia in alia re est impotentia. Dicimus namque: iste homo potest vinci, pro: aliquid potest eum vincere, et: ille non potest vincere, pro: nullus eum vincere potest. Non enim potestas est, posse vinci, sed impotentia, nec vincit non posse impotentia est, sed potestas. Nec dicimus Deum necessitate facere aliquid eo, quod in illo sit utra necessitas, sed quoniam est in alio, sicut dixi de impotentia, quando dicitur non posse. Omnis quippe necessitas est aut coactio, aut prohibatio, quæ duae necessitates convertuntur invicem contrarie, sicut necessitas est impossibile. Quidquid namque cogit esse, prohibetur non esse, et quod cogit non esse, prohibetur esse; quamadmodum quod necesse est esse, impossibile est non esse, et quod necesse est non esse, impossibile est esse, et conversim. Cum autem dicimus aliquid necesse esse aut non esse in Deo, non intelligitur, quod sit in illo necessitas aut cogens, aut prohibens, sed significatur, quod in omnibus aliis rebus est necessitas prohibens eam facere, et cogens non facere; contra hoc, quod de Deo dicitur. Nam cum dicimus, quod necesse est Deum semper verum dicere, et necesse est eum nunquam mentiri, non dicitur
aliud, nisi quia tanta est in illo constantia servandi veritatem ut necesse sit, nullum rem facere posse, ut verum non dicat, aut ut mentiatur.—Comp. Proslog. 7:........Inde verius es omnipotens, quia potes nihil per impotentiam et nihil potes contra te.—de concord. præsc. et præd. P. i. c. 2. ss. (where the question is discussed, how far the term necessitas can be applied to God.) Respecting the knowledge of God Anselm (after the example of Augustine) endeavoured to prove, that God does not know the things because they are, but that they are, because he knows them, ibid. c. 7.

(3) However different the theories of Abelard and Anselm were, yet in this one point they agreed. Theol. christ. lib. v. p. 1350. (Martène) : Querendum ita primo videtur, quomodo vere dicatur omnipotens, si non possit omnia efficere, aut quomodo omnia possit, si quædam nos possimus, quæ ipsæ non possit. Possimus autem quædam, ut ambulare, loqui, sentire, quæ a natura divinitatis penitus aliena sunt, cum necessaria istorum instrumenta nullatenus habere incorporea queat substantia. Quibus quidem objectis id prædicendum arbitrò, quod juxta ipsos quoque philosophos, et communis sermonis usum, nunquam potentia cujusque rei accipitur, nisi in his quæ ad commodum vel dignitatem ipsius rei pertinent. Nemo enim hoc potentia hominis deputat, quod ille superari facile potest, imo impotentia et debilitate ejus quod minime suo resistere potest incommodo, et quicquid ad vitium hominis vergit, magisque personam improbat, quam commendat, impotentiae potius quam potentiae adscribendum est......Nemo itaque Deum impotentem in aliquo dicere præsumat, si non possit peccare sicut nos possimus, quia nec in nobis ipsis hoc potentiae tribuendum est, sed infirmitati.........p. 1351 :.........Sicut etiam quædam, quæ in alius rebus potentiae deputanda sunt, in alius vero minime.........Inde potentem hominem comparatione aliorum hominum dicere mus, sed non ita leonem vel elephansem. Sic in homine quod ambulare valet potentiae est adscribendum, quoniam ejus necessitudini congruit, nec in aliquo ejus minuit dignitatem. In Deo vero, qui sola voluntate omnia compleat, hoc omnino superfluum esse, quod in nobis necessarium est, atque ideo non potentiae, sed vitio penitus tribuendum esset in eo, præsertim cum hoc in multis excellentiæ ipsius derogaret, ut ambulare videlice posset......Non absurde tamen et de his omnibus quæ efficere possimus Deum potentem prædicabimus, et omnia quæ agimus,
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ejus potentiae tribuimus, in quo vivimus, movemur et sumus. Et qui omnia operatur in omnibus (utitur enim nobis ad efficiendum quae vult, quasi instrumentis) et id quoque facere dicitur, quae nos facere facit, sicut dives aliquis turrem componere per opifices quos adhibet, et posse omnia efficere dicitur, qui sive per se sive per subjectam creaturam omnia quae vult et quomodo vult, operatur, et ut ita fiant, ipse etiam facit. Nam etsi non potest ambulare, tamen potest facere, ut ambuletur.........

*Posse itaque Deus omnia dicitur, non quod omnes suscipere posse actiones, sed quod in omnibus quae fieri velit, nihil ejus voluntati resistere queat.*


(5) Hugo of St. Victor (cap. 9. 14—18 quoted by Liebner p. 363. 364.) expressed himself as follows: “All things which were created by God in time, existed uncreated in him from eternity, and were known to him for this very reason, because they existed in him, and were known to him in the very manner, in which they existed in him. God knew nothing out of himself, because he comprehended all things in himself. They were not in him, because they should at some future period come into existence; the fact of their being designed to exist in time to come was not the cause of their existence in God, nor were they created in time because they existed in God, as if the eternal could not have existed without the temporal. On the contrary, the former would have existed without the latter: but it would not have stood in any relation to the latter, if this had

*With regard to the Trinity, it may be observed, that Abelard ascribed omnipotence principally to the Father, without denying it to either the Son or the Spirit.*
not existed as something which was to be in future. There would always have been the knowledge of an existence, viz. of an existence in God, though not of a future existence; but the knowledge of the creator would not therefore have been less comprehensive, because it could only be said that he had no foreknowledge of that which was not future.”—In the opinion of Alexander Hales God knows all things through himself and in himself; for if God knew them by means of something else, then the ground of his knowledge would be something perfect existing out of him, and he could not be the most perfect being which owes nothing to any other being......God knows all things at once; for he sees all things in himself, and since he knows himself at once and completely, it is evident that he knows all things in himself at once and perfectly. The things themselves may be multiplied or lessened, but not the knowledge of God; the latter is immutable; see Cramer vii. p. 240.—Bonaventura, Comp. i. 29: Scit Deus omnia præsentialiter et simul, perfecte quoque et immutabiliter. Præsentialiter dico, hoc est, ita limpide, ac si cuncta essent præsentialiter existentia. Simul etiam scit omnia, quia videndo se, qui sibi præsens est, omnia videt. Perfecte quoque, quia cognitio ejus nec potest augeri, nec minui. Scit et immutabiliter, quia noscit omnia per naturam sui intellectus, qui est immutabilis. Dicendum ergo, quod Deus cognoscit temporalia æternaliter, mutabilia immutabiliter, contingentia infallibiliter, creatas increatas, alia vero a se, in se et per se. Comp. Brev. i. 8.—On the relation between knowledge and foreknowledge, see John of Salisbury, Policrat. ii. 21. (Bibl. max. xxiii. p. 268.) An instance of subtle reasoning is given by Liebner, l. c. p. 365. note.

Abelard Theol. christ. v. p. 1354:......Facit itaque omnia quæ potest Deus, et tantum bene quantum potest......Necessese est, ut omnia que vult, ipse velit; sed nec inefficax ejus voluntas esse potest: necessæ est ergo ut quæcunque vult ipse perficiat, cum eam videlicet sumamus voluntatem, quæ ad ipsius pertinent ordinationem. Istis ergo rationibus astruendum videtur, quod plura Deus nullatenus facere possit quam faciat, aut melius facere, aut ab his cesser, sed omnia ita ut facit necessario facere. Sed rursus singulis istis difficillimæ occurrunt objectiones, ut utroque cornu graviter fidem nostram oppugnet complexio. Quis enim negare audeat, quod non possit Deus eum qui damnandus est solvere aut meliorem illum qui salvandus
C. MORAL ATTRIBUTES.

What is commonly called the moral attributes of God, viz. his wisdom, justice, and benevolence, were also treated of in the discussion of other doctrines, and sometimes induced theologians to suppose that they were contradictory to each other. The mystics preferred descending into the depth of Divine love, and endeavoured to explain it in their own way, while the scholastics advanced absurd questions even respecting this attribute of God, which admits least of all of being dialectically discussed.

(1) This was the case with the justice, omnipotence, and love of God in reference to the theory of satisfaction. Comp. Anselm, Cur Deus homo i. c. 6—12. and the preceding § note 1.

(2) The language of the author of the work entitled: Deutsche Theologie is worthy of notice (c. 50.): "God does not love himself as such, but as the most perfect being. For if God knew anything better than God, he would love it, and not him-
self. Self-love and self-will are entirely foreign to God; only so much belongs to God, as is necessary to constitute his personality, or the distinction between the different persons of the Trinity."

(3) Thus Alexander Hales asked (the passage is quoted by Cramer, vii. p. 261.), whether the love wherewith God loves his creatures is the same with that which he manifests towards himself, and the Divine persons manifest towards each other? He replies in the affirmative in reference to the principal idea, (principale signatum), but in the negative respecting the secondary idea (connatum), i. e. that love is the same on the part of him who loves, but not the same with regard to those who are loved. It is also on that account that God does not manifest the same degree of love towards all his creatures, but more of it towards the better portion of them, less towards the less good. He loves all creatures from eternity (in the idea), but he does not love them in reality, until they come into existence. Another question was: whom does God love most, the angels or men? The answer is: the former, inasmuch as Christ did not belong to the number of the latter; but the love wherewith God loves Christ, and consequently the human race in Christ, even surpasses the love which he manifests towards the angels. We have here a profound Christian truth expressed in a scholastic form.

§ 169.

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Walch, J. G., historia controversiarum, etc. Pfaff, historia succincta (comp. § 94.)

Before the doctrine of the Trinity could be more philosophically developed and fully established, it was necessary to settle the controversy which had arisen between the eastern and the western church respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son. After the view taken by the Greek church had been received in the East as the orthodox doctrine in consequence of the efforts made by John Damascenus,
the Emperor Charlemagne summoned a synod at Aix la Chapelle in the year 809, which being influenced especially by the Gallican theologians Alcuin and Theodulph of Orleans, confirmed the doctrine of the western church, according to which the Holy Ghost proceeds not only from the Father, but also from the Son.\(^2\) Pope Leo III. approved of the doctrine itself, but disapproved of the uncritical introduction of the clause “filioque” into the creed adopted by the council of Constantinople. He numbered the doctrine in question among those mysteries which pass knowledge, and are of greater importance in a speculative point of view, than in a practical aspect.\(^3\) But when in later times the controversy between Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Nicholas I. led to a disruption between the two churches, their difference on the said doctrines was again made the subject of discussion. Photius defended the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, and rejected the additional clause “filioque,” which the theologians of the western church, such as Æneas, bishop of Paris, and Ratramnus, a monk of Corvey, were desirous to retain.\(^4\) Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, likewise defended the doctrine of the Latin church at the synod of Barî (in Apulia) in the year 1098, and treated of it more fully in a separate treatise.\(^5\) The attempt made at the synod of Lyons in the year 1274, to reconcile the two parties, did not lead to any satisfactory result. The controversy was resumed in the year 1277; nor did the formula proposed at the synod of Florence (A. D. 1439.) settle the point in question.\(^6\) Hence it happened that from that time the two churches ever differed in this, that according to the Greek church the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, but according to the Latin church from both the Father and the Son.

\(^1\) De fide orth. i. c. 7. He called the Holy Ghost (in distinction from
a mere breath, or a mere Divine power) δύναμιν οὐσίωδην, αὐτὴν ἵαυτῆς ἐν ἱδιαζώσῃ ὑποστάσει Ἰερομαμήνη, καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς προεξομένη, but added: καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀνασαυμαμήνη καὶ αὐτοῦ οὐσίαν ἐκφαντικήν, εἰς χωρὶς βίνην τοῦ ἴδου ἵνα καὶ τοῦ λόγου, ὃ συμπαραμαρτεῖν, δυναμικήν, εἰς τρὶς τῷ ἀνασαυμαμήνη ἰαχωμικήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἁμαρτήνην τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως οὐσίαν, ἔξωθεν, προαιρετικήν, αὐτοκίνητον, ἐνεργόν, σάντος τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἡλιοσάν, καὶ τρὶς πάπσαν πρὸς τὸν ὑπαρχόν ξενοῦντα τῇ βουλῇ τῆς δύναμις, μὴν ἐρχην εἰς χουσάν, μὴν τίλος: οὐ γὰρ ἐπελειψάν ποτὲ τῷ πατρὶ λόγῳ, οὕτω τῷ λόγῳ εἰσόμα.


(3) On the occasion of a controversy between the Greek and Latin monks at Jerusalem prior to the synod of Aix la Chapelle, the Pope had given it as his opinion: Spiritum Sanctum a Patre et Filio æqualiter procedentem.—Respecting the relation in which he stood to the synod itself, see Collatio cum Papa Romæ a legatis habita et Epist. Caroli Imperat. ad Leonem P. iii. utraque a Smaragdo Abb. edita in Mansi T. xiv. p. 17 ss.

(4) See Photii Epist. encyclica issued a. d. 867. (given by Montacucius Ep. 2. p. 47.); the following among other charges is there brought forward: τῷ πνεύμα τῷ άγιον ὧν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ γε ἐκ τοῦ ιεροῦ ἐκπροζέβηκαι καινολογήσαντες. The writings of their opponents Ratramnus and Æneas are no longer extant in a complete form, comp. d'Achery, Spicil. Ed. i. T. i. p. 63 ss. Rössler, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter vol. x. p. 663 ss.

(5) Concerning the synod see Eadmer, in Vita Anselmi p. 21. quoted by Walch l. c. p. 61. The work of Anselm is entitled: de processione Spiritus S. contra Græcos, Opp. p. 49, (Edit. Lugd. p. 115.) In chapters 1—3 he shows in a clear and concise manner the points of agreement between the two churches (in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the Holy Spirit in its general aspects), as well as the points of difference. Respecting the doctrine of the western church itself,
Anselm argued from the proposition: Deus de Deo, as follows (c. 4.): Cum est de patre Spir. S., non potest non esse de filio, si non est filius de Spiritu Sancto; nulla enim alia ratione potest negari Spiritus S. esse de filio. Quod autem filius non sit de Spir. S. palam est ex catholica fide; non enim est Deus de Deo, nisi aut nascendo ut filius, aut procedendo ut Spir. S. Filius autem non nascitur de Spiritu S. Si enim nascitur de illo, est filius Spir. Sancti, et Spiritus S. pater ejus, sed alter alterius nec pater nec filius. Non ergo nascitur de Spiritu S. filius, nec minus apertum est, quia non procedit de illo. Esset enim Spir. ejusdem Spiritus Sancti, quod aperte negatur, cum Spiritus S. dicitur et creditur Spiritus Filii. Non enim potest esse Spiritus sui Spiritus. Quare non procedit filius de Spir. Sancto. Nulla ergo modo est de Spir. Sancto filius. Sequitur itaque inexpugnabili ratione, Spir. Sanctum esse de filio, sicut est de patre.—c. 7: Nulla relatio est patris sine relatione filii, sicut nihil est filii relatio, sine patris relatione. Si ergo alia nihil est sine altera, non potest aliquid de relatione patris esse sine relatione filii. Quare sequitur, Spiritum S. esse de utraque, si est de una. Itaque si est de patre secundum relationem, erit simul et de filio secundum eundem sensum. Non autem magis est pater Deus quam filius, sed unus solus versus Deus, Pater et Filius. Quapropter si Spiritus S. est de Patre, quia est de Deo qui pater est, negari nequit esse quoque de Filio, cum sit de Deo, qui est filius.—(c. 8—12. he gives the scriptural argument.) In the thirteenth chapter he meets the objection, that the doctrine in question would lower the dignity of the Spirit. Qui dicimus Spiritum S. de filio esse sive procedere, nec minorem, nec posteriorum cum filio fatemur, namque quamvis splendor et calor de sole procedant, nec possint esse nisi sit ille, de quo sunt, nihil tamen prius aut posterius in tribus, in sole et splendore et calore intelligimus, multo itaque minus, cum hæc in rebus temporalibus ista sint, in aeternitate, quæ temporis non clauditur, prædictæ tres personas in existendo susceptibiles intervalli possunt intelligi.—The concession made by the Greek theologians, viz. Spiritum Sanct. de patre esse per filium, did not appear satisfactory to Anselm. As a lake is formed not only by the spring, but also by the river which flows from the spring, so the Spirit proceeds both from the Father and the Son.* (c. 15.

* A similar illustration is adduced by Abelard theol. chr. iv. p. 1335: Spir. Sanct. ex patre proprie procedere dicitur, quasi a summa origine, qua
and 16.) We must not however assume the existence of two principles from which the Spirit might be supposed to proceed, but only one Divine principle including both the Father and the Son (c. 17.) In chapters 18—20. he considers those scriptures which apparently teach the procession of the Spirit from the Father alone; c. 21. he defends the introduction of the clause filioque as a necessary measure to prevent any misunderstanding. In chapters 22—27. he repeats and confirms all he has said before. Anselm commenced his treatise by invoking the aid of the Holy Spirit himself, he concluded it by saying: Si autem aliquid protuli, quod aliquatenus corrigendum sit, mihi imputetur, non sensui Latinitatis.—Concerning the progress of the controversy comp. Münch ed by von Colln ii. p. 113.

(a) At the synod of Lyons the Greeks agreed with the council in adopting as Can. I.: quod Spir. S. æternabiliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit.—But new differences arose, respecting which see the works on ecclesiastical history, and compare Münch ed. by von Colln, l. c. p. 114. In the formula of union issued by the synod of Florence, 6th July 1439 (given by Mansi T. xxi. p. 1027 ss. and Gieseler ii. 4. § 156.) use was made of the expression, quod Spirit. S. ex Patre et Filio æternaliter est; the phrase: procedere ex Patre per filium, was interpreted in accordance with the views of the Latin church, and the clause filioque was retained. But the peace thus established did not last long, and the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antiochia, and Jerusalem, issued (A. d. 1443.) a letter against the union. Comp. Leo Allatius, de ecclesiae occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione. p. 939 ss. For the other works see Münch ed. by von Colln, and Gieseler, l. c.

§ 170.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

The doctrine of the Trinity, which had received its
scientific form in the preceding period, presented an inducement to the speculative tendency and ingenuity of the scholastics, as well as to the imagination of the mystics, to fathom the unsearchable depth of that mystery. But all dialectic attempts were accompanied by the former danger of falling into heretical errors either in the one, or the other direction. This was especially the case with scholasticism in its earlier stage, so much so that the daring assertions of Roscelinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while those of Abelard exposed him to that of Sabellianism. The doctrines of Anselm, Peter Lombard, and of most of the later scholastics were less offensive, though they too sometimes bordered upon Sabellianism. But even within the narrowest limits of orthodoxy, scope was left for subtile distinctions and absurd questions, which were in accordance with the spirit of western scholasticism. Among the Greeks Nicetas Choniates contented himself with representing the mystery in question in figurative language, while Nicholas of Methone manifested a stronger leaning to the dialectic tendency of the western theologians. The mystics followed for the most part Dionysius Areopagita, and were at much pains either to represent the incomprehensible in their writings as incomprehensible, or to bring it more within the reach of our apprehension (in doing which they did not always avoid the appearance of pantheism.) The disciples of the school of St. Victor held, as it were, the medium between sterile scholasticism and fantastic mysticism. Savonarola and Wessel instead of indulging in philosophical reasonings, based upon the nature of God, returned to natural and human analogies, which served only for the purpose of illustrating the said mystery, but were not meant to explain it.

(1) In accordance with his nominalistic notions Roscelinus regarded the appellation God, which is common to the three per-
sons, as a mere name, *i.e.* as the abstract idea of a genus, under which the *Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghost* are comprehended (as three individuals, as it were.) This was at least the meaning which his opponents attached to his language; see Ep. Joannis Monachi ad Anselmum (given by Baluze Miscell. L. iv. p. 478): Hanc de tribus Deitatis personis quaestionem Roscelinus movet: Si tres personæ sunt una tantum res, et non sunt tres res per se, sicut tres angeli aut tres animæ, ita tamen ut voluntate et potentia omnino sint: ergo Pater et Spir. S. cum filio incarnatus est.—This opinion was condemned by the synod of Soissons (A.D. 1093.), and combated by Anselm in his treatise: *de fide trinitatis et de incarnatione verbi, contra blasphemias Rucelini.*—But Anselm doubted the accuracy of the statements made by his opponents, c. 3: sed forsitan ipse non dicit: "sicut sunt tres animæ aut tres angeli;" he thought it more probable that Roscelinus had expressed himself in more general terms: tres personas esse tres, sine additamento alicujus similitudinis, and that the above illustration was added by his opponents. Nevertheless he was disposed to attach credit to the statements of his opponents! comp. c. 2."

(2.) Concerning the history of Abelard’s condemnation at the synod of Soissons (Concilium Suessionense, a.D. 1121.) comp. the works on ecclesiastical history, and Neander, *der heilige Bernhard,* p. 121 ss. "His interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity" (which is principally given in his *Introductio ad Theologia*; and in his *Theologia christiana*) "was, properly speaking, not new, but the same rational idea with which we meet in all the interpretations of the dogma in question from the time of the council of Nice, viz. that it denotes the relations of existence, knowledge, and will, of power, wisdom, and love in the Divine being, that it denotes the Trinity which is necessarily founded upon the unity. The uncreated Father in particular, designates the Divine omnipotence as the cause of all existence; wisdom presupposes the faculty of acting, and consequently omnipotence.

*At a later period Jerome of Prague was also charged with Tetratheism, and even with more than that. He is said to have taught, in *Deo sive in divina essentia non solum est Trinitas personarum, sed etiam quaternitas rerum et quinternitas,* etc. *Ista res in divinis sunt sic distinctæ, quod una non est alia, et tamen quælibet earum est Deus. Istarum rerum una est alis perfection.* See Hermann von der Hardt, *Acta et decreta* T. iv. p. viii. ss. p. 645.
The Almighty has from eternity devised a plan which his omnipotence accomplishes, therefore wisdom is represented as being from eternity from omnipotence which it presupposes. It is necessary to abstract all notions of time; by eternal generation we must not understand successive action, but something founded from eternity and above all time in the Divine being, the necessary union of wisdom with omnipotence. The Almighty, who by means of this omnipotence possesses the power of realizing all that he thinks, and by means of this wisdom thinks only the perfect, will only that which his wisdom has recognized as the best. This is expressed by the dogma: the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son," etc. Neander l. c. compare the passages quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln ii. p. 53. 54.—The comparison which Abelard drew (Introd. ii. 12.) between the three persons of the Trinity, and the three persons in the grammar (prima quæ loquitur, secunda, ad quam loquitur, tertia, de qualoquentur) was particularly offensive, and might easily be represented as countenancing Tritheism.

(3.) The view which Anselm took of the doctrine of the Trinity, was on the whole not much sounder than that of Abelard. He too looked upon the Son as the wisdom of God, and upon the Holy Ghost as the love of God, though he did not regard them as mere qualities (nor was this done by Abelard), but rather as hypostases. Monol. c. 27. ss. c. 30. he says of the Son (the Word): Si mens humana nullam ejus aut sui habere memoriam aut intelligentiam posset, nequaquam se ab irrationabilibus creaturis, et illam ab omni creatura, secum sola tacite disputando sicut nunc mens mea facit, discerneret. Ergo summus ille spiritus, sicut est æternum, ita æterne sui memor est, et intelligit se ad similitudinem mentis rationalis: immo non ad ullius similitudinem, sed ille principaliter, et mens rationalis ad ejus similitudinem. At si æterne se intelligit, æterne se dicit. Si æterne se dicit, æterne est verbum ejus apud ipsum. Sive igitur ille cogitetur nulla alia existente essentia, sive aliis existentibus, necesse est verbum illius coæternum illi esse cum ipso. S. c. 36: Sicut igitur ille creator est rerum et principium, sic et verbum ejus; nec tamen sunt duo, sed unus creator et unum principium. S. c. 37: Quamvis enim necessitas cogat, ut sint duo: nullo tamen modo exprimi potest, quid duo sint. S. c. 38: Etenim proprium unius est, esse ex altero et proprium est alterius, alterum esse ex illo. c.
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39:......Illius est verissimum proprium esse parentem, istius vero veracissimam esse prolem. c. 42:......Sic sunt (pater et filius) oppositi relationibus, ut alter nunquam suscipiat proprium alterius: sicut sunt concordes natura, ut alter semper teneat essentiam alterius. c. 43: ...... Est autem perfecte summa essentia pater et perfecte summa essentia filius, pariter ergo perfectus pater per se est, et pariter perfectus filius per se est, sicut uterque sapit per se. Non enim idcirco minus perfecta est essentia vel sapientia filius, quia est essentia nata de patris essentia, et sapientia de sapientia: sed tunc minus perfecta essentia vel sapientia esset, si non esset per se, aut non saperet per se. Nequaquam enim repugnat, ut filius per se subsistat, et de patre habeat esse.—Nevertheless he speaks of a priority of the Father: c. 44: valde tamen magis congruit filium dici essentiam patris, quam patrem essentiam filii; quoniam namque pater a nullo habet essentiam nisi a se ipso, non satis apte dicitur habere essentiam aliquis nisi suam: quia vero filius essentiam suam habet a patre, et cvidem habet pater, aptissime dici potest, habere essentiam patris.—c. 45: Veritas quoque patris aptissime dici potest filius, non solum eo sensu, quia est cadem filii veritas que est et patris, sicut jam perspectum est, sed etiam hoc sensu, ut in eo intelligatur non imperfecta quædam imitatio, sed integra veritas paternæ substantiae, quia non est aliud, quam quod est pater. At si ipsa substantia patris est intelligentia et scientia et sapientia et veritas, consequenter colligitur: quia sicut filius est intelligentia et scientia et sapientia et veritas paternæ substantiae, ita est intelligentia intelligentiae, scientia scientiae, sapientia sapientiae et veritas veritatis. ...... c. 47: Est igitur filius memoria patris et memoria memoriae, i. e. memoria memor patris, qui est memoria, sicut est sapientia patris et sapientia sapientiae, i. e. sapientia sapientis patrem sapientiam, et filius quidem memoria nata de memoria, sicut sapientia nata de sapientia, pater vero de nullo nata memoria vel sapientia.—c. 48. Concerning the Spirit he expresses himself as follows: Palam certe est rationem habenti, eum idcirco sui memorem esse, aut se intelligere, quia se amat, sed ideo se amare, quia sui meminit et se intelligit; nec cum se posse amare, si sui non sit memor aut se non intelligit. Nulla enim res amatur, sine ejus memoria et intelligentia, et multa tenentur memoria et intelliguntur, quæ non amantur. Patet igitur amore summi spiritus ex eo procedere,
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quia sui memor est et se intelligit. Quod si in memoria summi spiritus intelligitur pater, in intelligentia filius, manifestum est: quia a patre pariter et a filio summi spiritus amor procedit. c. 49: Sed si se amat summus spiritus, procul dubio se amat pater, amat se filius et alter alterum: quia singulius pater summus est spiritus, et singulius filius summus spiritus, et ambo simul unus spiritus. Et quia uterque pariter sui et alterius meminit, et se et alterum intelligit, et quoniam omnino id ipsum, est quod amat vel amatur in patre et quod in filio, necesse est ut pari amore uterque diligat se et alterum.—c. 55.

Respecting the relation in which the three persons stand to each other, he says: Patrem itaque nullus facit sive creat aut gignit, filium vero pater solus gignit, sed non facit; pater autem pariter et filius non faciunt neque gignunt, sed quodammodo si sic dici potest, spirant suum amorem: quamvis enim non nostro more spiret summe incommutabilis essentia, tamen ipsum amorem a se ineffabiler procedentem, non discedendo ab illa, sed existendo ex illa, forsitan non alio modo videtur posse dici aptius ex se emittere quam spirando. c. 57: Jocundum est intueri in patre et filio et utriusque spiritu, quomodo sint in se invicem tanta æqualitate, ut nullus alium excedat. . . . Totam quippe suam memoriam summus intelligit spiritus et amat et totius intelligentiae meminit et totam amat et totius amoris meminit et totum intelligit. Intelligentur autem in memoria pater, in intelligentia filius, in amore utriusque spiritus. Tantaigitur pater et filius et utriusque spiritus æqualitate sese complectuntur et sunt in se invicem, ut eorum nullus alium excedere, aut sine eo esse probetur. . . . c. 60: . . . Est enim unusquisque non minus in aliis quam in se ipso. . . . (It should be observed that Anselm admitted that this relation can neither be comprehended, nor expressed in suitable words, c. 62.)

(*) Sentent. Lib. i. Dist. 5. (quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln ii. p. 56. 57.) Joachim, abbot of Flore, opposed Peter Lombard, and charged him with having taught: Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanct. quandam summam esse rem, quæ neque sit generans, neque genita, neque procedens. But Peter Lombard had only urged the importance of the distinction often neglected between God (as such) and God the Father (as one of

*a The word spiritus is also used through the whole treatise in reference to the Godhead generally speaking.
the persons of the Trinity,) and had therefore asserted: non est dicendum, quod divina essentia genuit filium, quia cum filius sit divina essentia, jam esset filius res, a qua generaretur, et ita eadem res se ipsam generaret....quod omnino esse non potest. Sed pater solus genuit filium, et a patre et filio procedit spiritus S. (On the doctrine of Joachim himself see note 10.)

(5) Alexander Hales: Summae P. i. qu. 42. Membr. 2. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Colln p. 55. Cramer vol. vii. p. 309 ss. Thomas Aquinas P. i. qu. 27—43. We meet with a purely speculative perception of the Trinity in the work of Alanus ab Ins. i. art. 25. (Pez. i. p. 484.) he regarded the Father as matter, the Son as form, and the Holy Spirit as the union of both. The view of Abelard, according to which the three persons denoted the power, wisdom and love of the Divine being, became on the whole current in the middle ages. Comp. note 11.

(6) Comp. Alexander Hales quoted by Cramer l. c. The generation of the Son is explained by the diffusive nature of God; at the same time a distinction is made between material generation (from the substance of the Father,) original generation (as a human son is begotten by his father,) and ordinal generation (as the morning gives rise to noon;) but none of these can be applied to the Divine being. It is only in so far admissible to speak of the Son being begotten from the substance of the Father, as such language is not meant to imply anything material, but only intended to teach, that the nature of the Son does not differ from that of the Father. Questions such as the following were started: Was it necessary that God should beget, or might he have possessed the power, but not the will to beget? why are there just three persons in the Trinity? why not more or less? how does it happen that the name of the Father is put first, and the names of the Son and Spirit follow, though all three are equal? is it allowed to invert the order, and why not? etc. Anselm (Monol. c. 40.) inquired into the reason for calling God Father in reference to the act of generation, and not mother. He also demonstrated very seriously, that the Son was the fittest of the three persons of the Trinity to become man: Cur Deus homo ii. 9.: Si quaelibet alia persona incarnetur, erunt duo filii in Trinitate, filius scilicet Dei, qui et ante incarnationem filius est, et ille qui per incarnationem filius erit virginis, et erit in personis, quae semper aequales esse debent, inaequalitas secundum dignitatem nativitatum......Item, si
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Pater fuerit incarnatus, erunt duo nepotes in Trinitate, quia Pa-
ter erit nepos parentum virginis per hominem assumtum, et
Verbum, cum nihil habeat de homine, nepos tamen erit virginis,
quia filii ejus erit filius, quae omnia inconvenientia sunt, nec in
incarnatione Verbi contingunt. Est et aliud, cur magis conve-
niat incarnari filio, quam aliis personis, quia convenientius sonat
filium supplicare Patri, quam aliam personam alii. Item, homo,
pro quo erat oraturus, diabolus, quem erat expugnaturus, ambo
falsam similitudinem Dei per propriam voluntatem presumptione-
runt. Unde quasi specialius adversus personam Filii peccave-
runt, qui vera Patris similitudo creditur etc. (Comp. below §
179.)

One of his illustrations is e. g. taken from a balance (The-
saur. c. 30.) The Son represents the central point of union be-
tween the Father and the Holy Spirit, and preserves the most
perfect equilibrium between the two; but the whole denotes the
perfect equilibrium between honour, power, and being, the inner
Divine equality and harmony, inasmuch as no person elevates
himself above the other. The double-winged seraphim also are
in his opinion a figure of the Trinity. But while in the former
case the Son is to be regarded as the central-point of union, in
the latter the body of the seraphim represents the Father, and
the wings denote the Son and the Holy Spirit. Comp. Ull-
mann l. c. p. 41. 42.

Many of the earlier theologians asserted the incompre-
hensibility of God, and at the same time propounded the most
profound mysteries of the doctrine of the Trinity with a de-
gree of assurance which would allow of no doubt, and Nicho-
las was guilty of the same inconsistency. In the same sen-
tence he represented the nature of God as beyond knowledge
and expression, beyond the apprehension and investigation
even of the highest order of spirits, and gave the most precise
and apodictical definitions concerning the relation subsisting
between the Divine being and the Divine persons' (e. g. Refut.
p. 23. 24.) Ullmann p. 78. Nicholas removed the apparent con-
tradiction of a trinity in a unity by avoiding all analogies with
created objects. He would not have understood the terms: unity
and trinity in the sense in which they are used by mathematicians,
viz. as numeric definitions. But in his opinion the unity of God
was only a unity of being, and the trinity a trinity of persons.
He thought that there was nothing contradictory in the union
of such a unity with such a trinity, see Ullmann p. 79. 80. (He also appealed to Gregory of Nazianzum Orat. xxix. 2.: μονώς ἄγερχη; ii; δύοάδα πνεύματα, μιαμε τριάδος ισημ.) “We adore,” said Nicholas (Refut. p. 67.), “as the creative principle of all existence that God who is one as respects his essential nature, but consists of three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. With regard to these three, we praise the Father as that which causes (ὡς αἰριόν), but we confess that the Son and the Holy Spirit have proceeded from the Father as that which is caused (ὡς αἱριναὰ.) They are not created nor brought forth in the common sense of the word, but in a supernatural, superhuman manner. Being of the same essence, they are united with the Father and with each other without being confounded; they are distinct without separation.” Regarding the term αἱριόν he would not have it understood to denote a creative or formative causality, but a hypostatic one, which might be called γίνοντικών (i. e. that which causes generation) in relation to the Son, and προϊματικών αἰτιών προβλητικών (i. e. that which causes procession) in reference to the Spirit. Thus he also said (p. 45.): ὁ πατὴρ ἡ πνεῦμα προβάλλει; see Ullmann, i. c. p. 82.

(a) Tauler (Predigten ii. p. 172.) said: “Concerning this most excellent and holy Trinity we cannot find any suitable words in which we might speak of it, and yet we must express this supernatural, incomprehensible Trinity in words. If we therefore attempt to speak of it, it is as impossible to do it properly, as to reach the sky with one’s head. For all that we can say or think of it, is a thousand times less proportionate to it, than the point of a needle is to heaven and earth, yea, a hundred thousand times less. We might talk to a wonderful amount, and yet we could neither express nor understand, how the distinction of the persons can exist in the supernatural unity. It is better to meditate on these things than to speak of them; for it is not very pleasant either to say much about this matter, or to hear of it, especially when words have been introduced (from without), and because we are altogether unequal to the task. For the whole subject is at an infinite distance from us, and wholly foreign to us, nor is it revealed to us, for it even surpasses the apprehension of angels. We therefore leave it to great prelates and learned men; they must have something to say, in order to defend the catholic faith; but we will simply believe.”
In opposition to Peter Lombard, Joachim, Abbot of Flore, laid down a theory which was condemned by the fourth council of the Lateran (A. D. 1215.), though he pretended to have received it by inspiration. He looked upon the instrument of ten strings as the best image of the Trinity. Its three corners represent the three persons, the instrument itself denotes the unity. Concerning the further development of this notion see Engelhardt, Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen p. 265 ss.—The views of Master Eckart on the doctrine of the Trinity are given by Schmidt in the Studien und Kritiken i. c. p. 694. Sermons on the Trinity fol. 265. a. it is said: "What is the language of God? the Father beholding himself with a simple knowledge, and looking into the simple purity of his nature, sees all creatures formed, and speaks within himself; that Word is a clear knowledge and that is the Son; therefore the phrase "God speaks," is equivalent to "God begets." For other passages comp. Schmidt i. c. p. 696.—H. Suso taught as follows (c. 55. see Diepenbrock p. 215): "In proportion as any being is simple in itself, it is manifold in its powers and capacities. That which has nothing, can give nothing; that which has much, can give much. God possesses the fulness of all that is perfect in himself, but, because his goodness is unlimited and higher than the heavens, he will not keep it all to himself, but he delights in sharing it between himself and others. On this account the first and highest act of the manifestation of the summum bonum must have reference to itself, and that cannot be, except it be present, inward, substantial, personal, natural, necessary without being compulsory, infinite and perfect. All other manifestations which are in time or in created objects, are only the reflection of the eternal manifestation of the unlimited Divine goodness. Therefore the schoolmen say, that in the emanation of the creature from the first origin there is a circular return of the end into the commencement; for as the procession of the person from God is a complete image of the origin of the creature, so it is also a type of the return of the creature into God. Now observe the difference between the said manifestation, and the manifestation of God. . . . A human father gives to his son in his birth a part of his own nature, but not all at once, and not the whole of that which he is; for he himself is a compound being. But as it is evident that the Divine manifestation is so much more intimate and dignified according to the dignity
of the person, and as God infinitely surpasses all other beings, it necessarily follows that his manifestation is equal to his nature, and that such a manifestation cannot take place apart from a manifestation of his nature according to personal qualities. If you can now contemplate with a pure eye, and behold the purest goodness of the highest good, which is in its very nature a beginning which operates in the present time, and loves itself naturally and willingly; then you will see the exceeding supernatural manifestation of the Word from the Father, by whose words all things were created and formed, and you will perceive in the highest good, and in the highest manifestation, the necessary origin of the Holy Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And as the highest manifestation proceeds from the supreme and essential Godhead, there must be in the said Trinity the most perfect and most intimate sameness of essence, the highest equality and independence of being which the three persons possess in triumphant manifestation, in undivided substance and in the undivided omnipotence of the three persons in the Deity."

(Suso however acknowledged that none could explain in words, how the Trinity of the Divine persons could exist in the unity of being. Ibid. p. 217.) Similar views were entertained by Ruysbroek, whose opinions concerning the Trinity are given in the work of Engelhardt p. 174—177. According to Ruysbroek, there are four unfathomable qualities in God. He manifests himself through wisdom and love, he attracts by unity and substantiality. The eternal truth is begotten from the Father, the eternal love proceeds from the Father and the Son. These are the two emanating attributes of God. The unity of the Divine nature attracts the three persons by the bonds of love, and the Divine wisdom unfolds the unity with a tranquil and happy embrace of love. These are the attractive attributes of God.

(11) Hugo of St Victor found in external nature an indication of the Trinity. He perceived a still purer impression of it in the rational creation, viz. the spirit, which is only assisted by the external world, or the world of bodies; in the one case we have a true impression, in the other only a sign. How the Trinity manifests itself in the external creation, (power, wisdom and goodness), he showed in his treatise: de tribus diebus T. i. fol. 24—33. Comp. de sacram. Lib. i. P. iii. c. 28. Liebner p. 375. Concerning his philosophical views, Hugo followed his
predecessors Augustine and Anselm, but employed that fuller and more poetical style which is peculiar to the mystics; he did so especially in his treatise: de tribus diebus. On the whole, Hugo differed from Anselm "by remaining at a certain distance, and thus keeping to more general and indefinite expressions, in the use of which he exposed himself to less danger." Liebner p. 381. We may notice as very remarkable, and foreign to the general spirit of mysticism, but as truly scholastic, the manner in which Hugo answered the question, why the Sacred Scriptures have ascribed power in particular to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and love to the Holy Spirit, since power, wisdom and love belong equally and essentially to all the three, and are eternal. He argued as follows: "When men heard of the Father and Son being in God, they might, in accordance with human relations, think of the Father as old and aged, and consequently weaker than the Son, but of the Son as juvenile and unexperienced, and therefore less wise than the Father. To prevent any such mistake, Scripture has wisely and cautiously ascribed power to the Father and wisdom to the Son. Likewise men hearing of God the Holy Spirit (Spiritus) might think of him as a snorting [Germ. schnaubend] and haughty being, and be terrified at his supposed harshness and cruelty. But then Scripture coming in and calling the Holy Ghost loving and mild, tranquillized them." (de sacram. c. 26.) The passage is cited by Liebner p. 381. and 382. where further particulars may be compared. Hugo however rejected, generally speaking, all subtle questions, and had a clear insight into the figurative language of Scripture. Nor did Richard of St. Victor indulge so much in subtle speculations in his work: de trinitate, as most other scholastics. It is true, he adopted the same views concerning the trias of power, wisdom, and love, but he laid most stress upon the latter, and ascribed to it the generation of the Son. In the highest good there is the fulness and perfection of goodness, and consequently the highest love; for there

* It is scarcely necessary to observe that Scripture by no means sanctions such an arbitrary distribution of the Divine attributes among the three persons. With equal propriety, if not with more, the Son might have been called love, and the Spirit wisdom or power. It was only the tracing of the idea of the Logos to that of the Sophia in the Old Testament, and the predominant speculative tendency (according to which intelligence was the most important thing) which led to this kind of reasoning.
is nothing more perfect than love. But love (amor), in order to be charity (charitas), must have for its object, not itself, but something else. Hence where there is no plurality of persons, there can be no charity. Love towards creatures is not sufficient, for God can only love what is worthy of the highest love. The love of God to none but himself would not be the highest love; in order to render it such, it is necessary that it should be manifested towards a person which is Divine, etc. But even this is not yet the highest love. Love is social. Both persons (who love each other) wish a third person to be loved as much as they love each other, for it is a proof of weakness not to be willing to allow society in love. Therefore every two persons in the Trinity agree in loving a third one. The fulness of love also requires highest perfection, hence the three persons are equal. In the Trinity there is neither a greater nor a less; two are not greater than one, three are not greater than two. This appears indeed incomprehensible, etc. Compare also the passage de Trin. i. 4. quoted by Hase, Dogmatik p. 637., and especially Engelhardt, l. c. p. 108 ss.—The other scholastics who manifested a leaning to mysticism, argued in a similar way. Thus Bonaventura, Itiner. mentis c. 6. Raimund of Sabunde c. 49. Compare also Gerson, Sermo i. in festo S. Trin. (quoted by Ch. Schmidt, p. 106.)

(12) Savonarola showed in a very ingenious manner (Triumphus crucis Lib. iii. c. 3. p. 192—96. quoted by Rudelbach, p. 366. 67.), that a certain procession or emanation exists in all creatures. The more excellent and noble these creatures are, the more perfect the said procession is; the more perfect it is, the more internal. If you take fire and bring it into contact with wood, it kindles and assimilates it. But this procession is altogether external, for the power of the fire works only externally. If you take a plant, you will find that its vital power works internally, changing the moisture which it extracts from the ground into the substance of the plant, and producing the flower which was internal. This procession is much more internal than that of fire; but it is not altogether internal, for it attracts moisture from without, and produces the flower externally, and though the flower is connected with the tree, yet the fruit is an external production, and separates itself from the tree.—The sensuous life is of a higher order. When I see a picture, a procession and emanation comes from the picture which produces an im-
pression upon the eye; the eye presents the object in question to the imagination or to the memory; nevertheless the procession remains internal, though it comes from without. Intelligence is of a still higher order; a man having perceived something, forms in his inner mind an idea of it, and delights in its contemplation; this gives rise to a certain love which remains in the faculty of thinking. It may indeed be said that even in this case there is something external (the perception.) But from this highest and innermost procession we may draw such further inferences with regard to God, who unites in himself all perfection, that the Father, as it were, begets out of himself an idea which is his eternal Word (Logos), and that the love, which is the Holy Spirit, proceeds from the Father and the Son. This procession is the most perfect, because it does not come from without, but remains in God.\footnote{Comp. Meier, Savonarola, p. 248 ss.}

\begin{quote}
(13) \textit{Wessel} (de magnitudine Passionis, c. 74. p. 606. quoted by Ullmann, p. 206.) expressed himself as follows: "In our inner man, who is created after the image of, and in resemblance to God, there is a certain trinity: understanding (mens), reason (intelligentia), and will (voluntas.) These three are equally sterile, inactive, and unoccupied, when they are alienated from their prototype. Our understanding without wisdom is like the light without the eye, and what else is this wisdom, but God the Father?\footnote{He calls the \textit{Father} Wisdom; the scholastics applied this term to the \textit{Son}. Comp. the note to note 11.} The Word (the Logos) is the law and the norm of our judgments, and teaches us to think of ourselves with humility according to the true wisdom. And the Spirit of both, the Divine love, is the food of the will (Spiritus amborum, Deus charitas, lac est voluntati.)" The practical application followed by itself.
\end{quote}

The \textit{three persons} in the Trinity were in a peculiar way connected with the development of the history of the world. According to Hugo of St. Victor (de tribus diebus, quoted by...
Liebner, p. 383, note), the day of fear commenced with the promulgation of the law given by the Father (power); the day of truth with the manifestation of Christ, the Son (wisdom), and the day of love with the effusion of the Holy Spirit (love). Thus there was a progressive development of the times towards greater and greater light!—The mystico-pantheistic sects, on the other hand, interpreted these three periods according to their own notions, and in connection with millennial hopes.

§ 171.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION, PROVIDENCE, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.—THEODICY.

The pantheistic system of John Scotus Erigena found no imitators among the orthodox scholastics; they adhered rather to the idea of a creation out of nothing. Later writers endeavoured to define this doctrine more precisely, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, as if nothing could have been the cause of existence.—The Mosaic account of the creation was interpreted literally by some, and allegorically by others. Even during the present period the opinion continued to prevail generally, that the world is a work of Divine goodness, and exists principally for the sake of man. Though mysticism would easily induce its advocates to regard the independent appearance of the finite creature as separation from the Creator, and consequently as rebellion, and thus to represent creation as the work of Satan (after the manner of the Manichæans), yet these pious thinkers would be roused by the sight of the works of God to the utterance of beautiful and elevating expressions, and be lost in wonder and adoration. On the contrary, the schoolmen, fond as they were of vain and subtile investigation, indulged here also in absurd inquiries.—Concerning the existence of evil in the world, the scholastics adopted for the most part the views of Augustine. Some (e.g. Thomas Aquinas) regarded evil as—
the absence of good, and as forming a necessary part of the finite world, retaining however the difference between moral evil and physical evil (the evil of guilt, and the evil of its punishment). (9) Others adopted, with Chrysostom, the notion of a twofold Divine will, (voluntas antecedens et consequens.) (10)

(1) Comp. above § 165. 1. and de divina natura ii. c. 19. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln, p. 63.

(2) God is not only the former (factor), but the creator and author (creator) of matter. This was taught by Hugo of St. Victor (Prolog. c. 1. Liebner, p. 355.), and the same opinion was adopted by the other mystics. The advocates of Platonism alone returned to the notions of Origen.

(3) Thus Alexander Hales (Summa P. ii. Quest. 9. Membr. 10.) drew a distinction between a nihilum privatum and negativum; see on this point Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 61. 62.— Thomas Aquinas (Pars i. Qu. 46. art 2) represented the doctrine of a creation out of nothing as an article of faith (credibile), but not as an object of knowledge and argumentation (non demonstrabile vel scibile), and expressed himself as follows. Qu. 45. Art. 2: Quicunque facit aliquid ex aliquo, illud ex quo facit, præsupponitur actioni ejus et non productur per ipsam actionem. . . . Si ergo Deus non ageret, nisi ex aliquo præsupposto, sequeretur quod illud præsuppositorum non esset causatum ab ipso. Ostensum est autem supra, quod nihil potest esse in entibus nisi a Deo, qui est causa universalis totius Esse. Unde necesse est dicere quod Deus ex nihil res in esse product. Comp. Cramer vii. p. 415 ss.

(4) Thus Hugo of St. Victor thought, that the creation out of formless matter in six days might be literally interpreted. The Almighty might have made it differently; but it was in this way that he resolved to teach rational beings in a figure, how they are to be transformed from moral deformity into moral beauty.— In creating the light prior to all other works he signified, that the works of darkness displeased him. The good and evil angels were separated at the same time, when light and darkness were separated. God did not separate light from darkness, till he saw that the former was good. In like manner, we should first of all examine, whether our light is
good, and then we may proceed to a separation, etc. Observing
that the phrase "and God saw that it was good," is wanting in
reference to the work of the second day in the Mosaic account
of the creation, he was induced to enter into further inquiries
respecting the reason of this omission. He found it in the
number two, which is an inauspicious number, because it de-
notes defection from the unity. Nor is it said in reference to
the waters above the firmament, as it is done with regard to
those under the firmament, that they were gathered together un-
to one place—because the love of God (the heavenly water) is
shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. This love must
explain itself and increase; but the waters under the firmament
(the lower passions of the soul) must be kept together. Though
fishes and birds are created out of the same matter, different
places are assigned to them, which is a type of the elect and
the reprobate, speaking of one and the same corrupt nature:
Comp. Liebner p. 256. 57.—Friar Berthold perceived in the
works of the first three days of the creation, faith, hope and
love; see Kling p. 462. 63.

(5) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. ii. 2. (after the example of Gregory
of Nazianzum and Dionysius Areopagita:) 'Ετσι εώο τό ἄγαλης καὶ
ὑπεράγαλης Θεος εώο ηφισσία τῇ ιαντοῦ ημωρία, ἀλλ' ὑπερβολὴ ἄγαλης
τοῦ νόμου γενεσθαι τινα τὰ ὑπερβοληθημάτα, καὶ μηδὲνα ὑπὲρ
της αὐτοῦ ἄγαλης, εἰ τοῦ μῆ ὅτες εἰς τὸ ἐδαπάνη καὶ ἀποστολὴν τὰ ὑπερβολή
tὰ καὶ ὑπερβολὴ καὶ τὸν ἐν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἀποστολήν συγκεκριμένον ἐνθεωρεῖν.—Petr.
Lomb. Sententt. ii. Dist. i. C.: Dei tanta est bonitas, ut summe
bonus beatitudinis susæ, qua aeternaliter beatus est, alios velit esse
participes, quam videt et communicari posse et minui omnino
non posse. Illud ergo bonum quod ipse erat et quo beatus erat,
sola bonitate, non necessitate alius communicari voluit......Litt.
D: Et quia non valet ejus beatitudinis participes existere aliquis,
nisi per intelligentiam (quæ quanto magis intelligitur, tanto
pleniæ habetur) fecit Deus rationalem creaturam, quæ summum
bonum intelligere et intelligendo amaret et amando possiederet
ac possidendo frueretur......Litt. F.: Deus perfectus et summà
bonitate plenus, nec augeri potest nec minui. Quod ergo ra-
nionalis creatura facta est a Deo, referendum est ad creatoris
bonitatem et ad creaturæ utilitatem. Comp. Alan. ab Ins. ii. 4.
(quoted by Pez. Thes. i. p. 487. 88.—Hugo of St. Victor also
said (quoted by Liebner p. 357. 58.): "The creation of the
world had man, that of man had God for its object. The world
should serve man, and man should serve God, but the service of the latter should be to his own advantage, inasmuch as he would find his happiness in it. For God being all-sufficient to himself, nor standing in need of the services of any one, man has received both i.e. all, viz. the good under him, and the good above him, the former to supply his necessities, the latter to constitute his happiness, the former for his benefit and use, the latter for his enjoyment and possession. Thus man, though created at a later period, was nevertheless the cause of all that was under him, and hence the high dignity of the human nature."

Thomas Aquinas supposed God to have no other object than the communication of his own being, Summæ p. i. qu. 44. art. 4.: Primo agenti, qui est agens tantum, non convenit agere propter acquisitionem alijus finis: sed intendit solum communicare suam perfectionem, quæ est ejus bonitas. Et unaquæque creatura intendit consequi suam perfectionem, quæ est similitudo perfectionis et bonitatis divinae. Sic ergo divina bonitas est finis rerum omnium. Comp. Cramer vii. p. 414. 15.

(6.) According to the author of the work on German theology (cap. i. from the commencement) the ideas of being a creature, being created, being an ego, and self-existence, are synonymous with love of the world, love of the creature, self-love, self-will, natural carnal sense, and carnal pleasure. The creature must depart, if God is to enter. He thinks it sinful, "to esteem created things, and to look upon them as something, while they are in reality—nothing." Subsequently he admits however, that those things have their existence only in God: "Out of that which is perfect, or without it there is no true existence, but all is mere accident, or mere semblance and glitter, which is no true being, nor has it a true existence, like the brightness which proceeds from fire, or light, or the sun."—Some of the heretical sects of the middle ages entertained views on these points which bordered upon Manichæism. Thus Berthold, a Franciscan monk, said in a sermon (quoted by Kling p. 305. Wackernagel, Lesebuch i. Sp. 678.): Some heretics believe and maintain that the devil created man, when our Lord created the soul in him. Comp. Ermengardi opusc. contra hæreticos, qui dicunt et credunt, mundum istum et omnia visibilia non esse a Deo facta, sed a Diabolo, edited by Gretser in Bibl. max. PP. T. xxiv. p. 1602. Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte ii. § 82. note o.

(7.) Henry Suso (c. 54. quoted by Diepenbrock p. 208.) said:
Now let us remain here for a while, and contemplate the high and excellent master in his works. Look above you and around you, look to the four quarters of the world, how wide and high the beautiful sky is in its rapid course, and how richly the master has adorned it with the seven planets, each of which, with the exception of the moon, is much larger than the earth, and how it is beautified by the innumerable multitude of the bright stars. O, how clearly and cheerfully the beautiful sun rises in the summer-season, and how diligently he gives growth and blessings to the soil; how the leaves and the grass come forth, how the beautiful flowers smile, how the forest, and the heath, and the field resound with the sweet airs of the nightingale and other small birds, how all the animals which were shut up during the severe winter, come forth and enjoy themselves, and propagate their species, how young and old manifest their joy in merry and gladsome utterances. O, tender God! if thou art so loving in thy creatures, how beautiful and delightful must thou be in thyself!—Look further, I pray you, and behold the four elements, earth, water, air, and fire, and all the wonderful things in them, the variety and diversity of men, quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and sea-monsters, all of which cry aloud and proclaim the praise and honour of the boundless and infinite nature of God! Lord, who does preserve all this? who does feed it? Thou takest care of all, of every thing in its own way, of great and small, rich and poor, thou, O God! thou doest it, thou art indeed God!

(8.) John Damascenus ii. 5 ss. treated of the whole range of natural science (cosmography, astronomy, physics, geology, etc.), as far as it was known to him, in the section on creation. Most of the scholastics followed his example. Comp. Cramer vii. p. 388 ss. But in introducing natural history into the province of dogmatic theology, writers thought themselves at liberty to circumscribe it by means of the doctrine of the church. Thus it happened that e. g. in the times of Pope Boniface, the assertion of Virgilius, a priest, that there are antipodes, was considered heretical; see Schröckh xix. p. 219. 220.—In reference to the work of creation it may further be asked whether it is to be assigned only to one of the persons of the Trinity? The theologians of the present period adopted the opinion of the earlier church, that all the three persons participated in it; Thomas Aquinas qu. 45. art. 6. Cramer vii. p. 416. This was however
scarcely more than a speculative idea. The power of creating was supposed to be more particularly possessed by the Father, from the very reason that power was ascribed to him, though different expressions were used e. g. in the hymn: Veni Creator Spiritus.

(9) Anselm himself taught that this world is the most perfect (omne quod est, recte est,) dial. de ver. c. 7. and Abelard agreed with what Plato asserted (in the Timæus:) Deum nullatenus mundum meliorem potuisse facere, quam fecerit (Intro. ad Theol. iii. c. 5. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln ii. p. 70.) This assertion however met with opposition on the part of others. (Comp. § 167, note 6.) According to Alexander Hales every individual possesses its own perfection, though it may appear imperfect if compared with the whole, see Cramer vii. p. 413. Concerning the nature of evil Thomas Aquinas expressed himself quite in the sense of Augustine (qu. 48. and 49.): evil is not a thing which exists by itself, but the absence and want of good. Evil is moreover necessary to constitute a difference of degrees; the imperfection of individual things belongs even to the perfection of the world; Summa p. i. qu. 48. art. 2. quoted by Münscher. But Thomas well knew how to make an exception in the case of moral evil: the latter is not only a defect, but the wicked are wanting something which they should not be wanting; therefore the idea of evil belongs more properly to the evil of guilt (malum culpa,) than to the evil of punishment (malum poenæ.) (Comp. Tertull. advers. Marc. ii. 14.)

(10) The scholastics commonly treated of the doctrine of Providence and of Theodicy in the chapter on Divine attributes, and on the Divine will in particular. According to Hugo of St. Victor the Divine providence itself is an attribute, viz. that attribute of God by which he takes care of all the works of his hands, abandons nothing that is his, and gives to every one his due. Both the actual existence of good, and the mode of its existence, depend on the disposition (dispositio) of God. It is not so with evil. Only the mode of its existence depends on God, but not its existence itself; for God does not do evil himself; but when evil is done, he overrules it (malum ordinabile est) de sacram. c. 19—21. quoted by Liebner, p. 366. Cramer vii. p. 274 ss. On the ἡληκία προηγομένων, etc. comp. § 126, note 5. and John Damasc. de fide orthodox. ii. 29. By the scholastics
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the ηλημα τετογονομεν was also called voluntas bene placiti, the
ηλ. επομεν (consequens) voluntas signi (expression of one’s will.)
i. Dist. 45. F. Alex. Hales Summa P. i. Qu. 36. Membr. 1.
Thom. Aquinas Summa P. i. Qu. 19. Art. 11. 12. Comp. Mün-
scher ed. by von Cölln p. 72. 73. Cramer p. 264 ss.

§ 172.

THE ANGELS AND THE DEVIL.

John Damascenus and others(1.) adhered to the classifi-
cation of the angels established by Pseudo-Dionysius
§ 131. note 8.) The council of the Lateran held A. D.
1215. under Pope Innocent III. pronounced as the doc-
trine of the church, that the angels are spiritual beings,
and were created in a state of innocence.(2.) But with re-
gard to particular points, such as the nature and the of-
ices of the angels, the relation in which they stood to
God, the world, man, and the work of redemption, ample
scope was left for poetical and imaginary speculations
which sometimes led to absurd and fanciful notions.(3.)
The idea of the devil formed a still more essential part
of the popular creed of the Germanic nations, and was
either connected in a somewhat awful manner with the
belief in sorcery and witches, so common during the
middle ages, or was treated with levity and humour, and
brought out in legends and popular tales.(4.) In the his-
tory of doctrines the said vulgar and current notion of the
devil is of as much importance as the theoretical systems
of the schools, which were for the most part founded up-
on earlier definitions.(5.) In the religious point of view
it is of moment, that the devil can compel none to com-
mit sin, while he himself is delivered up to eternal con-
demnation.(6.) He, as well as his associates, the evil spi-
rts, are conscious of their punishment, but take pleasure
in the torments of the damned; this compensation, worthy of their devilish disposition, is all that they enjoy.  

(7) De fide orthod. ii. 3. Most of the scholastics adopted the said classification. Thus Hugo of St. Victor mentioned and explained the orders and names of angels (according to Pseudo-Dionysius) only very briefly (de sacr. i. 5.), "which is a proof of his good sense." (Liebner p. 395.) Comp. Lomb. Sent. lib. ii. Dist. 9. A. Thom. Aquinas Summ. P. i. Qu. 108. quoted by Münsscher ed. by von Cölln p. 65.  


(3) Most of the scholastics adopted the opinion of Augustine, that the angels are created with all other creatures, and only in so far prior to them, as they surpass them in dignity. Thus Hugo of St. Victor (quoted by Liebner c. 28. and 29. p. 392.), Alexander Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, etc., quoted by Cramer vii. p. 426.—The angels are distinguished from the souls of men, 1. physically (they do not stand in absolute need of a body); 2. logically (they do not obtain knowledge by drawing conclusions); 3. metaphysically (they do not think by means of images, but by means of intuitive vision); 4. theologically (they cannot become either better or worse.) Alexander Hales however did not venture to make this last assertion boldly. The angels have their own faculty of perception (intellectum agentem et passibilem); their knowledge is either matutina (cognitio rerum in verbo), or vespertina (cognitio rerum in se), or, lastly, meridiana (aperta Dei visio.) Comp. Bonaventura, Compend. ii. 15. The knowledge of some angels however is more comprehensive than that of others. Some, e. g. foreknew the mystery of the incarnation of Christ, which was unknown to others. The angels also have a language, not however a sensuous, but an intellectual one. They have moreover a space, i. e. they are not omnipresent like God, but move with immeasurable celerity from one place to another, and pervade all space more easily than man. It was also asked whether they could work miracles: whether one angel could exert any influence upon the will of another? etc. see Cramer, l. c. (The quotations are for the most part taken from Alexander Hales and Thomas
Aquinas.) Peter Lombard and others also retained the idea of guardian-angels, see Sent. ii. Dist. ii. A. quoted by Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 66. Some entertained the singular notion of a hatred on the part of the angels against sinners, of which Berthold spoke in one of his sermons, quoted by Kling p. 18. 20.: They cry daily at the sight of sinners: Lord, let us kill them! But he appears and exhorts them to let the tares grow among the wheat. But the more intelligent scholastics did not enter into any further inquiries of this kind. Thus Hugo of St. Victor said: "We walk among those things timidly, and, as it were, blindfolded, and we grope with the sense of our insignificant knowledge after the incomprehensible." Liebner p. 393. Tauler expressed himself in similar language (Sermon upon St. Michael's day—vol. iii. p. 145): "With what words may and shall we speak of these pure spirits, I do not know, for they have neither hands, nor feet, neither shape, nor form, nor matter, and what shall we say of a being which has none of these things, and which cannot be comprehended by our senses? What they are is a mystery to us; nor should this surprise us, for we do not know ourselves, viz., our spirit by which we are men, and from which we receive all the good we possess. How then could we know this exceeding great spirit, whose dignity far surpasses all dignity which the world may possess? Therefore we speak of the works which they perform towards us, but not of their nature." Nevertheless Tauler followed the example of his contemporaries in adhering to the hierarchia celestis of Dionysius.

(4.) "It is somewhat remarkable, that the devil of the middle ages seems to have lost much of his terror and hideousness, and to play rather the part of a cunning impostor, and merry fellow—more like a faun who excites laughter rather than fear." Augusti, Dogmengesch. p. 320. Comp. Grimm, deutsche Mythologie p. 549 ss. Hase, Gnosi i. p. 263. Koberstein, Sage vom Wartburgkriege p. 67. 68. (The trials for witchcraft did not become general until the close of the present period, during the fifteenth century, from which time faith in the power of the devil became increasingly associated with all that is awful.)

(6.) Concerning the fall of the devil and the evil angels, most theologians still adhered to the opinion that pride was the principal cause. In accordance with Isa. xiv. 12. Satan was
identified with Lucifer, and the latter name was from thence-forward constantly applied to the devil. According to Anselm (or more correctly according to Augustine, Enchiridion c. 29.) the fall of the devil was the cause of the creation of man, which was to be a kind of substitute, and for the purpose of supplying the deficiency in the number of the elect spirits (Cur Deus homo c. 16—18.) The same idea was entertained by Hugo of St. Victor, though in a somewhat modified form; see Liebner, p. 395. According to Alexander Hales some fell from among all the different classes of angels, but the number of fallen angels is less than that of those who preserved their innocence. Neither the evil, nor the good angels can perform miracles in the proper sense; the former may however exert some power over the corporeal world, though they cannot go so far (as popular superstition would have men believe), as to change men into other beings, e. g. wolves or birds; see Cramer, p. 44.

(6) Thomas Aquinas, i. qu. 64. The power of Satan has been especially limited since the appearance of Christ, (comp. Cramer, p. 447.)—Anselm declared it impossible that the evil angels should finally be redeemed (as Origen supposed); Cur Deus homo ii. c. 21.: Sicut enim homo non potuit reconciliari nisi per hominem Deum (see below § 179.) qui mori posset........ita angeli damnati non possunt salvari nisi per angelum Deum qui mori possit.......Et sicut homo per alium hominem, qui non esset ejusdem generis, quamvis ejusdem esset naturæ, non debuit relevari, ita nullus angelus per alium angelum salvari debet, quamvis omnes sint unius naturæ, quoniam non sunt ejusdem generis sicut homines. Non enim sic sunt omnes angeli de uno angelo, quemadmodum omnes homines de uno homine. Hoc quoque removet eorum restaurationem, quia sicut ceciderunt nullo alio nocente, ut caderent, ita nullo alio adjuvante resurgere debant: quod est illis impossibile.

(7) Cramer, l. c. p. 448.: “They may indeed delight in the evil and mischief which they do to man, but this joy is a joy mixed with bitterness, and prepares for them a more painful

a Bonavent. compend. ii. 28.: Dictus est autem lucifer quia præ cæteris luxit, suaque pulchritudinis consideratio eum excæcavit. Among the earlier Fathers of the church, Eusebius was the only one who applied the appellation Lucifer to the Devil (demonstr. evang. iv. 9.) Neither Jerome, nor Augustine ever did so. Comp. Grimm. l. c. p. 550. note.
punishment." According to John Wessel (de magnit. pass. c. 38. p. 532. quoted by Ullmann, p. 236.) "Satan, (or more correctly the dragon), finds his greatest unhappiness in the knowledge, that God is ever happy in himself.....His second misery is, to see in his own condition, and in the case of all others, that the Lamb, as the victor, has received from God a name which is above every name.....His third misery is, that he himself, with all the host of the powers of darkness, has prepared this crown of victory for the Lamb."
VITAL CHRISTIANITY, ESSAYS AND DISCOURSES ON THE RELIGIONS OF MAN and the RELIGION OF GOD. By ALEXANDER VINET, D.D., Professor of Theology in Lausanne. Translated, with an Introduction, by the REV. ROBERT TURNBULL, Boston. Price 4s. 6d. cloth.

"These discourses, or essays rather, are among the best, in any language, that I have ever seen. Dr. Vinet is decidedly the ablest Christian philosopher in Europe, and is, as Dr. Merle D'Aubigné calls him, the 'Chalmers of Switzerland.' I have examined several portions of the translation, and declare it is no less excellent than the original."—From Rev. Ronald Barr, D.D.

"Dr. Vinet is fond of philosophical subjects, and discusses them in a masterly manner. What would embarrass others has no difficulty for him—he is naturally profound and lofty, and he can pursue his thoughts even to the remotest abstractions. He dwells constantly in regions of pure thought, and there displays the full force and whole extent of his mind."—M. G. De Felice, Professor of Theology, Montauban.

"In our opinion these discourses bear the impress of an acute and vigorous intellect, combined with earnest Christian feeling."—Professors Edwards and Park, Andover.

"Vinet's style is exceedingly pure and lucid, and the translation, so far as I have been able to judge, is faithful and elegant."—Rev. Dr. Skinner, New York.

"I am gratified that the Rev. Mr. Turnbull has translated some of the popular Discourses and Essays of so profound a thinker as Vinet. His discourses upon various religious subjects give token of power of intellect and elevation of moral sentiment."—Rev. Dr. Sears, Newtown Theological Seminary.

"There are in Vinet's mind and writings many things to remind a reader of John Foster. There is the same searching analysis and profound thought, united to a flowing eloquence to which generally Foster cannot lay claim."—Rev. Dr. Williams, New York.

"As a man of thought and of piety, Vinet occupies no common level among the theologians of our day. His pages are fresh with originality and eloquence, and he stands before us in all he writes as a man who thinks, and a man who prays, as a man of vigorous mind, as well as of living spirituality of soul. These are Essays and Discourses to be studied as well as read. You may gather much at the first reading, but you may gather more at the second. The calm philosophy which pervades them makes them most attractive and effective to the student or the inquirer."—From Presbyterian Review.

"The originality of thought, the beauty of diction, and the evangelical sentiment pervading this volume, will undoubtedly insure it a large circulation."—Baptist Magazine.

"We must declare the high and rare gratification which the perusal of this volume has afforded us. The author is a compeer and Fellow of D'Aubigné, but possesses more breadth of mind, more of profound philosophical eloquence and thoroughly correct views of the spirituality of the Saviour's kingdom, than have been exhibited by the Historian of the Reformation. We have not for a long time met such an animating and rousing book, and, thankful for the pleasure it has afforded us, we advise every Christian of cultivated and reflective mind to secure a perusal of it without delay. The Editor's notes are excellent, shewing a perfect appreciation of the Author's sentiments, and a power to carry them forth to new and valuable conclusions."—Christian Journal.

"There can be no question that Vinet is a man of distinguished ability and genius, he excels in depth and clearness, in delicacy and beauty. The acuteness of his mind enables him to penetrate into the heart of the subject, while his imagination supplies him with numerous and pertinent illustrations, by which he is enabled not only to invest his subject with interest and grace, but to aid the comprehension of those whose powers of abstract thought are inferior to his own. Such is the uction under which it is written, that the most established and matured Christian will have much benefit as well as delight in the perusal of it. We have not of late read a theological work bearing more decidedly the stamp of freshness and originality."—Witness.

"Dr. Vinet is one of the most eminent of the French protestant divines, and is equally distinguished as a profound thinker and eloquent writer. In the present work, ably translated by Mr. Turnbull, he has entered largely into an analysis of the nature of Christian faith—for the purpose of shewing that it is not a mere intellectual reception of truth, but a work demanding all the energies of our spiritual and moral nature."—Athenaeum.

"We accompany these Essays with our best wishes, and as they are published at a low price, there is nothing to hinder them from making their way even among the humbler classes of society."—Edinburgh Evening Post.

"It affords me much pleasure to see the writings of Dr. Vinet in an English garb. Their merit are of the first order; and they cannot fail greatly to enrich our literature. Dr. Vinet holds the first rank as a Christian philosopher."—From Rev. L. Kirk, Boston.

"There is a manly freedom, and a generous candour, combined with a hospitality such as is only found among the sons of Christianity. The minister who allows his library to lack this volume, deprives himself of an efficient auxiliary in pulpit preparation, and his people of the advantages derived from its perusal of one of the richest productions of modern times."—Continental Echo.
A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE THESALONIANS. BY THE REV. ALEXANDER S. PATTERSON, GLASGOW.

Just Published, in One Volume. 18mo, Price Is. 6d.

"This Commentary is brief, but it is as clever as it is brief. It should be added to the collection of all students who are studying that sometimes difficult portion of St. Paul's Epistles."—Church and State Gazette.

"Mr. P.'s learning, his deference to the authority of the sacred word, and his evident delight in the exercise, qualify him eminently for the interpretation of the Apostolic letters. We hope that he will persevere in his labours."—Bap. Mag.

"The author has given us an instructive and edifying treatise on this interesting portion of Scripture."—Scottish Guardian.

"The author has given us an instructive and edifying treatise on this interesting portion of Scripture."—Scottish Guardian.

"We are thankful to record any attempt to rescue so precious an Epistle from neglect. Those who have studied it most deeply will be the first to attest its exceeding preciousness and beauty. We admire much Mr. Patterson's candour in criticism. There is no squaring by systems or preconceived opinions, but a simple and honest enquiry into the real meaning of the word. Hence there is much minute and useful criticism to be found in this brief Commentary. Its style is elegant, its tone is calm and Christian."—Presbyterian Review.

"A very clear, judicious, and sound exposition, highly adapted for the instruction and edification of all who deem it their duty and privilege to endeavour to ascertain what the Spirit saith unto the churches. It gives evidence of a well furnished and well disciplined mind, and any one who will consult his exposition of the more difficult passages of the Epistle will be satisfied that this book, small as it is, must have cost a very considerable amount of labour. We trust it will obtain an extensive circulation."—Dumfries Standard.

"A very valuable and interesting little volume. It is free from controversy, lucid and simple in style, evangelical in sentiment, and blending the critical and practical in a manner at once pleasing and instructive. There is no ostentatious display of learning in it, the object of the author evidently being usefulness as a minister of the Gospel, more than fame as a profound scholar."—Ayr Advertiser.

"His discrimination and judgment are very apparent; rarely indeed do these qualities ever seem to fail. We commend this production to our readers, satisfied they will find in it very much to make an interesting portion of Scripture plain and clear to their understandings."—Greenock Advertiser.

"It is precisely to our minds what a commentary ought to be,—simple but elegant—short but perspicuous—learned, but pious and judicious."—National.

"All that is most important for the elucidation of the Apostle's meaning, has been brought within a narrow compass, and delivered in a style which will be plain to the humblest, while it will not offend the man of taste or learning."—Scottish Christian Instructor.

"It is precisely to our minds what a commentary ought to be,—simple but elegant—short but perspicuous—learned, but pious and judicious."—National.

"It is by far the soberest, most systematic, and most satisfactory work of the kind that we have yet seen, and will, we trust, very speedily obtain extensive reputation. We hail with much pleasure a work which, adopting the principle for which we have contended, uses it with caution."—Church of England Quarterly Review.

"A learned, judicious, and truly evangelical work."—Extract of a letter from Dr. Pye Smith, of Homerton College.

"The substance of the book is of sterling merit, and highly creditable to the author's learning and judgment. The theological student will not find so much material on the same subject within the same limits elsewhere."—British Quarterly Review, No. 3.

"It affords us great satisfaction to introduce to our readers a work on Typology incomparably superior to any that we have previously seen. It is not often that we meet with a book on any subject in which originality of conception and solidity of judgment are so thoroughly blended as in this. We have derived from it instruction as well as pleasure."—Baptist Magazine.

"Mr. Fairbairn has contributed very greatly to the removal of difficulties, and has cleared off a great deal of the mist that had been gathering round the Types, as well as cast a very considerable light upon the whole subject."—Presbyterian Review.

"It is a very important and valuable work. The enquiry is conducted in a way which reflects the highest credit upon the learning, ability and critical acumen of the author."—Witness.
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"It is by far the soberest, most systematic, and most satisfactory work of the kind that we have yet seen, and will, we trust, very speedily obtain extensive reputation. We hail with much pleasure a work which, adopting the principle for which we have contended, uses it with caution."—Church of England Quarterly Review.

"A learned, judicious, and truly evangelical work."—Extract of a letter from Dr. Pye Smith, of Homerton College.

"The substance of the book is of sterling merit, and highly creditable to the author's learning and judgment. The theological student will not find so much material on the same subject within the same limits elsewhere."—British Quarterly Review, No. 3.

"It affords us great satisfaction to introduce to our readers a work on Typology incomparably superior to any that we have previously seen. It is not often that we meet with a book on any subject in which originality of conception and solidity of judgment are so thoroughly blended as in this. We have derived from it instruction as well as pleasure."—Baptist Magazine.

"Mr. Fairbairn has contributed very greatly to the removal of difficulties, and has cleared off a great deal of the mist that had been gathering round the Types, as well as cast a very considerable light upon the whole subject."—Presbyterian Review.

"It is a very important and valuable work. The enquiry is conducted in a way which reflects the highest credit upon the learning, ability and critical acumen of the author."—Witness.
It is now twelve years since, at a period when, confessedly, the study of Biblical Criticism was at a very low ebb in this country, Mr. Clark of Edinburgh projected the series of publications known under the general head of "THE BIBLICAL CABINET," with the view of, in some measure, opening to Biblical Students, the hitherto locked up treasures of German Theological Science.

That such a work was needed was generally admitted; that such a work would, under the circumstances, prove a profitable speculation to the Bookseller, was a very different matter. For, though there was a general desire to know something of the writings of German and other Continental divines, yet there was also a certain dread (justified, in but too many instances, by the fact) of everything coming from that quarter.

Germany was only then beginning to rise from the darkness of Neo-Latin night, and though even in that night there had been bright gleams of the morning dawn, yet it cannot be denied, much as Seuwer, Michaelis, Ammon, Winer, De Wette, Wegscheider, and such like, had, aided by their writings, the study of Biblical Criticism, that through their instrumentality vital Christianity had been well nigh crushed.

The Series was, however, started, and has been carried on in the face of every obstacle. The various works are before the public, and it is not for the Publishers to say more than that they include some of the best writings of Tholuck, of Hengstenberg, of Neander, of Lisco, of Steiger, of Billroth, and others, whose praise is in all the Churches; but he would humbly trust that the British Theological public in general, and students in particular, will encourage him in this new scheme he is about to propose, taking into consideration that it is in some measure owing to his perseverance that such a taste has been created, or fostered so as to give any hopes of such a project succeeding.

It now appears to the Publisher that the time has arrived for extending more widely the writings of these giants in Biblical Literature; and he accordingly begs to submit the following proposals for the publication of a series of translations from the most eminent German, French, Dutch, and other Foreign authors, in the various branches of Theological learning.

He proposes to issue FOUR VOLUMES YEARLY, of about 500 pages, Demy Octavo, The Annual Subscription to which will be only ONE POUND.

Mr. Clark has hitherto committed, and will continue to confide, the important trust of Selection to Theologians thoroughly conversant with the various departments of Foreign Theological Literature; and the public may rest assured that every effort shall be used to make the Collection include such works as are best calculated to promote the advancement of Biblical studies. In the meantime, he may mention the greater part of the following first-rate works as in progress of translation, (as will be seen in the preceding page:)

L i c k e n o n t h e G o s p e l o f S t J o h n.
O l s e n a u e r ' s C o m m e n t a r y o n t h e N e w T e s t a m e n t.
D r. J u l i u s M ü l l e r o n t h e D o c t r i n e o f S i m.
H a c k e n b a c h ' s H i s t o r y o f O p i n i o n s.
H a r l e y o n t h e E p h e s i a n s.
H e r v e r n i c k ' s I n t r o d u c t i o n t o t h e O l d T e s t a m e n t.
H e n g s t e n b e r g o n t h e A u t h e n t i c i t y o f D a n i e l.

H o f f m a n n o n P r o p r e t y.
P e t t ' s T h e o l o g i c a l E n c y c l o p e d i a.
U n t e r s P a u l L e h n e r i g e r f.
N e a n d e r ' s G e n e r a l C h u r c h H i s t o r y.
G i e b e l s e r ' s E l e m e n t s o f C h u r c h H i s t o r y N e w E d.
N e a n d e r ' s L i f e o f C h r i s t.
H e n g s t e n b e r g ' s C h r i s t o l o g y. N e w E d i t i o n, w i t h v e r y l a r g e a d d i t i o n s a n d a l t e r a t i o n s.

One feature of his plan is this,— he will print a small number of copies above the number on the Subscription List, which will be sold at 10s. 6d. per volume; so that the Subscribers will have the confidence that they are getting for 5s., a volume, the marketable value of which is more than double that sum.

The T H I R D volume (for 1846) is now ready for delivery,—


N. B.—The Publishers beg leave respectfully to request of those Gentlemen, to whom this Circular is addressed, will have the goodness to communicate the subject of it to their Clerical friends and others interested in the progress of Theological Education.


It is earnestly requested that intending Subscribers will intimate their name and address with the least possible delay.

The B I B L I C A L C A B I N E T is now completed in 45 volumes—The Publishers, with the hope of inducing the Managers of Parochial and Congregational Libraries to include in their collection have resolved to offer complete sets at the reduced price of TEN POUNDS, the original published price was £14. 2s.
CLARK'S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOUR LARGE VOLUMES, Octavo, handsomely bound in Cloth, lettered, For ONE POUND Per Annum,—Or to Non-Subscribers, 10s. 6d. each Volume.

The First and Second Volumes of this Series, Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms, and the Third, Hugenbach's History of Religious Opinions, are now Published.

We, whose names are undersigned, beg to call attention to the undertaking described in the Title at the head of this paper.

Mr. CLARK, It is well known, has been engaged during many years, in Publishing a Series of Translations from the most approved works of German and other Continental Divines. This Series, which has appeared under the general title of the BIBLICAL, ELOGICAL, ERIMEUTICAL, EXEGETICAL, AND PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY, extends to FORTY-FIVE VOLUMES, and embraces works on all the subjects specified in the general title.

By these Publications, Mr. CLARK has, we are convinced, contributed in a very high degree to the diffusion of a taste for Biblical Science, and of a higher tone of Theological Study, generally, throughout the British Empire; and on this account we think he has earned a full title to the confidence and approbation of all who are interested in the progress of Sacred Science.

Mr. CLARK has been engaged, THE FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, which he has already commenced with the first volume of a Translation of Dr. Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms—a work which, for sound learning, accurate exegesis, and evangelical sincerity, is well entitled to a place among the recent productions of German Theology), we hail with sincere satisfaction, and anticipate from it the best results. We especially draw attention to the admirable facility which his plan of publication affords for the obtaining of a series of the most important works in Sacred Philology at an almost insignificant cost. For Students, such a collection is invaluable, and we earnestly trust will be gratefully and extensively supported by them.

Mr. CLARK's enterprise, we think, deserves all praise, and we shall rejoice to hear that his undertaking meets with that encouragement, to which we are sure, it is well entitled.

Acoverth, James, A.M., President of Hertford College, Brad- ford, A. M., President of Hantun Theological Institution, Dublin.
Black, Alex D., New College.
Brown, John, D.D., Prof. of Divinity, United Sees, Church.
Clapham, John, Black, Alex D., New College.
Crisp, Thomas, President of Baptist College, New York.
Cunningham, William, D.D., Prof. of Divinity, New College.
Davidson, Samuel, D.D., Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Oriental and Independent College, Lancaster.
Davies, Rev. W. Ph. D. Theological Tutor, Llandow.
Dawson, J. D.D., Prof. of Biblical Literature, Marischal College, Aberdeen.
Duncan, John, L.L.D., Prof. of Oriental Languages, New College.
Farrar, John, Wesleyan Institution, Richmond.
Golding, Rev. J. D. D., President of Lane Theological Institution, Bristol.
Hannahs, D.D., Wesleyan Theological Institution, Dliquidie.
Harris, John, D.D., Theological and Exegetical Professor, Author of "Mammonitic", London.
Harper, James, D.D., Prof. of Divinity, United Sees, Church.
Henderson, K. D. D., Prof. of Divinity, Highbury College.
Hollis, John, D. D., Prof. of Biblical Literature, Marischal College, Aberdeen.
Jackson, Thomas, Theol. Tutor, Wesleyan Institution, Richmond.
Jenny, Thomas, W. D.D., Pres. of Coward Col., London.
Kitto, John, D.D., F.S.A., Editor of the Pictorial Bible.
Lorimer, Peter, A.M., &c, Prof. of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism, English Presbyterian College, London.

In order that the preceding Testimonial should carry along with it the greatest possible weight, Mr. CLARK has designedly limited the names to those Gentlemen who, from the high position which they occupy as the superintendents and conductors of the Theological Education of the united kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, are entitled to speak with authority on a question which so intimately involves the vital interests of Biblical science.

As a further earnest of his determination to use his best efforts to justify the confidence with which he has, in so expressive a manner, been honoured—Mr. C. begs to announce the following works as now in course of translation, and that active arrangements are in progress to add to the list other valuable works in the various departments of Theological Literature.

Olahusen's on the Gospels, translated by Dr. J. Lees, Olahusen's Commentary on the Acts, &c, translated by Dr. Lees.
Hagenbach's History of Opinions, trans. by Carl Buch.
Lübeck on the St. John, translated by Rev. James Osborn, D.D.
Hagenbach's History of the Reformers, translated by Robert Montgomery, A.M., Oxon, and Dr. Hennen.
Schrodt's First Hundred Years of the English Church, or Reflections on Theological Education among the Anglo-Saxons, translated by Rev. Henry Stebbing D.D.

SACRED HERMENEUTICS.

In one thick Volume Octavo, handsomely bound in Cloth,

SACRED HERMENEUTICS DEVELOPED AND APPLIED;
INCLUDING
A HISTORY OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION,
FROM THE
EARLIEST OF THE FATHERS TO THE REFORMATION.

By the REV. SAMUEL DAVIDSON, LL.D.

Professor of Biblical Literature, Ecclesiastical History, and Oriental Languages, in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester.

Chap. I. HERMENEUTICAL QUALIFICATIONS.

II. USE OF REASON IN THE EXPOSITION OF SCRIPTURE.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE SENTIMENT, that the language of the Bible should be interpreted like that of other books.—Some peculiarities in Biblical Interpretation.

IV. ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION.

V. HISTORY OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION — PATRIARCHIC PERIOD. — Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Ireneaeus.—The Clementine Recognitions.—Tertullian.—Origen.—Cyprian.—The Tradition of the Alexandrian Church.—The Tradition of the Latin Church.—Gregory Thaumaturgus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Athanasius.—Epiphresch, the Syrian.—Basil the Great.—Gregory of Nazianzum.—Gregory of Nyassa.—Diodorus.—Chrysostom.—Bilary.—Ambrose.—Jerome.—Augustine.—Tichonius.—Theodoret.—Cyril of Alexandria.—Isidore of Pelusium.—Pelagius.—Julian.—Vincentius Lirinensis.—Andrew.—Cassiodorus.—Gregory the Great.—General Estimate of the Fathers.

VI. HISTORY OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE HISTORICAL PERIOD, or from the beginning of the Seventh Century to the Reformation.—Bede.—Alcuin.—Rhabanus Maurus.—Walafrid Strabo.—Drutmar.—Claudius.—Cecumenius.—Arethas.—Notker.—Theophylact.—Lanfranc.—Nicetas.—Peter Lombard.—Enthymus Zygogenus.—Rupes—Thomas Aquinas.—Hugo de St. Carc.—Albert.—Bonaventura.—Nicolaus de Lyra.—Gerhard.—John Wessel.—John Huss.—Paulus Burgensia.—Laurentius Valla.—James Fair.—Stapulensis.—Erasmus.—Review of the Second Period.

VII. SYSTEMS OF INTERPRETATION. — The Moral or Kantian.—The Psychologico-Historical.—The Accommodation System.—The Mythic.—The Rationalistic.—The Pietist.

VIII. THE PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION STATED AND EXEMPLIFIED.

IX. USE OF HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN INTERPRETATION.

XI. QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.—Introductory Formulas.—Conformity with the Originals.—The purposes for which citations were made.—Important Formulas.—Supposed instances of accommodation.—Quotations classified.—Their connexion with verbal inspiration.

XII. ALLEGED CONTRADICTIONS OF SCRIPTURE.—Discrepancies between the OLD TESTAMENT WRITERS.—Discrepancies between the NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS.—Discrepancies between the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS.


XIV. COGNATE LANGUAGES AS SOURCES OF INTERPRETATION.—1. The Arabic. 2. The Syriac. 3. The Chaldee.


XVI. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF HERMENEUTICAL WRITERS FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME, containing an analysis of their Works, with a critical estimate of their value.

THREE INDICES.

Edinburgh: THOMAS CLARK.; London: HAMILTON & ADAMS.; Dublin: CURRY & CO.
ELEMENTS OF CHURCH HISTORY,
COMPRISING THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES,
By DAVID WELSH, D.D., F.R.S.E.,
Professor of Divinity and Church History, New College, Edinburgh; formerly Regius Professor of Divinity and Church History in the University of Edinburgh.

"We have perused the work with equal care and gratification, and we regard ourselves as not conferring any favour on the distinguished author, but as discharging our duty to our readers, and the public in general, when we direct their attention to this work, and give it our most entire and grateful approbation."—Free Church Magazine.

"...all classes of our readers to encourage the effort, by a speedy and extensive circulation of this admirable volume."—Christian Examiner.

"We now recommend these Elements of Church History to the careful perusal of Students."—Church of England Quarterly.

EXPOSITION OF THE PSALMS OF DAVID, &c.
By Dr. E. W. HENGSTENBERG,
Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

"... much to illustrate and defend in their legitimate sense, the Scriptures of the Old Testament."—Methodist Magazine.

"We believe that in point of soundness, learning, and critical acumen, he is unsurpassed by any theologian in his own or in any other country. He draws his stores, from a thorough and learned study of the Word of God.—This work promises to turn out a very valuable contribution to sacred literature. While rich in all the refinements of German Criticism, to give it an interest and value in the eyes of the Professional Student of the Bible, it abounds in those spiritual views and Messianic interpretations, which cannot fail to render it acceptable to the general reader. We hesitate not to say, that no Critical apparatus for the scientific, or even practical study of the Psalms, can be complete without it."—Witness.

In Two Volumes, Foolscape 8vo. Price 15s. Cloth,

COMMENTARIES ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN,
By Dr. C. C. TITTMANN,
Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg.
Translated from the Original, with additional Notes from Storr, Tholuck, Kuinoel, and Lücke, By JAMES YOUNG.

"...for general and extensive usefulness, these Meditations will be inferior to none of the Author’s former works. His laudable object has been to illustrate the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the dignity of his person and the riches of his grace, in order to revive the piety and establish the faith of his reader."—Methodist Magazine.

In Demy Octavo, Price 7s. 6d. Bound in Cloth,

EGYPT AND THE BOOKS OF MOSES,
OR THE BOOKS OF MOSES ILLUSTRATED BY THE MONUMENTS OF EGYPT,
WITH AN APPENDIX.
By Dr. E. W. HENGSTENBERG,
Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.
BIBLICAL CRITICISM & EXPOSITION.

Biblical Cabinet.

Biblical Cabinet, or Hermeneutical, Exegetical, and Philological Library.

Vol. I. to XLV. are published, price £14. 2s. Edin. 1833-44.

Only a very few Complete Sets now remain and are offered for TEN POUNDS.

"The Biblical Cabinet, which is still in progress, promises to be of singular utility to Biblical students."—Horne's Introduction, 2nd Ed. vol. ii. p. 4.

"It is now a considerable time since this publication was commenced, with the laudable intention of elucidating the Scriptures. The idea of the work was good, and its design excellent. To those who wish to avail themselves of the labours of the men who have devoted so much time to the interpretation of the Scriptures,—to those whose anxiety to know the will of God goes beyond a mere translation, and who aspire to eminence in sacred studies, the series is calculated to be highly useful. The greater number of the volumes consist of translations from orthodox German di-vines, to which occasional extracts from other authors have been added with the utmost attention of all the ablest Biblical students. They may be found in much valuable knowledge connected with the sacred Scriptures,—many topics illustrated with learning and ability,—and above all, a habit of analytical investigation exemplified in practice, which they would do well to imitate."—Baptist Magazine.

A list of the various works comprised in this very important series of publications, may be had upon application to the publisher in Edinburgh, or to his agents in London or Dublin.


"This edition, by Messrs. Negris and Duncan, we venture to assert, is the most accurate edition of a Lexicon which is any one to be met with. In this respect it is much superior to the original."—Church Review.

"The present edition by Messrs. Negris and Duncan may be pronounced as, in all respects, the best of this valuable Lexicon of the New Testament."—Orthodox Presbyterian.

"The Edinburgh edition is corrected with an exactness and care by Mr. Hunter, the equal of any distinguished scholar, whose names are mentioned. Several thousand errors have been detected, many of them of vital importance. It cannot be doubted therefore, that, on a comparison of the two editions, he (Dr. Robinson) would give his suffrage in favour of Mr. Clark's."—Baptist Magazine.

"In justice to the editor and publisher of the Edinburgh edition, we must state, it is as beautifully as it is correctly printed. British students are deeply indebted for the indefatigable exertions of the Editors to present Dr. Robinson's Lexicon in Edinburgh, and this is a very elegantly printed, and is also, in point of accuracy, fully worthy of its respectable editors."—Methodist Magazine.

"We prefer this edition (Negris and Duncan) to any other that has yet appeared. The typography is beautiful, and the accuracy of the Greek text is everything that can be desired. As to the whole, the Lexicon is remarkably low. We regard this Lexicon as a valuable addition to philological science; and, on the whole, the best Lexicon, upon the New Testament which a student could purchase."—Baptist Magazine.

SACRED HERMENEUTICS.

In one thick Volume Octavo, handsome bound in Cloth, price 21s.

SACRED HERMENEUTICS DEVELOPED AND APPLIED, including A HISTORY OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION, from the Earliest of the Fathers to the Reformation. By the Rev. SAMUEL DAVIDSON, LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Ecclesiastical History, and Oriental Languages, in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester; Author of "Lectures on Biblical Criticism."

"In this book-making age, it is refreshing to meet with a work which has grown out of a want which has been felt and which the Author is competent to supply. It is praise-worthy in its condition, as well as in its excellence; it is not only a text-book of valuable instruction, but it contains scarcely anything but what is absolutely necessary to the critical student of Holy Scripture.

"Nothing seems to be left undone which could be brought within the prescribed limits, and all that has been done appears to be well done, and treated in an intelligent and masterly manner."—Church of England Quarterly Review.

"We hail the publication of Dr. Davidson's book as a happy omen. It is a book much wanted. Its publication is an era in the history of English Theological Literature. Our readers will see it is a work of great merit, and worthy of high commendation. We are able to give it in a form which continued research. We hope the churches will appreciate the performance, and so reward the learning of the author."—Eclectic Review.

"It is a long time since a Biblical work of more lasting value to the student has issued from the English press; the pervading tone of vital piety which enwraps this volume, excites it far above the ordinary manuals of interpretation. We rejoice to think that the appearance of this work will give a fresh and healthy stimulus to the study of the Bible."—London Congregational Magazine.

"It is incomparably the best treatise on sacred Hermeneutics within the compass of the English Language."—Scottish Congregational Magazine.

"We welcome this book as a valuable contribution to the cause of Biblical interpretation. It bears upon every page the marks of thorough investigation, of patient and erudite research. The learning employed in it is both deep, varied, and cautious."—Secession Magazine.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

In one vol. 8vo. price 14s. handsome bound in cloth, with Facsimiles of ancient MSS.

LECTURES ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM, Exhibiting a Systematic View of that Science. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, LL.D. Professor of Biblical Literature, &c.

"All the subjects connected with Biblical criticism, which are within the pale of what a parochial minister may advantageously treat, are fully discussed in the present volume; and the information which it contains, whilst it is sufficiently copious for any ordinary student, is much more to be depended on than in the larger volumes of Mr. Horne."—Edinburgh Review.

"Every part of it shows deep and indefatigable research, a thorough acquaintance with all the sources of information, and a moderation and caution of mind which has released him from all the shackles of favourite masters and dominant schools."—Eclectic Review.

"The various topics embraced in Dr. Davidson's volume, are treated in such a way as to show that instead of servilely copying from copystates, he has gone to the sources of authority, and examined, and judged for himself."—American Biblical Repository.

"This work is the fruit of much extensive and various reading, of diligent inquiry, sound learning, independent thinking, indefatigable labour, and Christian sobriety of mind."—Congregational Magazine.
CLARK'S LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.—EDINBURGH, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE BIBLICAL CABINET; OR
Hermeneutical, Exegetical, and Philological Library,
Consisting of Translations of the most Valuable and Interesting Works of German, and other Continent Divines, in so far as they are connected with Biblical Literature.

Only a very few Complete Sets now remain and are offered for TEN POUNDS.

Translations of the works have already appeared, all neatly bound in cloth:


2. From the Biblical Cabinet.


5 & 12.—Tholuck's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols. 12mo.

6 & 14.—Tholuck's Exposition of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, 2 vols. 12mo.

7.—Planché's Introduction to Sacred Philology, 6 vols. 12mo.


10.—Stuart's Greek Syntax of the New Testament, 6 vols. 12mo.

11, 17, 36.—Rosenmuller's Biblical Geography, 3 vols. 12mo.

12 & 14.—Steiger's Exposition of the 1st Epistle of St. Peter, 2 vols. 12mo.

15.—Lecce's Exposition of the Three Epistles of St. John, 2 vols. 12mo.

16 & 18.—Umbreit's Exposition of Book of Job, 2 vols. 12mo.


22.—Krummacher's Life and Character of Cornelius the Centurion, and of St. John the Evangelist, 6 vols. 12mo. These may be had separately: Cornelius, 4s.; St. John, 3s.

34.—Witius' Dissertations on the Lord's Prayer, 7 vols.

35.—Clavis Symbolica; a Key to the Symbolical Language of Scripture, 8 vols. 8vo. (Parts iv. and v. By Thomas Wemyss, Author of Biblical Gleanings, 7 vols. 8vo. 1849, 1854, 1856, 1858, 1868, 1873.)

37.—Rosenmuller's Biblical Botany and Mineralogy, 2 vols. 12mo.


40.—Lisco's Exposition of Christ's Parables, 2 vols. 12mo.

45.—Calvin on Epistle to the Hebrews, 2 vols. 12mo.

46.—Gess on the Revelation of God in his Word, 2 vols. 12mo.

53.—Rosenmuller on the Messianic Psalms, 2 vols. 12mo.

54.—Coun's Commentary on the Life of the Early Christians, 2 vols. 12mo.

55 & 36.—Neander's History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church, 2 vols. 12mo.

56.—Clarke's Symbolic Grammar, 2 vols. 12mo.

57.—Calvin and Storr on the Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and Colossians, 2 vols. 12mo.

58.—Dale and Ussher's Life, Times, and Writings of Justin Martyr, 2 vols. 12mo.


60.—Rosenmuller on the Gospel of St. John, 2 vols. 12mo.

65.—Hengstenberg. The Books of Mose illustrated by the Monuments of Egypt.

Critical Notice from Horne's Introduction.

"The Biblical Cabinet, which is still in progress, promises to be of singular utility to Biblical students."—7th Edit. vol. ii. Ap. p. 15.

From Davidson's Biblical Criticism.

"It is now a considerable time since this publication was commenced, with the laudable intention of elucidating the Scriptures. The idea of this work was necessarily a very great one. We wish success to the labours of the men who have searched deep into particular portions of the Scriptures,—to those whose anxiety to know the will of God goes beyond mere translation, and who aspire to eminence in sacred studies, this Series is calculated to be highly useful. The greater number of the volumes consist of Translations from orthodox German divines, which are generally accompanied with notes by the Editors. The whole series is worthy the attention of all Biblical students. They may find in it much valuable knowledge connected with the sacred Scriptures,—many topics illustrated with critical acuteness; and, above all, a habit of analytical investigation, exemplified in practice, which they would do well to imitate."

From the American Biblical Repository.

"We have repeatedly expressed our estimation of the Biblical Cabinet, a series of translations from German works on Biblical topics: It is a noble undertaking."

From the Church of England Quarterly Review.

"This series contains the best works of the best divines among our English neighbours."

From the Congregational Magazine.

"It may be safely affirmed, that no work which has hitherto been contributed to this collection, has given a greater stimulus to the study of those accurate and settled principles of Scripture interpretation, with which every minister of the word ought to be well acquainted, or afforded greater assistance in the prosecution of such study, as this interesting and useful series—the Biblical Cabinet.—It must be regretted, that recommending this work to our children, Oriental and Hebraic to our readers, especially to ministers. The execution is as creditable to the parties conducting the work, as the original design was felicitous; it is got up with uncommon beauty and elegance."

From the Christian Observer.

"The Biblical Cabinet will assist at once to stimulate and to gratify for this species of Biblical literature. The Selections of its editor are very conspicuous; and we have reason to think, that such articles as are now before the Christian student.—It would be a great disgrace to our sacred literature, if, while various series of our popular theological works are largely patronized, there should not be sufficient encouragement for the maintenance of such publication as the present."

From the Christian Instructor.

"Of all the series of publications which have lately been planned, there is not one which pleases us so well, or to which we attach so much importance as this."

From the Church of Scotland Magazine.

"We rejoice to see that the critical study of the Sacred Scriptures is attracting more attention, and is more systematically pursued in this country than formerly. The foundation of all sound theological knowledge must lie in a critical acquaintance with the works we are forming, or with the commencement of such a work as the Biblical Cabinet, the great object of which is to draw the attention of theologians, young and old, to the state of German Biblical Literature."

From the Edinburgh Review.

"In his work, we think, entitled, fulminating the object, to the cordial support of all who take an interest in the critical study of the Scriptures, and desire to see it more extensively diffused. It is peculiarly incumbent upon all who appreciate the importance of the object, to come forward and support the work, and endeavour to extend its circulation."

From the Presbyterian Review.

"We cannot conclude without expressing our earnest hopes, that all who have the interest of Biblical science at heart will support this publication."

From the Evangelical Magazine.

"If we could make the wide Anyone to be heard and regarded, we should say to the heads of every Christian family in Great Britain, able to make the slender pecuniary means at their disposal to purchase, and cherish, the Biblical Cabinet, which contains a mass of well-digested matter, on almost all topics connected with the language, literature, and theology of the Old and New Testaments. In giving this advice, we do it most sincerely, and we do say, that in such a country as Great Britain, and in such an age as this, a compendium of Scripture Philology, like the Biblical Cabinet, ought to command the sale of many thousands."

THE CABINET LIBRARY
OF
SCARCE, CELEBRATED, & USEFUL TRACTS.

It is well known that in every age and country where literature is pursued with activity, much that valuable and interesting issues from the press in the shape of Pamphlets or Tracts. When the shows of these have had other claims on the recollections of posterity, their tracts have been preserved in collected editions of their works; but single tracts, by anonymous authors, or by authors who have written nothing besides, are seldom to be procured after a few years, except in the library of the curious collector. He therefore who wishes to consult some tract of great note in its day, is sometimes obliged to purchase the voluminous and expensive works of its author; and sometimes he that neither his bookseller, nor any library to which he has access, can afford him a copy of it. It is with a view to prevent in some degree the recurrence of these difficulties, that it is now proposed to publish a selection of the most useful, interesting and celebrated tracts, in two separate series—the first under the title of The Cabinet Library of Scarce and Celebrated Tracts, and the second under the distinctive name of The Students' Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts, and to exclude nothing that can come within the designation either of polite letters or of useful knowledge; and hopes thus to present a series of cheap publications, which will interest the Antiquarian, the Theologian, the Philosopher, and the Scholar.

The Cabinet Library of Scarce & Celebrated Tracts.

"The schools of these rare gems are recommended by their neat form and cheapness, and will now have a large circulation."—MONTHLY REVIEW.

1. Life of Lord Russell, by Mrs Child. 1s 6d. Biographical Series, No. 4.
2. Prof. Tholuck's Remarks on the Character, Life, and Style of the Apostle Paul, designed as an Introduction to the Study of the Pauline Epistles. 1s 6d. Philosophical Series, No. 3.
4. The Volumes may be had neatly bound in morocco cloth.

LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.; SIMPSON & CO.
Interpretation of the Old Testament.

PRINCIPLES of the INTERPRETATION of the OLD TESTAMENT, translated from the original of J. H. Pareau, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Utrecht. By Patrick Forbes, D.D., Professor of Humanity, &c. King's College, Aberdeen. 2 vols. 12s.

"We have carefully perused this volume, and can confidently recommend it to our readers. It must be remarked, however, that it is designed for Biblical students alone, who are acquainted with the Scriptures in their original languages. Pareau is one of the soundest and safest of the continental divines and, like most of his Dutch countrymen, is free from what is thought by many, though not by us, to be irrational rationalism, with which their German neighbours are so deeply tainted. The present work is a valuable addition to our Biblical knowledge, and must form an admirable auxiliary to all whose business it is to expound and illustrate the sacred volume.

"It is the production of a mind manifestly deeply impressed with the value and importance of revelation, and imbued with profound reverence for the word of God. But while completely satisfied himself, both of the authenticity and integrity of the Scriptures, he is ready calmly and deliberately to investigate the doubts and objections of others, to remove their scruples, and, by the known and acknowledged principles of criticism and logic, to give the most satisfactory reasons, for relying implicitly and confidently on the declarations of Scripture. The English translation is every way worthy of the original, and is such as might have been expected from the accurate acquirements and judgment of Dr. Forbes."—Caledonian Mercury.

"We have not, for a long time, read any work with so deep and intense interest, nor from which we have derived so much gratification, and received, in so limited a space, so much instruction. We recommend, in the warmest manner, to our clerical readers, the several precepts inculcated in it."—Stirling Journal.

"In the volume now before us, the reader is presented with a concise history of the interpretation of the Old Testament, and the difficulties connected with it; an account of the qualifications which will render one a good interpreter of the Old Testament, at the present age; the necessary endowments of mind; the subsidiary studies which are necessary; and the true manner of interpreting the Old Testament. On each of these subjects, divided into various branches, the reader will find a mass of information, both pleasing and profitable. We wish the author had laid more stress upon the necessity of seeking divine assistance, in biblical studies. The work is invaluable, and is adapted to prove a severe test of the pretensions of many. If there be an increasing desire to be better acquainted with the Scriptures awakened in the Church of Christ, this work will be in great demand."—Christian Advocate.

Interpretation of the New Testament.

ERNESTI'S PRINCIPLES of the INTERPRETATION of the NEW TESTAMENT, Translated by the Rev. C. H. Terrot. 2 vols. 12s.

"We highly approve of the plan of this work; it could not begin better than with Ernesti's Institutes, a most sound treatise on the art of Interpretation."—Brit. Mag.

"If the reader should be desirous of seeing the style of the New Testament fully and satisfactorily handled, I refer him to Ernesti."—Archbishop Magee.

"The Institutes of Ernesti is indeed a noble work—imposing on account of the very nakedness of its strength, and the unadorned simplicity and stability of its intellectual proportions. The translation of Mr. Terrot is executed with faithfulness and ability."—Presbyterian Review.

"The Institution Interpretis of Ernesti requires no recommendation from any one. Its merits have long been known, and fully appreciated. The translation is uniformly correct, perspicuous, and forcible. The notes of Mr. Terrot are always sensible and judicious, and are creditable to him as a proof of his scholarship, the extent of his reading, and the soundness of his views."—Edinburgh Theological Mag.

"Of the excellence of Ernesti's Institution Interpretis it is unnecessary for us to say one word. It is perhaps the most valuable manual on Hermeneutics in existence, and has long been used as a text-book in the universities of Europe. Mr. Terrot has given a translation of Ammon's notes on the Institution in the present volume, but has, as usual, supplied a thorough corrective to the Neologism of that learned critic. We can easily imagine the superficial Scholast, or uneducated bigot, denying the usefulness of such works as the present; but every sound-thinking and well instructed theologian will find, in the labours of Ernesti and his brethren, much that is calculated to satisfy and to instruct the believer, and much that must silence the cavilling objector."—Dumfries Journal.


A TREATISE on the SYNTAX of the NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT, with a Dissertation on the GREEK ARTICLE. By Prof. Moses Stuart, of Andover. Price 6s. bound in cloth.

"When it is considered how much all sound interpretation depends on accurate notions of the syntax of a language, it will be seen that the subject of this work will amply repay the most careful perusal. Professor Stuart seems eminently to possess those qualities of mind necessary for writing a good grammar of a language."—Scottish Guardian.

"This work is of the first importance to all students of the Sacred Scriptures; I rejoice in the republication of it."—Dr. J. Pye Smith.
CLARK'S LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS—EDINBURGH, 38 GEORGE STREET.

DR THOLUCK'S WORKS.

Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount.
EXPOSITION, DOCTRINAL and PHILOLOGICAL, of CHRIST'S SERMON on the MOUNT; intended likewise as a Help towards the Formation of a pure Biblical System of Faith and Morals. Translated from the original German of Dr A. THOLUCK, by the Rev. R. MENZIES, of Hoddam. 2 vols. price 12s. bd. in cloth.

"By the friends of the gospel in Germany, the Professor is thought here to have surpassed all his former efforts; and we have good reason to suppose, that, in the view of the author himself, it is the capital production of his pen. We do not hesitate to say, that, so far as our knowledge reaches, no work of equal value has ever appeared on the same subject."—BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

"The volumes before us have furnished a fine specimen of sanctified learning and talent. On those great truths which form the substratum of the theology of all genuine Christians, he is clear and explicit, and will be read by the most pious characters with pleasure and satisfaction."

Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.
EXPOSITION of ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS, with Extracts from the Exegetical Works of the Fathers and Reformers. Translated from the German of Dr A. Tholuck, by the Rev. R. Menzies. 2 vols. price 12s. bd. in cloth.

"Of its kind it is the best Commentary we know. Tholuck has been the Magna Apollo of Moses Stuart, who often refers to him, and has been still more indebted to him than his references show. This is of itself sufficient to establish the value of this Commentary. Its principal excellence consists in the accurate philological knowledge of the author. The translator seems to have done his duty faithfully and ably."—CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.

"Tholuck on the Romans is a work of very great merit."—CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

"Confessedly the ablest exposition of the Scriptures in any language."—EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE.

"The author is well known to Europe as a sound theologian and learned orientalist, and his qualifications are eminently shown in this Commentary. He has elucidated many of the difficulties in this Epistle from the Rabbinical writings and peculiar Jewish customs,—a source of explanation much neglected by former commentators."—ATHENEUM.

Commentary on the Hebrews.

"This Commentary is distinguished by the prominent excellencies of the author. Though written in haste, and not free from the errors into which haste invariably leads, it abounds in admirable elucidations, frequently deep, usually comprehensive, and almost invariably strikingly instructive."—FROM THE ECLACTIC REVIEW.

"The merits of Dr Tholuck, as a critical expositor of the Bible, are now tolerably well known in this country, and all competent judges, we think, must admit that they are very great. His learning is singularly extensive and profound. His understanding appears to be naturally acute, fertile, and energetic—qualities which his immense erudition seems to have quickened and invigorated, rather than impaired. In addition to these excellencies, he possesses, in an eminent degree, that vivid sense of the loveliness and purity of evangelical truth, without which a commentator, however learned, logical and ingenious, is out of his element, and often does more harm than good."—FROM THE SCOTTISH CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

A book which ought to be in every clergyman's library."

Tholuck's Sermons, &c.
SKETCH of the LIFE and CHARACTER of Dr Tholuck, by Professor Park.
—Professor Tholuck's Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul.—SERMONS on various occasions.—The Nature and Moral Influence of Heathenism, especially among the Greeks and Romans, viewed in the light of Christianity. In one volume, price 6s. bd. in cloth.

"His remarks on the Life, &c. of Paul, afford abundant evidence of the proficiency he has attained, and his thorough acquaintance with the chief of the Rabbinical writings. His Treatise on the Nature &c. of Heathenism ranks very high in Germany, and has been pronounced by Grevenius to be the ablest which he had ever seen on the subject."

"In his Sermons there is a freshness of thought, which cannot fail to attract attention and excite interest. His style seems to vary with his subject and feelings, appearing now bold and impetuous, now gentle and winning, at one time argumentative, and at another imaginative."—SCOTTISH GUARDIAN.

"His Sermons display such elevation and richness of religious sentiment, great liveliness and exuberance of fancy, and characterised at the same time by vigour and boldness, by tenderness, and a childlike simplicity, and by variety of thought and expression."—EVENING POST.
CLARKE'S LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS—EDINBURGH, 38 GEORGE STREET.

CALVIN—STORR—WITSIUS.

Calvin on the Galatians and Ephesians.

COMMENTARIES on the EPISTLES of PAUL to the GALATIANS and EPHESIANS. By JOHN CALVIN. Translated from the Original by the Rev. WILLIAM PRINGLE, Auchterarder. Price 6s. bd. in cloth.

From Bishop Horsley. "I hold the memory of Calvin in high veneration; his works have a place in my library; and in the study of the Holy Scriptures, he is one of the commentators whom I most frequently consult."

Critical Notice from the Evangelical Magazine.

"Calvin's insight into the meaning of God's word was equally penetrating and profound. Though he flourished at a period when Hermeneutical science was but little cultivated, such was his prophetic sagacity, that he well nigh anticipated the best results of modern criticism, while he excelled most of its errors and mistakes. The translator has done himself great honour by his forcible and scholarly rendering of a work which must live while sound theology is appreciated in our country. Those who wish thoroughly to understand the general drift of Paul's reasoning with the Galatians, as well as to grasp the meaning of its minute parts, cannot find a safer human guide than the cheap volume now placed within the reach of persons in almost every walk of life."

From the Church of England Quarterly Review.

"Calvin's writings can never be studied without benefit. The Commentary on the Ephesians and Galatians abounds with practical matter of a very valuable character, and is most efficiently translated by Mr Pringle."

From the Christian Journal.

"The splendour of Calvin's genius, and his extraordinary merits as a commentator, have been freely acknowledged by divines of all parties. The volume before us exhibits the model of the Scottish lecture, and will be highly prized by young ministers who are fond of that most useful mode of communicating scriptural knowledge to their congregations."

From the Scottish Guardian.

"With regard to Mr Pringle's part of the work before us, we doubt not that all who are acquainted with the competency of his scholarship, and the accuracy of his habits of thought and expression, will be prepared to believe that his task has been ably and satisfactorily executed."

Calvin and Storr on the Philippians and Colossians.

EXPOSITIONS of the EPISTLES of PAUL to the PHILIPPIANS and COLOSSIANS. Translated by Robert Johnston. Price 7s. bd. in cloth.

From the Methodist Magazine.

"A very useful and singularly constructed volume. Calvin is doctrinal and practical, Storr exclusively critical. The one aims at giving the right expression of the text, but the other its proper explanation. Storr is for the reader considered as a scholar, Calvin for the reader considered as a Christian."

From the Baptist Magazine.

"This is the fortieth volume of the Cabinet, and a precious volume it is. The idea of this double commentary was very felicitous, and the result is truly satisfactory. The specimens of Calvin here presented are distinguished, like the other expository writings of that eminent man, by great perspicuity and great earnestness. Calvin's expositions are admirably supplemented by the Notes of Storr. These Notes are characterised by remarkable precision of thought, and great scriptural erudition. The style of the translator is clear and vigorous; and the preface and notes of the translator indicate a strong and independent mind."

Witsius on Prayer.

SACRED DISSERTATIONS on the LORD'S PRAYER. Translated from the Latin of Witsius. With Notes by the Rev. W. Pringle, Auchterarder. Price 7s. cloth.

From the Rev. David Duncan's "Pattern of Prayer."

"The admirable dissertations of Witsius have been rendered accessible to the English reader, by one who has proved himself well qualified for the task he undertook, and who has a claim on all the friends of genuine religion."

From the Evangelical Magazine.

"This is one of the ablest pieces on the subject of prayer, in any language. It has long been regarded by those who were acquainted with it, as containing in itself a system of theology. We cannot most cordially recommend it to students of divinity, and others wishing to obtain enlarged views of revealed truth."

From the Orthodox Presbyterian.

"The exposition is replete with learning, and at the same time intelligible and perspicuous. Nothing is omitted at all connected with the subject, and nothing is superficially or unsatisfactorily discussed. In short, we know of no treatise on the Lord's Prayer altogether equal to it in merit. The translator seems to have executed his task in a manner highly creditable to his classical knowledge, his judgment, and his theological attainments."
ECCLERICAL HISTORY.

Neander's Church History.

HISTORY of the Planting and Training of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH by the APOSTLES. By Dr Augustus Neander, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, &c. Translated from the Third Edition of the original German, by J. E. Ryland, Esq. 2 vols. 14s, bound in cloth.

Critical Notice from the Eclectic Review.

"It is a work expressly intended to aid the diligent, well-instructed, earnest student of Christianity and the word of God, entering into the very spirit of the Christian life and doctrine. In every respect Mr Ryland may be said to have well discharged his office; what is done is well done, and we are truly glad the translation was made by so competent a hand. The meaning has not only been accurately seized, but well expressed. The style of the translation is as good as that of such an original can well be."

Critical Notice from the American Biblical Repository.

"These volumes will doubtless be welcomed by the scholars of Great Britain and the United States. They refer to an interesting period of the world's history, and come from the pen of Neander, than whom there is probably no better, no more impartial ecclesiastical historian living; the work will unquestionably commend itself to public attention."

Critical Notice from the Methodist Magazine.

"They are every way worthy of the connection in which they are placed. As an illustration of the Acts of the Apostles, and of many passages of the Apostolical Epistles, they are very valuable, as well as a general introduction to the study of ecclesiastical history; their appearance at this time, in an English dress, is peculiarly seasonable."

Critical Notice from the Secession Magazine.

"The book is distinguished by earnest piety and research. No difficulty is passed over. It is altogether suggestive in its examinations. No one can read it without falling into many trains of thought both novel and entertaining. It is the production of a very fertile mind, so disciplined at the same time as to pursue every object of thought to its first principles. One can have no conception from the title of the book, of the mass of matter contained in it."

Life of the Early Christians.

The LIFE of the EARLY CHRISTIANS during the first Three Centuries of the Church; a Series of Sermons on Church History. By Dr Chr. J. Couard. Translated from the German by Leopold J. Bernays. Price 5s. bound in cloth.

Critical Notice from the Baptist Magazine.

"This volume will be acceptable to many readers, and especially to ministers, who may derive from it hints which will be useful in directing their thoughts to a class of subjects and illustrations not very commonly employed in their sermons. We are indebted to this volume for some excellent views which the early Christians entertained of their vocation."

Critical Notice from the Watchman.

"It is a volume which the Christian minister may read with advantage. Its principles are sound, its spirit good, and it furnishes an example of a somewhat new subject of pulpit delivery. Circumstances have latterly compelled a more than ordinary degree of attention to the human infirmity of the early church; a practical view of its Christian piety will not be an useless accomplishment."

Critical Notice from the Eclectic Review.

"Highly proper it is that Christian congregations should be better informed than they are upon the subject of ecclesiastical history; and we therefore wholly recommend the plan of Dr Couard to the attention of pastors in our own country."

Life of Justin Martyr.

JUSTIN MARTYR; his Life, Writings, and Opinions. By the Rev. Charles Semisch, of Trebnitz, Silesia. Translated by J. E. Ryland, Esq. 2 vols. 15s. cloth.

Critical Notice from the Scottish Guardian.

"The Life and Writings of Justin Martyr present a fine field for the theological critic and historian. The earnestness of the age in which he lived to the Apostles, although no guarantee for absolute and undiluted truth in the writings of this good but uninspired man, gives his works and opinions a special claim to be considered. For attaining a clear, comprehensive, and accurate acquaintance with the life and writings of this interesting Father of the Church, we know of no work at all equal to that of Mr Semisch; and to the English student we recommend the translation of Mr Ryland, by his publication of which Mr Clark has laid the theological public under a new obligation. The work is distinguished to a remarkable degree by learning, acuteness, and candour. It is calculated both to excite and to gratify a taste for such investigations as those of which it is so admirable a monument."

Critical Notice from the Baptist Magazine.

"It is a valuable contribution to our Ecclesiastical History, illustrating not the personal opinions and intellectual habits of the ancient Apologist alone, but also the prevalent modes of thinking among the Christians and Pagans in the second century. To the more learned portion of our readers, we recommend it cordially."

Critical Notice from the Methodist Magazine.

"Two more valuable volumes the publisher of this useful series has not given. This Father was one of those who strongly illustrated his period. The knowledge, therefore, of his history and writings, is of real importance to the student of Church history; and this knowledge the reader may, to a very great extent, obtain from these volumes."
SACRED GEOGRAPHY, &c.

Palestine.

A HISTORICO-GEOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT of PALESTINE, in the Time of CHRIST: or, The Bible Student's Help to a thorough Knowledge of the Scripture. By D. John F. Röhr. Translated by the Rev. David Esdaile. To which is added, RESEARCHES IN PALESTINE, by Rev. Messrs Smith and Wolcott; edited by Edward Robinson, D. D. One vol. 6s. bd. in cloth.

Critical Notice from the CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW.

"It is a work of very great interest to the Biblical Student, indeed to all who are anxious to be made acquainted with the history, the former and present condition, of the inhabitants of the Land of Promise. A vast body of materials is collected in the notes, on a great variety of subjects. The book is popular in its style, and the translator has our best thanks for supplying us with a volume on Palestine, which we can put into the hands of our children, and also into those of the upper classes in our various schools."

Critical Notice from the METHODIST MAGAZINE.

"It is generally known that the most popular work containing a description of Palestine is that of Röhr, Principal Chaplain at the Court of Weimar. It has been so well received in Germany as to pass through seven editions. It is a valuable addition to that series of which it forms a part."

Central Asia, &c.

The BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY of CENTRAL ASIA; with a General Introduction to the Study of Sacred Geography, including the Antediluvian period. By the late E. F. C. Rosenmuller, D. D. Translated by the Rev. N. Morren; with Notes by the Translator. 2 vols. 12s. bd. in cloth.

Critical Notice from the METHODIST MAGAZINE.

"We know of few books that throw more light on many passages of the sacred writings, that is more necessary for understanding several points connected with the history of ancient nations, their modes of thinking and speaking, and the countries which they originally inhabited, and the dispersions which they underwent. A great variety, also, of useful notes and illustrations have been added by the Translator."

Central Asia, &c.

The BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY of ASIA MINOR, PHOENICIA, AND ARABIA. By E. F. C. Rosenmuller, D. D. By the Rev. N. Morren. 6s. bd. in cloth. Critical Notice from the METHODIST MAGAZINE.

"An accurate and useful compendium of the subject on which it treats, and an indispensable article in the Biblical Student's Library."

Critical Notice from the CHURCH REVIEW.

"In the volume before us the same excellencies on the part of the Translator are apparent which distinguished his predecessors, — fidelity to his author without the sacrifice of his vernacular idiom, and an ever watchful care to supply to the student such additional information as may be gleaned from sources not accessible to the author, or not extant at the time he wrote. For the Biblical Geography of Asia there is no work in our language which can be placed in competition with the volumes which Mr. Morren has, as translator of Rosenmuller, produced, and we most cordially recommend them, therefore, to all who are engaged in the study of the sacred text."

Critical Notice from the Eclectic Review.

"One of the most important and interesting works of modern times is Dr. Rosenmuller's Natural History of the Bible. The learning which he has brought to bear upon his favourite study is immense; and he has done what few men so ponderously learned have done before him, has made his work both intelligible and acceptable to general readers."

From the Eclectic Review.

"The subjects here treated of are not less interesting and important than his Sacred Geography; to ourselves, we must confess, they possess even a higher charm. The care and research which Mr. Morren has displayed in translating the present work, and illustrating it with copious additional matter, deserves our highest commendation."
TO PROFESSORS & STUDENTS OF GREEK LITERATURE.

EDINBURGH, 38 GEORGE STREET, 1844.

Mr. Clark begs leave respectfully to invite the attention of Masters of Grammar Schools and others, to the following New and Cheap Editions of Herodotus, &c., which, in point of accuracy, he does not hesitate to affirm, excel all existing editions, British or Foreign.

CHEAP EDITION OF NEGRIS' HERODOTUS,

In Two Volumes, neatly Bound in Cloth,
Without Notes, 8s. With English Notes by NEGRIS, 10s.
With English Notes by C. S. WHEELER, A. M., Tutor in Greek in Harvard University, 12s.

"This New Edition of the Father of History—by a Greek—is very neatly printed, and also exceedingly correct."—Quarterly Journal of Education.

"This Edition by Mr. Negris, does credit to his taste and erudition. He has brought the spirit of the philosopher, as well as the learning of the grammarian to his task; and has done much service to the author whom he has published. The Volumes are neatly and accurately printed."

THE CLIO OF HERODOTUS, (Text separately), Is. 6d.
With English Notes by NEGRIS, 2s. With English Notes by WHEELER, 2s. 6d.

NEGRIS' PINAR.

In One Volume, foolscap 8vo, price 7s. 6d. bound in cloth,

THE WORKS OF PINAR, with various Readings, English Notes, and Emendations. By ALEXANDER NEGRIS.

"Pindar is one of those Poets who is more often boasted of than in reality enjoyed. Perhaps this may have proceeded from the peculiar difficulties besetting the readers of this poet; an obscure and corrupt text, dark and indistinct allusions, are some of these obstacles. Mr. Negris has conferred a lasting obligation on literature, by producing his present very excellent edition, in which he has combined the purest text with a number of highly useful and instructive notes. The editor is already advantageously known by his editions of Herodotus and Xenophon's Anabasis, and his present production will in nowise tend to diminish his reputation."—Literary Gazette.

"We have been much pleased with this edition. The critical labours of Mr. Negris have improved the purity of the text; and the introduction of the metrical schemes enables junior students to understand the complicated structure of Pindar's verse."—Athenaum.

NEGRIS' XENOPHON'S ANABASIS.

XENOPHON'S EXPEDITION OF CYRUS, in Seven Books; with various Readings, English Notes, and Index. By A. NEGRIS. 4s. 6d., 4s. 6d. bd. in cloth.

"The Text and various Readings may be had separately, price 3s. sewed, or 3s. 6d. bd. in cloth.

"An excellent edition, neatly printed, with a good text, and critical and useful notes."—Gent. Mag.

"Mr. Negris is already advantageously known by his edition of Herodotus, and his very curious little volume of Greek Proverbs. Of his present production, we can say that it fully maintains his reputation. He has selected the best text, and his notes are useful and instructive."—Lit. Gazette.

"A very useful little edition. The notes, which, in compliance with common sense, are English, not Latin, are well composed and compiled. Altogether, from its accuracy, neatness and portability, it is a work deserving recommendation."—Brighton Gazette.

"This is a cheap and very neat edition of this celebrated work for the use of schools, to the notice of the conductors of which we can very confidently recommend it. Besides the body of English notes, there is also a copious index."—Sheffield Independent.

In One Volume, royal 18mo, price 3s. bound in cloth,

A DICTIONARY OF MODERN GREEK PROVERBS, with an English Translation, Explanatory Remarks, and Philological Illustrations. By ALEXANDER NEGRIS, Professor of Greek Literature.

"Mr. Negris, a modern Greek, has printed a charming little book of Greek Proverbs. They are well selected, well translated, and pleasantly commented upon."—Spectator.

NEGRIS' LITERARY HISTORY OF MODERN GREECE. 6d.

"To the classical student this treatise cannot fail in interest."—Stirling Journal.
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