



LIBRARY  
Theological Seminary.

11 - 11 - 14

Rev. Jose, n Espind. 1574

A. J. J. of Christian.

317 on the





A MANUAL  
OF  
CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.



A MANUAL

OF

CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES:

OR,

AN ACCOUNT

OF

THE CONSTITUTION, MINISTERS, WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE,  
AND CUSTOMS OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH,

PARTICULARLY DURING THE THIRD, FOURTH, AND FIFTH CENTURIES;

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

AN ANALYSIS OF THE WRITINGS OF THE  
ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

---

COMPILED FROM THE WORKS OF AUGUSTI AND OTHER SOURCES.

---

BY

THE REV. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A.,

OF ST. EDMUND HALL, OXFORD;

AUTHOR OF AN ENGLISH-LATIN AND LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY,  
SERMONS, LUTHER AND HIS TIMES, &c.

---

THE SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

---

M.DCCC.XLIII.

LONDON:  
HARRISON AND CO., PRINTERS,  
ST MARTIN'S LANE.



# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	1
§ 1. Remarks on the study of ecclesiastical archæology. Design, contents, and plan of this Manual . . . . .	1
§ 2. Some account of the principal treatises on Christian Antiquities . . . . .	4
§ 3. A review of Christian Antiquities considered in con- nexion with the theology and morals of the ancient Church . . . . .	11
§ 4. A plea for Episcopacy, Charity, and Peace . . . . .	32

## BOOK I.

### LIVES AND WRITINGS OF THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

Preliminary Remarks . . . . .	55
<small>CHAPTER</small>	
I. Clement of Rome . . . . .	58
Note concerning some spurious writings:—	
1. Shepherd of Hermas . . . . .	64
2. Epistle of Barnabas . . . . .	65
II. Ignatius . . . . .	65
III. Polycarp . . . . .	68
IV. Justin Martyr . . . . .	70
V. Hermias . . . . .	74
VI. Hegesippus . . . . .	75
VII. Tatian . . . . .	76
VIII. Dionysius of Corinth . . . . .	79
IX. Athenagoras . . . . .	79
X. Theophilus of Antioch . . . . .	82
XI. Irenæus . . . . .	84
XII. Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	94
XIII. Tertullian . . . . .	109
XIV. Minucius Felix . . . . .	129
XV. Origen . . . . .	130
XVI. Cyprian . . . . .	144
XVII. Dionysius of Alexandria . . . . .	171
XVIII. Gregory of Neocæsarea . . . . .	155
XIX. Arnobius . . . . .	159
XX. Lactantius . . . . .	160
XXI. Eusebius of Cæsarea . . . . .	164
XXII. Apostolical Constitutions and Canons . . . . .	171

## BOOK II.

## OF THE CHURCH, OR GENERAL BODY OF CHRISTIANS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Accounts of Jewish and Profane Authors . . . . .	175
Epistles of Pliny and Trajan . . . . .	178
II. Sect. 1. Names assumed by Christians . . . . .	181
— 2. Names applied to Christians by way of reproach . . . . .	185
III. Divisions or classes of Christians . . . . .	188
IV. Of Catechumens . . . . .	192
V. Of the Baptized, Faithful, or Complete Members of the Church . . . . .	194
1. Their names or titles . . . . .	194
2. Their rights and privileges . . . . .	195
VI. Of Penitents . . . . .	197
VII. Of Energumens . . . . .	197
VIII. Of Ascetics . . . . .	198

## BOOK III.

## OF THE MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH.

I. Names given to the Ministers of the Church, both ordinary and extraordinary . . . . .	201
Remarks concerning Apostles . . . . .	204
— Evangelists . . . . .	205
— Prophets . . . . .	206
II. Different orders or classes of the Clergy, or ordinary Ministers of the Church . . . . .	208
Officers of the Jewish Synagogue . . . . .	209
III. Of Bishops . . . . .	210
Sect. 1. Their names and titles . . . . .	210
— 2. Their office and duties . . . . .	214
1. Celebration of divine worship . . . . .	214
2. Church government and discipline . . . . .	215
— 3. Insignia or emblems of the episcopal office . . . . .	217
— 4. Different orders or classes of bishops . . . . .	219
1. Superior bishops . . . . .	219
2. Inferior bishops . . . . .	221
More particular account of Metropolitans and Patriarchs.	
1. Of Metropolitans . . . . .	223
1. The name or title . . . . .	223
2. Origin of the office . . . . .	225
3. Metropolitans in the East and West . . . . .	225
4. Privileges and office of Metropolitans . . . . .	226
5. Election and ordination . . . . .	228

CHAPTER		PAGE
III.	Sect. 4. 2. Of Patriarchs . . . . .	228
	1. The name or title . . . . .	228
	2. Origin of the office . . . . .	229
	3. Privileges and office of Patriarchs . . . . .	231
	4. Division of the Patriarchate. Seats of Patriarchs . . . . .	232
	— 5. Difference between bishops and presbyters . . . . .	233
	1. Episcopacy supposed to be of merely human, or ecclesiastical, origin . . . . .	234
	2. Episcopacy supposed to be founded upon Divine Institution or Apostolical Tra- dition . . . . .	249
	— 6. Division of the church into Metropolitan and Patriarchal Dioceses at the latter end of the fourth century . . . . .	262
	— 7. Of Councils . . . . .	270
	Origin of church councils . . . . .	271
	Extent of early councils . . . . .	272
	Their form or constitution . . . . .	273
	Lists of General Councils . . . . .	275
IV.	Of Presbyters and Presbyteries . . . . .	277
	Sect. 1. Of the name or title . . . . .	277
	— 2. Quality and office of presbyters . . . . .	273
	— 3. Different orders or classes of presbyters . . . . .	283
V.	Of Deacons . . . . .	284
	Sect. 1. Their name and rank . . . . .	284
	— 2. Their office and duties . . . . .	283
	— 3. Of Archdeacons . . . . .	292
	History of the office . . . . .	294
VI.	Of Deaconesses and other Female Ministers . . . . .	295
	1. Testimony of Apostles and early ecclesiastical writers . . . . .	296
	2. Allusions of heathen writers . . . . .	298
	3. Prescribed or canonical age . . . . .	298
	4. Ordination of deaconesses . . . . .	299
	5. Their office and duties . . . . .	299
	6. Discontinuance of this office . . . . .	309
VII.	Of Subdeacons . . . . .	301
VIII.	Of Readers . . . . .	303
IX.	Of Acolyths . . . . .	304
X.	Of Exorcists . . . . .	305
XI.	Of Singers or Precentors . . . . .	306
XII.	Of Ostiarii or Doorkeepers (Porters) . . . . .	308
XIII.	Of Inferior Servants of the church and clergy . . . . .	309
XIV.	Of Ordination . . . . .	311
	Sect. 1. Origin and nature of the rite . . . . .	311
	— 2. Disqualifications and qualifications for ordination . . . . .	313
	— 3. Administration of the rite . . . . .	320
	— 4. Forms of prayer used at ordinations . . . . .	323

CHAPTER	PAGE
XV. Modes of Appointment to Ecclesiastical Offices . . . . .	327
Sect. 1. Election by the votes of a whole church . . . . .	327
— 2. Election by visitors, &c. . . . .	331
— 3. Extraordinary modes of appointment . . . . .	335
— 4. Patronage . . . . .	335
XVI. Rank, Rights, and Privileges of the Clergy.—Punishment of Delinquents . . . . .	337
Sect. 1. Rank, rights, and privileges of the clergy . . . . .	337
— 2. Punishment of delinquents . . . . .	342
1. Suspension . . . . .	342
2. Degradation . . . . .	343
3. Privatio Communionis, or Deprivation . . . . .	343
4. Corporal Punishment . . . . .	344
5. Excommunication . . . . .	345
XVII. Revenues of the Church . . . . .	345
XVIII. Habit and Vestments of the Clergy . . . . .	351
XIX. Remarks of Chrysostom, Jerome, and Gregory Nazi- anzen, relating to the character and duties of Christian Ministers . . . . .	354

## BOOK IV.

### OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

I. Of Public Prayer, Psalmody, and Instruction . . . . .	372
Sect. 1. Use of the Lord's Prayer . . . . .	372
— 2. Of different kinds of Public Prayer and Liturgical Formularies . . . . .	378
1. Amen . . . . .	379
2. Hallelujah . . . . .	379
3. Hosannah . . . . .	379
4. Kyrie eleison . . . . .	380
5. Gloria in excelsis . . . . .	381
6. Pax vobiscum! . . . . .	382
7. Oremus! . . . . .	382
8. Sursum Corda! . . . . .	383
— 3. Of Psalmody . . . . .	384
— 4. Rites and Ceremonies connected with Public Prayer and Psalmody . . . . .	391
1. Standing . . . . .	391
2. Kneeling . . . . .	393
3. Bowing . . . . .	393
4. Prostration . . . . .	393
5. Stretching out the arms . . . . .	393
6. Folding of the hands . . . . .	394
7. Heads uncovered or covered . . . . .	394
8. Turning towards the East . . . . .	394
9. Times and hours of Prayer . . . . .	395

CHAPTER	PAGE
I, Sect. 5. Ancient forms of Common Prayer . . . . .	396
1. Prayer for the Catechumens . . . . .	397
2. ——— Energumens . . . . .	399
3. ——— Competentes or Candidates for Baptism . . . . .	400
4. ——— Penitents . . . . .	401
5. ——— Faithful . . . . .	403
6. ——— Lord's Day . . . . .	403
7. Prayers for Morning and Evening . . . . .	409
— 6. History of Ancient Liturgies . . . . .	413
1. Oriental Liturgy . . . . .	413
1. Liturgy of Antioch . . . . .	414
2. ——— Basil, or Caesarea . . . . .	414
3. ——— Chrysostom, or Constantinople . . . . .	415
2. Alexandrian Liturgy . . . . .	416
3. Roman Liturgy . . . . .	416
Milanese Liturgy . . . . .	417
African Liturgy . . . . .	417
4. Gallican Liturgy . . . . .	417
Mozarabic or Spanish Liturgy . . . . .	418
Liturgy of Ephesus . . . . .	418
British Liturgy . . . . .	418
Synopsis of the contents of ancient Liturgies . . . . .	419
— 7. Of Prayers for the Dead . . . . .	421
General statements on this subject . . . . .	421
Testimony of Tertullian . . . . .	424
— Origen . . . . .	425
— Cyprian . . . . .	425
— Arnobius . . . . .	425
— Cyril of Jerusalem . . . . .	426
— Gregory of Nazianzen . . . . .	426
— Ambrose . . . . .	426
— Epiphanius . . . . .	427
— Chrysostom . . . . .	428
— Jerome . . . . .	429
— Augustin . . . . .	429
Form of prayer in the Apostolical Constitutions . . . . .	431
General conclusions concerning this practice in the ancient church . . . . .	433
Connexion of prayer for the dead with the doctrine of purgatory . . . . .	434
— 8. Of the public use of Holy Scripture . . . . .	437
— 9. Of Preaching . . . . .	447
Testimonies concerning preaching in the early church . . . . .	449
The preachers . . . . .	451
Frequency of preaching . . . . .	453
Length of discourses . . . . .	453
Place of delivery . . . . .	453

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Sect. 9. Posture and conduct of hearers . . . . .	454
Notation and publication of Sermons . . . . .	456
Extempore preaching . . . . .	458
Prayer before Sermons . . . . .	458
Subject-matter of Sermons . . . . .	459
— 10. Of Catechetical Instruction . . . . .	460
Disciplina Arcani . . . . .	462
— 11. Ancient Creeds . . . . .	463
Creed of Irenæus . . . . .	466
— Tertullian . . . . .	467
— Origen . . . . .	469
— Cyprian . . . . .	470
— Gregory of Neocæsarea . . . . .	471
— Lucian the Martyr . . . . .	472
— The Apostolical Constitutions . . . . .	473
— Jerusalem . . . . .	474
— Cesarea in Palestine . . . . .	475
— Arius, presented to Constantine . . . . .	476
— Antioch . . . . .	476
— Rome . . . . .	477
— Aquileia . . . . .	477
— Nicaea, as first published . . . . .	478
— — as completed . . . . .	478
Question concerning the author of the Athanasian Creed . . . . .	480
II. Of Baptism and Confirmation . . . . .	483
Sect. 1. Various names and appellations of Baptism . . . . .	483
— 2. Persons baptized . . . . .	486
Classes of persons excluded from Baptism . . . . .	490
— 3. Ministers of Baptism . . . . .	492
— 4. Times of Baptism . . . . .	496
— 5. Place of Baptism . . . . .	499
— 6. Mode and form of Baptism . . . . .	502
1. Immersion, or Dipping . . . . .	502
Trine Immersion . . . . .	502
Single Immersion . . . . .	503
2. Aspersions, or Sprinkling . . . . .	504
3. Form of words used at Baptism . . . . .	505
— 7. Observances and Ceremonies connected with Baptism . . . . .	509
1. Catechetical Instruction . . . . .	509
2. Exorcism . . . . .	510
3. Vow or promise of obedience, and profession of faith . . . . .	514
4. Signing with the sign of the Cross . . . . .	517
5. Unction . . . . .	518
6. Use of salt, milk, and honey . . . . .	519
7. Ceremonies after Baptism . . . . .	521

CHAPTER	PAGE
II. Sect. 8. Of Sponsors . . . . .	522
1. Their names or appellations . . . . .	522
2. Origin of the office . . . . .	524
3. Duties of Sponsors . . . . .	525
4. Persons qualified to act as Sponsors . . . . .	527
5. Number of Sponsors . . . . .	528
— 9. Of names given at Baptism . . . . .	529
— 10. Of Confirmation . . . . .	531
1. Derivation of the rite from the practice of the Apostles . . . . .	531
2. Confirmation in connexion with baptism . . . . .	534
3. Ministers of confirmation . . . . .	538
4. Administration of the rite . . . . .	539
1. Imposition of hands . . . . .	540
2. Uction, or anointing with the chrism . . . . .	540
3. Sign of the Cross . . . . .	541
4. Prayer and benediction . . . . .	541
III. Of the Lord's Supper . . . . .	542
Sect. 1. Names or appellations of this Sacrament . . . . .	542
— 2. Celebration of the Lord's Supper in successive periods of the Church . . . . .	552
1. Accounts given in the New Testament . . . . .	552
2. Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers . . . . .	556
3. ——— Justin Martyr . . . . .	559
4. ——— Irenæus . . . . .	562
5. ——— Clement of Alexandria and Origen . . . . .	563
6. ——— Tertullian and Cyprian . . . . .	564
7. ——— The Apostolical Constitutions . . . . .	566
— 3. Times of Celebration . . . . .	568
1. The time of day . . . . .	568
2. Days and seasons . . . . .	570
— 4. Place of Celebration . . . . .	574
— 5. Ministers of the Lord's Supper . . . . .	575
— 6. Of the Communicants . . . . .	577
1. Persons admitted to the Holy Communion . . . . .	577
2. Preparation of the Communicants . . . . .	580
3. Acts and conduct of the Communicants . . . . .	586
— 7. Of the Elements . . . . .	587
1. Of the Bread . . . . .	587
1. Quality of the Bread . . . . .	587
2. Form of the Bread . . . . .	589
2. Of the Wine . . . . .	590
1. Colour of the Wine . . . . .	590
2. Mixture of Water with the Wine . . . . .	590
— 8. Observances and Ceremonies connected with the Administration of the Lord's Supper . . . . .	592
1. Consecration of the Elements . . . . .	592
2. Distribution of the Elements . . . . .	593
1. Communion in both kinds . . . . .	593

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. Sect. 3.	
2. Order of distribution . . . . .	594
3. Form of distribution . . . . .	595
4. Method of distribution . . . . .	596
3. Sign of the Cross . . . . .	599
4. Use of Incense . . . . .	599
5. Agapæ, or Feasts of Charity . . . . .	600
6. Kiss of Charity or Peace . . . . .	601
— 9. Liturgy or Formularies used at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper . . . . .	602
IV. Of Penance, Confession, and Absolution . . . . .	616
Sect. 1. Public Penance . . . . .	616
1. The origin and antiquity of Penance . . . . .	618
2. — objects of Penance, or the offences with which it was concerned . . . . .	623
3. Different classes of Penitents . . . . .	628
4. The duties and burdens imposed upon Peni- tents; or the different kinds and degrees of Penance . . . . .	631
5. Re-admission of Penitents into the church . . . . .	633
— 2. Private Penance . . . . .	636
— 3. Absolution . . . . .	641

## BOOK V.

### OF SACRED SEASONS.

I. Of Festivals . . . . .	645
Sect. 1. Origin of Christian Festivals . . . . .	645
— 2. Celebration of Festivals in the ancient church . . . . .	647
— 3. Multiplication of Festivals . . . . .	648
— 4. Observance of the Lord's day, and the Sabbath . . . . .	649
1. The Lord's day . . . . .	649
2. The Sabbath, or Saturday . . . . .	652
— 5. Of Annual Festivals . . . . .	654
1. Cycle of the Feast of the Nativity, or Christmas . . . . .	656
2. ———— Easter . . . . .	656
3. ———— Whitsuntide . . . . .	657
II. Of Fasts . . . . .	657
Sect. 1. Practice of the early church . . . . .	657
— 2. ———— later times . . . . .	659
III. A more particular Account of the Date, Names, and History of Ancient Festivals and Holy days throughout the year . . . . .	663
1. Moveable Feasts and Holy days, Sundays, and other days and seasons in connexion with them . . . . .	663
2. Immoveable Feasts and Holy days . . . . .	663
<i>Moveable.</i>	
Advent . . . . .	665
Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima Sundays . . . . .	665



CHAPTER		PAGE
III.	Ash-Wednesday . . . . .	666
	Quadragesima and the four following Sundays . . . . .	668
	Palm Sunday . . . . .	668
	Maunday Thursday . . . . .	669
	Good Friday . . . . .	671
	Easter Eve (Sabbatum Magnum) . . . . .	672
	Easter Day . . . . .	674
	Sundays after Easter . . . . .	677
	Ascension Day . . . . .	678
	Whitsunday . . . . .	679
	Trinity Sunday . . . . .	682
	<i>Innocentia.</i>	
	The Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . . .	683
	The Epiphany . . . . .	685
	The Conversion of St. Paul . . . . .	687
	The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, or the Purification of St. Mary the Virgin . . . . .	688
	St. Matthias's Day . . . . .	689
	The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary . . . . .	689
	St. Mark's Day . . . . .	691
	St. Philip and St. James' Day . . . . .	692
	St. Barnabas the Apostle . . . . .	692
	St. John Baptist's Day . . . . .	693
	St. Peter and St. Paul's Day . . . . .	693
	St. James the Apostle . . . . .	694
	St. Partholomew the Apostle . . . . .	694
	St. Matthew the Apostle . . . . .	695
	St. Michael and all Angels . . . . .	695
	St. Luke the Evangelist . . . . .	695
	St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles . . . . .	696
	All Saints' Day . . . . .	696
	St. Andrew's Day . . . . .	696
	St. Thomas the Apostle . . . . .	697
	The Nativity of our Lord, or Christmas Day . . . . .	697
	St. Stephen's Day . . . . .	700
	St. John the Evangelist's Day . . . . .	700
	The Innocents' Day . . . . .	700
	Other Festivals of inferior note . . . . .	701

## BOOK VI.

## OF SACRED PLACES.

I.	Names or appellations of Churches . . . . .	702
II.	History of Churches . . . . .	707
	Sect. 1. To the time of Constantine the Great . . . . .	707
	— 2. From Constantine to Justinian . . . . .	709

CHAPTER	PAGE
II. Sect. 3. From Justinian to the tenth century . . . . .	711
— 4. During the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries . . . . .	712
III. Forms of Churches . . . . .	714
IV. Site and position of Churches . . . . .	716
1. Site . . . . .	716
2. Aspect . . . . .	717
V. Structure and parts of Churches . . . . .	718
Sect. 1. The Bema, or Sanctuary (chancel, or choir) . . . . .	719
— 2. The Nave . . . . .	721
— 3. The Narthex, or Ante-Temple . . . . .	723
— 4. Outer buildings . . . . .	725
— 5. Towers, Bells, and Organs . . . . .	729
Towers . . . . .	729
Bells . . . . .	729
Organs . . . . .	734
— 6. Church-doors, Pavements, and Windows, . . . . .	736
Doors . . . . .	736
Pavements . . . . .	737
Windows . . . . .	737
VI. Respect shown to Churches; their immunities and privileges	738
VII. Ornaments of Churches . . . . .	741

## BOOK VII.

### OF OCCASIONAL OFFICES AND SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHURCH.

I. Of Marriage . . . . .	743
Sect. 1. History of Laws and Customs relating to Marriage in the Christian Church . . . . .	743
— 2. Marriage Rites and Ceremonies . . . . .	748
II. The Anointing of the Sick . . . . .	752
III. Funeral Rites and Ceremonies . . . . .	753
IV. A more particular account of the Agapæ, or Feasts of Charity	764
Sect. 1. Origin of the Name, and of the Custom . . . . .	764
— 2. Mode of celebration . . . . .	765
— 3. Time and place of celebration . . . . .	766
1. Time of day . . . . .	766
2. Day of the week . . . . .	766
3. Place of meeting . . . . .	766
— 4. Abolition of the custom . . . . .	767
V. Of Stations, Processions, and Pilgrimages . . . . .	768
Sect. 1. Of Stations . . . . .	769
— 2. Of Processions . . . . .	771
— 3. Of Pilgrimages . . . . .	774

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. Of Monachism and Monasteries . . . . .	775
Sect. 1. Of Monachism . . . . .	775
1. Origin of Monachism . . . . .	775
2. Names and different classes of Monks . . . . .	777
— 2. Of Monasteries . . . . .	781

## CHRONOLOGICAL AND ALPHABETICAL TABLES.

Chronological Table of Ecclesiastical Writers to Gregory the First . . . . .	784
Alphabetical List of Ecclesiastical Writers enumerated in the foregoing Table . . . . .	787
Chronological List of the principal Councils mentioned in this Work . . . . .	788
Alphabetical List of the same Councils, with Latin Titles . . . . .	789

## APPENDIX.

A. Public Prayer in the Primitive Church (King) . . . . .	791
B. On turning towards the East in Prayer (Bingham) . . . . .	795
C. Gregorii M. Liber Sacramentorum: qualiter missa Romana celebratur . . . . .	798
D. Daily Temple-Service and Synagogue-Worship of the Jews at the beginning of the Christian Era (Lightfoot and Prideaux; Bingham) . . . . .	801
E. Ornaments of Churches (Ambrose and Jerome) . . . . .	811
F. Use of Pictures, &c., in Churches (Gregory the Great) . . . . .	812
G. Ascetics and Monks (Mosheim) . . . . .	814
H. The Literature of Christian Antiquities; or, a classified Catalogue of the principal works relating to the several subjects of Ecclesiastical Archæology (Augusti and Siegel) . . . . .	816

INDEX . . . . .	819
-----------------	-----

---



# P R E F A C E.

---

§ 1. *Remarks on the study of Ecclesiastical Archaeology.  
Design, contents, and plan of this Manual.*

AN acquaintance with the institutions, rites, and ceremonies of the early church is, on many accounts, interesting and important. Accordingly, great pains have been bestowed upon this department of literature during the last two centuries, by divines of various communions; and by none with greater success than by a member of our own Church. But the works of these learned men have been written, in general, for the use of others almost as learned as themselves; or, at least, they have been composed in such a style, or in so copious a form, that the information they contain is accessible only to the few. At the same time, there are many educated persons, including especially the younger students of divinity, who desire to possess a certain amount of knowledge relating to the early practices and institutions of the Christian Church; and to whom a compendious account of such matters, with due reference to authorities, would be at once acceptable and useful. But no such manual has been placed within their reach. While our biblical and classical students have possessed admirable summaries of Jewish, Greek, and Roman antiquities, in their own language, no similar compilation has been at hand to assist those persons who may wish to form an acquaintance with the Church, as it existed and appeared during the early centuries. It is, then, in the absence of any better work of the kind, that I have undertaken to construct the volume now before the reader. And in this preface I intend to offer some explanation of the contents and plan of the work;—to give a general view of the history of this branch of literature, by an enumeration of the principal works on ecclesiastical archæology, which have hitherto

appeared;—and to notice a few points which seem, at present, to deserve peculiar attention, in connexion with the study of church antiquity.

It would be easy to introduce this volume to the reader by recounting the various uses of the studies in which it proposes to assist him, and by displaying the benefits which such studies, if properly pursued, may produce to the great cause of true Christian religion. Much might be said, also, in favour of attempts to make progress in such investigations, as a duty incumbent upon not a few members of our church. But all that could be said on these heads shall be included in one remark, namely, that these are Christian Antiquities, and that we are Christians. Nor do I offer any further amplification of this sentiment than that which may be found in the following words of a writer of the last century:—“*Productis in medium Hebraicarum, Græcarum, Romanarum Antiquitatum monumentis, ea demum, ut ingenue fatear, mentem cogitatio subit;—cuinam hominum generi, et ad quid, hæc omnia scribantur? Hebræorum respublica cum veteri lege tumulo pridem illata est; Græcia sub mausoleis et pyramidibus suis sepulta jacet; Romana gloria atque potentia inter triumphos suos consentit; . . . . Modo Hebræi non sumus, neque Græci, neque Romani. . . . ; neque amplius harum gentium moribus vivimus. Quid ergo nos juvat, illarum antiqua tempora, mores, et monumenta tanto studio a ruderibus suis ac tenebris in lucem protrahere, dum interea obliiti vivimus eorum, quæ domestica nobis sunt, et esse deberent? Dixi, non sumus Hebræi, non Græci, non Romani . . . . attamen Christianos nos omnes esse profitemur in hodiernam usque diem. Horum itaque quorum nomine, disciplina, et religione insigniti etiamnum vivimus, horum, inquam, antiquitates cognoscere præ omnibus cæteris, rem summi momenti, summæ utilitatis, ac gloriæ futuram esse judicavi.*” (*Mannhart.*)

The following work has been designed as a compendious history of the subjects usually denominated Christian Antiquities; that is to say, an account of the institutions, offices, rites, ceremonies, and other observances of the early church, and

especially of the church as it existed from the second century to the fifth. It has been my object to compress into one volume such records and notices of these interesting subjects as may be useful to the student in divinity, and at the same time acceptable to any other persons who may wish to inform themselves concerning the manners and customs of our fore-runners in the Church of Christ. This twofold adaptation of the work has been kept in view, both in the choice of materials and in the manner of making quotations and references; and I trust that while the ecclesiastical student will here find sufficient appeals to authorities and sources, other readers will not find obstruction or difficulty in the appearance of anything scholastic or recondite. I have made it a rule not to quote in the text any Latin or Greek words or sentences without immediately subjoining a translation or its equivalent. All the longer quotations from ancient writers, and any others which appeared less simple or less interesting than usual, have been thrown into notes at the foot of the page, or transferred to the Appendix; and those continual references which were necessary to the completion of the design are inserted in the text within parentheses, and in a distinct type, in order that they may be easily passed over by the eye of any reader willing to dispense with them.

I have made use of the works of several continental scholars, who have lately laboured with great industry and success in this department of literature, as well as of the voluminous and learned work of Bingham. The book now in the hands of the reader has, in fact, been almost entirely constructed upon the basis of the archæological compendiums of Augusti and Siegel, which will be mentioned more particularly hereafter, together with Schröck's Church History. My part in the undertaking may be described, in few words, as consisting chiefly in the selection, arrangement, translation, and abridgment of materials under my hand, together with care in verifying and correcting references and quotations as far as appeared needful, and the occasional addition of matter from the stores of our own theological literature.

A distinction of dates has been observed throughout the work, as far as possible. Such general expressions, however, as “the ancient church,” “early Christians,” &c., have been unavoidably used, chiefly with reference to some of the first four or five centuries. But statements of date, when not formally made, are often implied in the references made to authors or councils; a rule having been generally observed of quoting, among others, the earliest authorities which may have been alleged in support or explanation of facts under consideration. And in order to make this kind of information available to all readers, I have appended some alphabetical and chronological tables of early ecclesiastical authors and councils. Dates of other writers or councils are connected with the mention of them in the course of the work.

The foregoing remarks concerning the design and construction of the present volume, are, I trust, sufficient.

§ 2. *Some Account of the principal Treatises on Christian Antiquities.*

WE now enter upon an inquiry concerning this class of books in general, or an examination of the dates, titles, and authors of the principal works on ecclesiastical archæology hitherto published.

All matters relating to the constitution, ceremonies, and discipline of the early church were for a long time included in general church history, without being made the subjects of separate treatises or distinct inquiry. A large fund of materials of this nature was collected, in the first instance, by the Magdeburg Centuriators, who devoted two portions or chapters of their voluminous history, in each century, to a description of the rites and ceremonies, the constitution and government, of the church (6, *De Ritibus et Ceremoniis*. 7, *De Politia et Gubernatione Ecclesie*). The Magdeburg Centuries gave rise to another laborious compilation, the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius, written with a view to support the doctrines and pretensions of the Church of Rome, in opposition to the



Centuriators and their party. This work included a large amount of archæological investigation. So great, indeed, was the admixture of this kind of matter, that Schulting, one of the epitomists of Baronius, expressly described his book as "containing a Thesaurus of Sacred Antiquities." For a considerable time, the Centuries and Annals, with continuations and abridgments, were the only great repositories of learning on the combined subjects of the history and antiquities of the Christian church. Nor did succeeding historians omit to treat of the ceremonies and institutions of the church as an integral portion of their subject. This branch of inquiry holds an important place in the voluminous and learned works of Natalis Alexander, Fleury, Tillemont, Saccarelli, Stollberg, and other Roman Catholic writers, and of Basnage, Venema, Arnold, Mosheim, Walch, Schröck, among Protestants, as well as of Schmidt, Gieseler, and Neander, in later times.

As early as the seventeenth century, some scholars began to consider it more correct and useful to treat the subject of ecclesiastical ceremonies and institutions as a distinct branch of study, not only independent of polemics, but apart from the general materials of church history. An example, to this effect, had been set by the introduction of a custom of describing the antiquities of Greece and Rome in separate treatises, using that title in a sense which had been assigned to it by Terentius Varro, Aulus Gellius, and other Latin writers. More especially, the work of Jo. Rosinus, entitled *Antiquitates Romanæ*, first published in the year 1583, appears to have conveyed a hint, or to have set a pattern to divines. Balthasar Bebelius, a theologian of Strasburg, was probably the first who applied the new system to ecclesiastical subjects. In the year 1669, he published a work entitled *Antiquitates Ecclesiæ in tribus post Chr. nat. sæculis*, which was followed in 1679, by *Antiquitates Eccl. in quarto post Chr. nat. sæculo*. But this work, although it contained some sections, "De ministris Ecclesiæ, De moribus Christianorum," and the like, was less historical, and of a more polemic and dogmatical character, than its title would lead us to expect. About the same time appeared a sketch of Christian

Antiquities, in alphabetical order, by Joshua Arnd, under the title of *Lexicon Antiquitatum Ecclesiasticarum*; Gryphiswaldiæ, 1669. After this, several works were constructed upon the same system. The learned brothers, D. and C. Maeri, compiled a *Hierolexicon s. Sacrum Dictionarum*: Rom. 1677. In Germany the following works were published:—J. A. SCHMIDT, *Lexicon Ecclesiasticum minus*: Helmst., 1712. 8.—A. RECHENBERG, *Hierolexicon Reale*: Lips., 1714. 4.—A. E. MIRUS, *Lexicon Antiquitat. Eccl.*: 1717. 8.—And to these have been added in later times, C. W. ROCH's *Deutsches Kirchen-Wörterbuch*: Halle, 1784, — and F. GRUNDMAYR's *Lexicon der Romish Katholischen Kirchengebräuche*: Augsburg, 1816. 8.

Other writers, abandoning the alphabetical or lexicographical plan, attempted to throw the subjects of Christian antiquities into a more systematic form. The following are their names, and the titles of their works: J. A. QUENSTEDT, *Antiquitates Biblicæ et Ecclesiasticæ*: Viteb., 1688, 1699. 4.—JO. NICOLAI, *Antiquitates Eccl.*: Tubing., 1705. 12.—J. G. WALCH, *Compendium Antiquitatum Eccl. ex scriptoribus apologeticis eorumque commentatoribus compositum*. Accedunt C. S. Schurtzfließchii *Controversiæ et Quæstiones Antiq. Eccl.*: Lips., 1733. 8.—S. J. BAUMGARTEN, *Prime Lineæ Breviarii Antiquit. Chr.*; *Scholia multa addidit J. S. Semler*: Halle, 1766. 8.—S. J. BAUMGARTEN, *Erläuterung der Christlichen Alterthümer*; *herausg. von J. Chr. Bertram*: Halle, 1768. 8.—J. SIMONIS, *Vorlesungen über die Chr. Alterth. nach Baumgarten*; *herausg. von S. Mursinna*: Halle, 1769. 8.—J. L. VÖGEL's *Altherthümer der ersten und ältesten Christen*: Hamb., 1780. 8.—HAUG's *Altherthümer der Christen*: 1785. 8.—J. C. VOLBORTH, *Prime Lineæ Antiquitatis Chr., in usum tironum*: Goetting., 1789. 8.—The treatises here enumerated were, however, of but limited extent; nor did they contain more than a general and imperfect survey of the large field of inquiry upon which their authors proposed to enter.

Roman Catholic writers, at first, avoiding both the general subject and the comprehensive title of "Antiquities," contented themselves with recording and expounding the ancient ritual.

Several elaborate works on this subject appeared in the course of the seventeenth century. Such were the following: J. BAPT. CASALIUS, *De Sacris Christianorum Ritibus, sive apud Occidentales sive Orientales Catholica in Ecclesia probatis*: Rom., 1647.—J. STEPH. DURANTUS, *De Ritibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*: Par., 1632. 8.—Cardinal J. BONA, *Rerum Liturgicarum, Libri ii.*: ed. Colon., 1674. 8.—GABR. ALBASPINEUS (AUBESPINE), *De Veteris Ecclesiæ Ritibus*: edit. Meyer. Helmst., 1672. 4.—All these writers were surpassed by the learned Edm. Martène, in his treatise entitled *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*: ed. 2, Antverp. 1736—1738. f.—At a later period, books of “Antiquities” were compiled by divines of the Romish communion. A work on an extensive scale, entitled *Originum et Antiquitatum Christianarum*, Libri xx., was begun by Th. Mar. Mamachi, but never completed. (Romæ, 1749-55, vol. i.—v. 4.) This attempt was followed, from time to time, by the publication of J. L. SELVAGHI *Antiquitatum Chr. Institut.*: vol. i.—vi., Neapol., 1772-74; (ed. Mogunt., 1787, vol. iii. 4, with a better arrangement).—F. XAV. MANNHART, *Liber Singularis De Antiquitatibus Christianorum*: Aug. Vindel., 1767. 8.—A. AUREL. PELLICCIA, *De Christianæ Ecclesiæ primæ, mediæ, et novissimæ ætatis Politia, Lib. VI., duobus tomis comprehensi*: Neapol., 1777. 8; (of this work a new edition has lately been published by J. J. Ritter, Colon.)—A. J. BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ.-catholischen Kirche aus dem ersten, mittlern und letzten Zeiten*: Mainz., 1825—1832, 8, (constructed upon the basis of Pelliccia’s book, but more prolix in its style, and less distinguished by candour and impartiality.)—J. N. LOCHERER, *Lehrbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*: Frankf., 1832. 8.

In our own country, comparatively little was effected in this branch of literature during the seventeenth century. The learned William Cave published his *Primitive Christianity, or the Religion of the Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel*; but, as it was the chief design of that author to draw a picture of the institutions and customs of the early Christians on the favourable side, his work is defective in an historical point of view. “The most methodical account of things of

this kind that I have yet seen," says Bingham, "is that of our learned countryman, Dr. Cave, in his excellent book of *Primitive Christianity*; wherein he has given a succinet, but clear, account of many ancient customs and practices, not ordinarily to be met with elsewhere. But his design being chiefly to recommend the moral part of primitive Christianity to the observation and practice of men, he was not obliged to be very particular in explaining many other things, which, though useful in themselves, yet might be looked upon as foreign to his design; and for that reason, I presume, he industriously omitted them." Besides this, the learned author appears to have composed his work under the mistaken impression that, "the life and spirit of Christianity" did not "visibly decline apace," until after the first three or four centuries.—Sir Peter (afterwards Lord Chancellor) King published *An Inquiry into the constitution, discipline, unity, and worship of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ*, in which he appears to have made a free use of Cave's labours, as far as suited his purpose. This work was distinguished as advocating peculiar principles concerning the government and constitution of the church, in opposition to the sentiments and practices of our own episcopal communion. It was answered by a presbyter of the Church of England (Sclater), in a treatise entitled *An Original Draught of the Primitive Church*, in which some historical errors are corrected, and some high church views of polity strenuously maintained. It has been said that Lord King was convinced by the arguments of this Answer: but I do not know upon what authority the assertion rests.

The great work, however, in this department of literature, adapted at once to supply former deficiencies, and to assist the future pursuit of archæological inquiries, was that which proceeded from the pen of a learned member of our church, whose name has been already mentioned,—Joseph Bingham. This well-known repository of materials relating to ecclesiastical ceremonies, institutions, and observances,—*Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or The Antiquities of the Christian Church*,—was first

published between the years 1708 and 1722, and since that time has gone through several editions. Many of the works already enumerated as having been subsequently published on the continent were largely indebted to this valuable compilation. Soon after its appearance it was translated into Latin by Grischovius\*. It was also abridged, much to the learned author's dissatisfaction, by Antony Blackmore, who published his compendium under the title of *Ecclesie Primitivæ Notitia, or A Summary of Christian Antiquities*. Lond. 1722. S. This Summary was translated into German by F. E. Rambach†. An abridgment of Bingham's book, but without due acknowledgment, was published at Venice, in the year 1766‡; and another compendium of Antiquities, avowedly extracted from this work by an anonymous Roman Catholic writer, was published at Augsburg, towards the close of the century§.

This work is the produce of much original research, and indefatigable industry. It contains a large mass of information, including numerous statements of facts, quotations from fathers and councils, and references to authorities. Its arrangement of subjects is tolerably clear; but it presents a confusion of dates, or frequent intermingling of matters relating to different periods of history, which has formed a subject of complaint. High church principles are professed and maintained to a considerable extent; but the more modern corruptions of Romanism are often detected and exposed. Many persons, who believe that Christian catholicism is more catholic than the author's, are inclined to charge him with undue partiality on the side of the hierarchy and old ecclesiastical institutions; while others, of course, are ready to unite in the judgment of a Roman Catholic critic, who speaks of this work in the following terms:

\* JOSEPHI BINGHAMI *Angli Originæ s. Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ*. Ex Lingua Anglicana in Latinam vertit J. H. Grischovius; accedit Præfatio J. Fr. Buddei: Hale, 1724—1729, x. vol., 4. (Ejusd. *Dissertat. Eccles. interpretate Grischovio*: 1738. 4.) Edit. nova. 1751. xi. vol., 4.

† ANT. BLACKMORE'S *Chr. Alterthümer*; aus dem Engl. übersetzt, Th. I. II., Breslau, 1768-69. 8.

‡ LUCII PALEOTIMI *Antiquitatum s. Originum Ecclesiasticarum Summa*.

§ JOS. BINGHAM'S *Alterthümer der Kirche*: ein auszug aus der Engl. ausgabe: Augsburg, 1788—1796. 8.

“Ce livre est plein de recherches et d’érudition, mais il renferme des préjugés et de mauvaises critiques contre les dogmes, la liturgie, et la discipline de l’Eglise catholique.” Charges like this, and the recriminations which they produce, will never be banished from the church, until Christians in general rightly understand, and practically adopt, a maxim which has been often repeated, but seldom cordially embraced,—“In things essential, *unity*; in things not essential, *liberty*; in all things, *charity*!”

In recounting the names of more modern scholars who have bestowed any considerable labour upon the study and arrangement of Christian Antiquities, we must, perhaps, give the first place to one from whose volumes the present Manual has been chiefly compiled,—Johann Christian Wilhelm Augusti. His principal work, comprised in twelve octavo volumes, was published at Leipsic, between the years 1817 and 1831, under the general title of *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie; mit beständiger Rücksicht auf die gegenwärtigen Bedürfnisse der Christlichen Kirche*; and this has been followed by a very useful abridgment, contained in three thick octavo volumes, entitled *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*. I have endeavoured to compress into the present Manual the substance of the most important and valuable information contained in these works of Augusti, so far as relates to the customs and phraseology of the earlier ages; omitting, however, the mention of institutions and terms of more modern origin, and thus reserving room for the introduction of other materials connected with the early history of the church, and for occasionally enlarging upon subjects which Augusti has treated less copiously than their importance, at present, demands.

Other continental scholars have laboured in this department of literature during the present century. To the work of Augusti the following must be added as particularly worthy of notice:—K. SCHÖNE’S *Geschichtsforschungen über die Kirchlichen Gebräuche und Einrichtungen der Christen, ihre Ausbildung und Veränderungen*, Th. I.—III.: Berlin, 1821—22. 8;—F. H.

RHEINWALD'S *Kirchliche Archäologie*: Berlin, 1830. 8;—C. F. SIEGEL'S *Handbuch der Christlich-kirchlichen Alterthümer in alphabetischer Ordnung, mit steter Beziehung auf das, was davon noch jetzt in Christlichen cultus übrig geblieben ist*; Leipzig, 1835—38, 4 Bde. 8. To the last-mentioned of these works I acknowledge considerable obligation. It occupies four closely printed octavo volumes, but is by no means prolix or redundant in its style. The author has made great use of the labours of his learned predecessors; and has, indeed, frequently incorporated into his work their statements and expressions, sometimes with, and sometimes without, abridgment. The book contains a large fund of information concerning the rites, ceremonies, and constitution of the church, both ancient and modern; and much matter highly interesting to the ecclesiastical student is to be found in its pages: but I regret to add that there are few Christians in our own country whose minds would feel satisfied with the tone and manner of its statements in connexion with many important passages of sacred history.

I have elsewhere taken opportunities of indicating the use which I have made of the copious church history of the learned, laborious, and candid Schröck.—I ought also to mention that I am under some obligation to the new edition of Pelliccia's concise and valuable work, *De Christianæ Ecclesiæ Politia*.

A more particular account of the literature of Christian Antiquities, in a list of works which have been written on the several branches of the subject, will be found in the APPENDIX, II.

3. *A review of Christian Antiquities considered in connexion with the state of Theology and Morals in the ancient Church.*

IN a work on Christian Antiquities the reader must not expect to find a systematic examination or exposition of the doctrines of the early church, or of the state of religion and

morals among its members. But the contents of such a treatise are intimately connected with these important subjects, and throw considerable light upon their history. And a little attention to the facts stated, the institutions described, and the formularies cited, in the following pages, may enable us to draw some tolerably accurate conclusions relating to the faith and religion of the ancient church, especially as it existed during the fourth and fifth centuries. A few cursory remarks in this place may serve to point out, in some measure, the use to which an acquaintance with Christian Antiquities may be applied with reference to such inquiries.

The creeds which were received in ancient churches satisfactorily show that the great facts on which Christianity rests, and which involve its leading doctrines, were recognised, and, to a certain extent, rightly apprehended. But the anathemas which we occasionally find appended to such confessions of faith indicate the existence of a bad ecclesiastical spirit, which must have produced evil consequences, and may lead us reasonably to conclude that refinements of doctrine, bitter controversies, and positive error, had prevailed to no inconsiderable extent.

The forms of prayer, which have been preserved, exhibit a good acquaintance with many of the principles and practical truths of religion; although they are not without some admixture of superstition and error. A system of divinity, of no mean value, might be constructed from them.

The known opinions and speculations of many individual writers belonging to the early church prove that great mischief had been wrought within its borders by an undue deference to heathen philosophy, a perverse use of reason, and the indulgence of imagination. This remark is made chiefly with allusion to the contents of the first book of the following Manual.

The records which relate to the clergy and the sacraments during this early period make it painfully evident that the mediatorial glory of the Saviour had been generally obscured,—that the true doctrines of Christ's religion with reference to pardon of sin and acceptance with God had been perverted or



concealed,—and that the dictates of Scripture concerning the conveyance of divine grace to the soul had begun to be imperfectly understood. The phraseology current in the (so called) orthodox or catholic church with reference to the Lord's supper,—and especially the copious list of terms which were applied, not to the holy supper itself, but merely to the elements employed in its celebration,—indicate the want of a sound acquaintance with the nature and design of that sacred institution. Many terms and modes of expression which are necessarily employed in describing the observances and practices of the church, during the period under review, forcibly admonish us of the presence of deeply-seated error, and of a prevalent deviation from scriptural and primitive truth.

It may appear, however, from a calm consideration of the general nature of the institutions of the early Christians, and from the tone of their formularies, that they had so far retained the apprehension of Gospel truth, as to leave us the satisfaction of contemplating our Lord's faithfulness in the fulfilment of his promise concerning his perpetual presence with his church. We cannot, at the same time, but find cause for gratitude in the reflection, that our lot has been cast within the borders of a church which has detected and renounced the errors of former ages, and in which the truths of the Gospel are taught with a simplicity and purity unknown to the churches in which Athanasius, Chrysostom, or Ambrose taught.

A demonstration of theological opinions or ecclesiastical partialities does not properly consist with an historical detail of facts, such as that which this Manual professes to exhibit. I have, accordingly, made it a rule to give, for the most part, a simple statement of what was said or done in the early church, without any indication of approbation or the contrary. But it would be a difficult matter, and indeed no very enviable attainment, to manifest an entire indifference to what is true and right, throughout a long survey of subjects which affect, more or less directly, the vitals of religion. Sometimes, perhaps, I have written not merely as an historian, but also as a clergyman who assents to the doctrine and admires the ritual of the

Church of England; but I hope that I have not in any instance expressed myself offensively to members of other churches, or given an unbecoming prominence to my own convictions and preferences. One observation, however, which I have ventured to make, although it requires no apology, leaves me not without a wish to make some further remarks in connexion with it. In stating the progress of inquiry respecting the author of the Athanasian Creed (pp. 438—441), I have expressed my entire approbation of the doctrines contained in that well-known confession. But perhaps, in justice to myself, and as one small tribute to the great cause of Christian charity, I ought to have subjoined some notice of my entire and hearty concurrence in the following remark of Bishop Burnet, taking his words in the utmost extent of their meaning: “We may believe that some articles are necessary to salvation, as well as that there are some commandments necessary for practice; and we may also believe that some errors, as well as some sins, are exclusive of salvation; all which imports no more than that we believe such things are sufficiently revealed, and that they are necessary conditions of salvation; but by this we do not limit the mercies of God towards those who are under such darkness as not to be able to see through it, and to discern and acknowledge these truths. It were, indeed, to be wished that some express declaration to this purpose were made by those who have authority to do it: but, in the meanwhile, this being the sense in which the words of this creed are universally taken, and it agreeing with the phraseology of the Scripture upon the like occasions, this is that which may be rested upon. And allowing this large explanation of these severe words, the rest of this creed imports no more than the belief of the doctrine of the Trinity.” Such observations respecting the “severe words” which occur in some parts of the Athanasian Creed are, I think, at once just and charitable. Indeed, if our church should resolve upon altogether expunging the clauses commonly called condemnatory, it is possible that the cause of truth would suffer no detriment. One reflection connected with this subject has often occurred to my mind, which I will

venture to mention in this place, especially as it stands connected with a branch of Christian Antiquities. The Nicene Creed, as originally published (see p. 436), concluded with an anathema against all persons who should reject its doctrines; but, in the course of time, the anathema has been kindly dropped, and we now recite the creed without the defensive clause, or any equivalent. No harm, however, has happened to the Christian faith in consequence of this omission; and to the present hour it is fully understood, that every man who deserves to be regarded as a minister of our church believes and teaches all the doctrines contained in this gentle and inoffensive creed. Now, why may we not, with equal impunity, adopt the same course with regard to certain clauses in the creed commonly called the Creed of Athanasius? We know, indeed, in what sense those clauses are usually understood among ourselves, and how far they are true. But we cannot oblige every man to honour them with a similar construction, or to receive the interpretation of Burnet, or of any other member of our church. Perhaps the history of the Nicene Creed may suggest a still better mode of proceeding than even that of making any "declarations," however "express." The original Nicene Creed has not only received addition, but has suffered mutilation; and yet the Christian faith remains, within the borders of our church, entire. Why then should we fear lest a similar mutilation of the Athanasian Creed should involve a sacrifice of Christian truth? One creed has been taught a lesson of moderation, and why may not another be made to learn the same? Surely it cannot be supposed that a creed must lose its life when it has lost its sting. A sting has been extracted from the confession of faith drawn up and published by the venerable fathers of Niceea, without loss or detriment to the cause of religion and truth; and why may we not safely take the same liberty with the later composition of an unknown writer? Doubtless, this is no new argument; but, if it be a sound one, it deserves attention.

Some intimations respecting the state of practical religion and morals in the early church may be gathered from the

history of Christian Antiquities. An investigation of such a subject is at all times delicate, and is attended with peculiar difficulties, because practical religion is hidden as to its source, and unobtrusive in its exercise; and especially because it falls neither within our province, nor under our power, to determine with what feelings any religious offices are performed, or what is the moral effect upon the mind of those who may perform them. Express testimonies concerning the religious condition of Christian societies, as declared by apparent piety and virtue, or evident ungodliness and immorality, are to be found in the writings of the fathers. The pictures there drawn are varied with light and shade; and they may perhaps lead us to infer that the mixture of good and evil principles and practices in the early church was not very different from that which appears to exist at the present day. But with such descriptions and testimonies we are not now concerned. We propose merely to collect information on these points from the history of the rites, ceremonies, and institutions of the church. And we may perhaps arrive at some correct conclusions by a consideration of the obvious or probable *tendencies* of those observances.

It may be hoped that religious knowledge, such as the age possessed, was pretty generally diffused among the members of the church, by means of the formal and careful preparation of catechumens, by the regular reading of holy Scripture in the congregation, and by the labours of pious and zealous preachers. Although some doctrines were studiously concealed from the uninitiated, under the system of secret instruction, yet it is pleasing to remember that practical duties were assiduously inculcated upon persons of all ages. We cannot, indeed, but fear that some great mistakes were made even in this department of Christian erudition; but yet we may find reason to hope that, on the whole, much good was produced.

Again, from an inspection of ancient forms of public prayer, we may conclude that a flame of devotion was kept up in the church; and, more particularly, that high and reverent thoughts of God,—charitable feelings towards Christian brethren, and

kind sympathy with all sorts and conditions of men,—and ardent hopes of future blessedness,—were cherished in the breasts of a large number of the members of the church.

Perhaps, also, a salutary exercise of self-denial, self-distrust, and humility prevailed to a considerable extent.

All this may be inferred, with greater or less probability, from what is recorded as having taken place within the walls of baptisteries and churches. But, on the other hand, we discover in the records of ancient institutions too many traces of spurious piety and fictitious virtue, and even of disorderly conduct and immorality.

Ascetic institutions, and more especially the practices of fasting and celibacy, which were introduced as early as the second century, and rose rapidly in repute, point to the existence of some grievous mistakes respecting the nature of true spiritual excellence and Christian morality. And we fear that any extensive mistake respecting the real nature of holiness and virtue is usually either a consequence or a cause of erroneous or defective practice. It is likely that, in the early church, false humility was linked with spiritual pride; and needless mortification or austerity in some particulars was, probably, too often attended with its natural accompaniment, unhallowed licence, or too great indulgence, in others.

Again, even in matters connected with the celebration of divine worship, we seem to discover an increasing stiffness and formality, together with a growing love of pomp and desire of external effect; and to such an extent did these things take place, that we can hardly avoid regarding them as symptoms of a gradual exchange of the life and energy of primitive devotion for coldness and indifference. We may well fear that piety was, to a great degree, oppressed and stifled under the burden of a splendid ritual.

The disorders attendant upon the *Agapæ*, or feasts of charity, which led to the abolition of that primitive institution, do not speak in favour of the feelings or morals of many Christians of the third and fourth centuries; nor do the regulations which it was thought necessary to make for the preser-

vation of order during the celebration of divine worship give us a very high idea of a sense of propriety, or of a sober and deep religious impression, with reference to a large, or at least an indefinite, number of the faithful.

The penitential discipline which prevailed in the early church may at first sight seem admirable, and adapted to promote the cause of practical religion and morals. We may hope that it produced this effect to a considerable extent; but we find cause to fear that it was likewise attended with many evils. Was the course of humiliation which was prescribed to penitents adapted to produce altogether a wholesome effect upon their minds? Was it not too abject and sordid, considered as a social and relative act,—an act not only performed in the presence of their fellow creatures, but in a certain sense addressed to them? And was it not such as to open a wide door for hypocrisy and imposture? Besides this, what effect may it not probably have produced upon the minds of the “faithful,” whose intercessions, compassion, and favour were sought with tears and lamentations? It is true that the infliction of penance may have served as a warning against sin, and may have been useful as an incentive to watchfulness. This, no doubt, would have been its proper effect, and would have been in accordance with one part of the original design. But we may justly fear that the mode of treating penitents in the ancient church, and the circumstances attendant upon their seeking re-admission into the number of the faithful, tended to excite or cherish pride and unhallowed notions of superiority in the minds of many members of that venerated body. They probably derived more harm than good from the situation in which they found themselves placed relatively to their offending brethren.

Again, the servile respect and almost impious reverence paid to the clergy must have been highly demoralizing. It must have wrought injurious effects upon the minds of both ministers and people. We may hope, indeed, that in many cases the distinction which was made between clergy and laity, and the deference paid by the latter to their spiritual pastors,

may have been attended with no more than becoming humility, modesty, and submission on the part of the people, and may have been received by the ministers of religion as a salutary admonition concerning the nature of their duties, and their own deep responsibility to the great Head of the Church, who alone is worthy to receive honour and adoration. But, at the same time, it is difficult to consider the extravagant titles and marks of respect which were bestowed upon the clergy during the fourth and fifth centuries, without feeling convinced that the less enlightened members of the Christian community must have been affected with a mean and pitiful spirit, a want of generous self-respect and of holy Christian emulation, and a debasing forgetfulness of the animating assurance that all who truly believe on the Lord Jesus Christ have been made by him kings and priests unto God and his Father. It is true, indeed, that a faithful, industrious, and affectionate minister readily acquires the esteem and good-will of the people among whom he labours; and that this feeling of attachment, under certain restrictions, is at once due to the pastor and salutary to the people. More than this, respect to the whole order of Christian ministers, apart from personal connexion with them, and solely on account of their office, is a sentiment which necessarily pervades every well-disposed Christian community; and this, also, if maintained on right principles, is at once an element and a promoter of true religion. But the excesses, and especially the counterfeits, of these things are at once wrong in principle and mischievous in their result. It is a hurtful prejudice in the minds of Christians, when they suppose that any order of men, as such, possesses a greater degree of inherent sanctity than other men can possess or can attain, or that such an order comprises within itself the peculiar favourites of heaven. The existence of such arrogant pretensions tends not so much to produce genuine humility in the minds of those men who are hopelessly excluded from the privileged class, as to discourage them, and to act as a check upon their pursuit of excellence. Wise men have thought that "one way to make men better is to make the best of them;" and, on the same

principle, one way to lower the general standard of piety and virtue is to cherish a belief in the minds of some members of the church that they are necessarily and unalterably inferior to others in point of Christian excellence, and lower in the divine favour. Much spiritual and moral mischief must have been thus produced, during the fourth and fifth centuries, by means of the extravagant honours bestowed upon certain classes of believers, and especially upon the clergy and ascetics of the day.

One clear indication of a low state of religious feeling and practice in the church, during the period under review, occurs in that general adoption of heathen rites and ceremonies which seems to have been deemed necessary, in order to swell the ranks of the faithful, or to keep professed Christians firm in their attachment to the religion of the Gospel. When heathen superstitions and festivals were incorporated into the course of Christian worship, with little other ceremony than a change of name, no inconsiderable amount of levity, sensuality, and evil love of the world, must have existed within the borders of the church.

The demonology of the ancient church will be considered more particularly below; but I may here mention certain errors and abuses connected with the commemorations of martyrs, which seem to bespeak the presence of considerable alloy in the practical religion of the times. In course of time, considerable superstition was involved in these solemnities; and superstition is always debasing. Besides this, the examples which were furnished by the illustrious sufferers whose names were held in honour, although suited to the encouragement of believers when called to undergo severe persecution or trials, were yet, in many instances, far from perfect, and were ill adapted to produce a happy influence on the general course of Christian life. At the same time, the unbounded encomiums bestowed upon the lives and actions of these worthies, by the preachers who assisted at their commemorations, must have greatly tended to counteract the influence of scriptural truth relating to the solemn demands of the divine law, the true



condition of human nature, and the right influence of Christian doctrines upon the heart. And, in addition to all this, it is certain that disorderly conduct and immoral practices were at last connected with these religious festivals to a very serious extent. Such abuses of this ancient custom were, indeed, condemned by the ministers of the church; and, when they had become evidently incurable, the custom itself was discountenanced, and gradually laid aside. So that, if we were discussing the merits or demerits of the clergy on this point, we should be bound to pay attention to the following remarks and admonition of Augustin:—"I know there are many who superstitiously worship graves and pictures; I know many that drink luxuriously and excessively over the dead, and when they make a feast for the deceased bury themselves over those that lie buried in the graves, and, after all, place their gluttony and drunkenness to the account of religion. But I advise you to leave off railing at the catholic church for this; for, in speaking against the morals of such men, you only condemn those whom the church herself condemns, and daily labours to correct them as wicked children. . . . They who make themselves drunk in the memorials of the martyrs, are so far from having the approbation of the church, that she condemns them for being guilty of that vice in their own private houses; it is one thing we are commanded to teach, and another thing we are commanded to correct, and obliged to tolerate and endure till we can amend it\*."—But, in considering the state of practical religion and morals among the Christian community at large during the fourth and fifth centuries, it is necessary to remember that such abuses did exist; and it is impossible not to regard the fact as a drawback in our estimate of the Christian character prevalent in those ages. "As the best things," says Bingham, "by the corruption of men, often degenerate into abuses, so it fared with this laudable practice. Some made use of it only as an opportunity of gratifying their covetousness and desires of filthy lucre; others hence took occasion to indulge

\* *AUG. De Moribus Ecclesie Cathol.* c. 34; *Cont. Faust.* lib. xx. cap. 21.—  
BINGHAM.

themselves in revellings and dancings; and some were so vain as to think that even rioting and drunkenness at such times was for the honour of the martyr." These demoralizing festivals, it must be remembered, were of frequent occurrence, at least in some places. "They were grown so numerous in the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret, that they tell us it was not once, or twice, or five times in a year that they celebrated these memorials, but they had oftentimes one or two in the same week, which occasioned frequent solemnities\*."

The practice of alms-giving was connected with the festivals of martyrs, as well as with the general celebration of divine worship; and indeed it holds a prominent place in the institutions and history of the early church. The consideration of this circumstance may tend to enhance our opinion of the piety and morals of the times, while we remember that the exercise of benevolence, especially towards the needy members of the church, is what holy Scripture positively requires as a manifestation of vital religion, or true Christian principle. But we know that no outward duty varies in its real nature and value more than this, according to the motives with which it is performed, and the circumstances by which it is affected. We wait, therefore, to know the general impression which existed during the fourth and fifth centuries respecting those acts of charity of which we read, before we draw from them any conclusion with reference to the state of Christian feeling, and the amount of practical religion, in the churches of that period. And we find too great occasion to fear that even the practice of alms-giving among the ancients must be regarded as an indication of ignorance and corrupt doctrine, and as a work of superstition and selfishness, rather than an evidence of the power of true religion. The following passages occur in the Homilies of Chrysostom. Upon reading them, we may well reason thus:—if a Christian bishop of the fourth century could venture to adopt such language, what must have been the practical persuasion concerning the nature of religion among the unlearned

\* Vid. CHRYS. *Hom.* 40 in *Juveninum*; THEOD. *Serm.* 8 *de Martyribus*; CHRYS. *Hom.* 65 *de Martyr*.—BINGHAM.

multitude? “For this reason,” says Chrysostom, “our forefathers appointed the poor to stand before the doors of our churches, that the sight of them might provoke the most backward and inhuman soul to compassion. And as by law and custom we have fountains before our oratories, that they who go in to worship God may first wash their hands, and so lift them up in prayer; so our ancestors, instead of fountains and cisterns, placed the poor before the doors of the church; that as we wash our hands in water, so we should cleanse our souls by beneficence and charity first, and then go and offer up our prayers. For water is not more adapted by nature to wash away the spots of the body, than the power of alms-deeds is to cleanse the filth of the soul. As therefore you dare not go in to pray with unwashed hands, though this be but a small offence, so neither should you without alms ever enter the church for prayer. You, many times, when your hands are clean, will not lift them up to God, before you have washed them in water; so prevalent is the force of custom with us: let us, therefore, do the same with respect to alms-deeds; and though we are not conscious to ourselves of any great and heinous crimes, yet let us by charity clear our consciences of lesser spots and blemishes which we contract in our daily business and conversation.” So again, in another place, expounding these words, “Thou shalt not appear before the Lord empty,”—“Those things,” says he, “were spoken to the Jews, and how much more to us? Therefore the poor stand before the doors of the church, that no one should go in empty, but enter securely with charity for his companion. You go into the church to obtain mercy; first show mercy; make God your debtor, and then you may ask of Him, and receive with usury. We are not heard barely for the lifting up our hands. Stretch forth your hands not only to heaven, but to the hands of the poor: if you stretch out your hands to the poor, you touch the very height of heaven. For He that sits there receives your alms: but if you lift up barren hands, it profits nothing\*.” It

\* \* CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 25 *de Verbis Apost.*; *Hom.* 1 in 2 *Tim.* *Conf. Hom.* 9 *de Penitent.*—BINGHAM.

is painful to reflect that such expressions proceeded from the lips of a man who was regarded by tens of thousands as almost an oracle of truth. This was the eloquent bishop concerning whom multitudes were heard to declare, "It were better that the sun should not shine, than that he should not preach!" Well may we feel thankful that we belong to a church which teaches a more scriptural doctrine in connexion with this branch of Christian morals. Our Homily on Alms-deeds, although it includes some expressions of this "godly and learned doctor," and some sayings of Augustin, very questionable and dangerous in themselves, omits not, however, to add useful explanations, and earnestly contends that nothing which it contains is to be understood in a sense which may tend "to deface Christ, and to defraud Him of his glory."

Such are some reflections which may occur to the mind upon a survey of several of the details of worship and practice during the fourth and fifth centuries. But there are certain features of the prevalent religion of the times which deserve a separate and more particular consideration; especially as they have been made the foundation of some most serious charges affecting the general character and condition of the ancient church. Our learned Bishop Newton does not hesitate to affirm, in accordance with the opinion of Mede, that *the apostasy* foretold by St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iv. 1—3, had begun, and had even proceeded to a considerable length, during the period now under review. He appeals, in support of his views, to the prevailing demonology, with its accompanying passion for the false and marvellous, and to the extensive adoption of ascetic institutes, especially fasting and celibacy. His allegations are weighty, and deserve the most serious attention; especially as they have never been disproved. Nor can we, perhaps, obtain a more correct or forcible impression concerning the theology of the ancient church, than by carefully considering the bishop's interpretation and application of that remarkable prophecy. The substance of his remarks shall be here given, as far as possible, in his own words.

The passage of Scripture under consideration, closely and

critically translated, is as follows:—"But the Spirit speaketh expressly, that, in the latter times, some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to erroneous spirits, and doctrines concerning demons, through the hypocrisy of liars, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the believers, and them who know the truth."

Apostasy from the faith, says the bishop, consists in "a revolt in the principal and essential article, when we worship God by any image or representation, or when we worship other beings besides God, and pray unto other mediators besides the 'one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.'"

"Spirits" seems to be used in much the same sense as "doctrines" (compare 1 John iv. 1), so that the latter word is explanatory of the former; and "error" sometimes signifying "idolatry," "erroneous doctrines" may comprehend idolatrous, as well as false, doctrines; and it is in order to fix the sense precisely, that the explanatory clause is added,—"*doctrines concerning demons.*" The former part of this prophecy therefore gives us to understand "that the idolatrous theology of demons professed by the Gentiles should be revived among Christians. Christians should in process of time degenerate, and resemble the Gentiles as well as the apostate Jews. Now, demons, according to the theology of the Gentiles, were middle powers between the sovereign gods and mortal men; and were regarded as mediators or agents between the gods and men. Of these demons there were accounted two kinds. One kind of demons were the souls of men deified, or canonized after death. The other kind were such as had never been the souls of men, nor ever dwelt in mortal bodies. These latter demons may be paralleled with angels, as the former may with canonized saints.

It appears then, that, according to this prophecy, the doctrines concerning demons, which prevailed so long in the

heathen world, should be revived and established in the Christian church. Now, how stand the facts?

“Some tendency to *the worshipping of angels* was observed even in the apostle’s time, insomuch that he thought proper to give his caution to the Colossians (ii. 18), ‘Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels;’ and this admonition, we may suppose, checked and suppressed this worship for some generations. *The worshipping of the dead* was not introduced so early into the church; it was advanced by slower degrees; and what was at first nothing more than a pious and decent respect to the memory of saints and martyrs degenerated at last into an impious and idolatrous adoration. At first, annual festivals were instituted to their honour; the next step was praying in the cemeteries at their sepulchres; then their bodies were translated into churches; then a power of working miracles was attributed to their dead bodies, bones, and other relics; then their wonder-working relics were conveyed from place to place, and distributed among the other churches; then they were invocated and adored for performing such miracles, for assisting men in their devotions, and interceding for them with God; and not only the churches, but even the fields and highways, were filled with altars for invoking them.

“As early as the time of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, we find Eusebius, one of the best and most learned of the fathers, quoting and approving Hesiod’s and Plato’s notions before mentioned concerning demons, and then adding, ‘These things are befitting upon the decease of the favourites of God, whom you may properly call the champions of the true religion. Whence it is our custom to assemble at their sepulchres, and to make our prayers at them, and to honour their blessed souls.’ Here Eusebius compares the saints and martyrs with the demons of the Gentiles, and esteems them worthy of the same honour. The famous Anthony, who was one of the great founders of monkery, gave it in charge to the monks, with his dying breath, ‘to take care and adhere to

Christ in the first place, and then to the saints, that after death they may receive you as friends and acquaintances into the everlasting tabernacles.' His advice was but too well followed; and the emperor Julian reproacheth the Christians for 'adding many new dead men to that ancient dead man Jesus.' All the fathers, almost, *of the fourth and fifth centuries*, contributed too much to the support and propagation of this superstition; and Theodoret, in particular, having cited the same passages of Hesiod and Plato, reasons thus: 'If, then, the poet hath called good men, after their decease, the deliverers and guardians of mortal men, and the best of philosophers hath confirmed the poet's saying, and asserted that we ought to serve and adore their sepulchres, why, I beseech you, sirs (speaking to the Greeks), do you blame these things which are done by us? For such as were illustrious for piety, and for the sake thereof received martyrdom, we also name deliverers and physicians; not calling them demons (let us not be so desperately mad), but the friends and sincere servants of God.' Here Theodoret plainly allows the thing, and only disapproves the name. Again, he saith, in the same exalted strain, concerning the martyrs, 'They who are well pray for the continuance of health, and they who have been long sick pray for recovery; the barren also pray for children; and they who are to make a long journey desire them to be their companions and guides in the way; not going to them as gods, but applying to them as to divine men, and beseeching them to become intercessors for them with God.' Nay, he saith, 'That the martyrs have blotted out from the minds of men the memory of those who were called gods. For *our Lord hath brought his dead into the place of your gods*, whom he hath utterly abolished, and hath given their honour to the martyrs: for, instead of the feasts of Jupiter and of Bacchus, are now celebrated the festivals of Peter, and Paul, and Thomas, and the other martyrs. Wherefore, seeing the advantage of honouring the martyrs, fly, O friends, from the error of the demons; and, using the martyrs as lights and guides, pursue the way which leadeth directly to God.' Here are 'the doctrines of demons' evidently revived,

only the name is altered, and the saints are substituted for demons: the divi or deified men of the Christians, for the divi or deified men of the heathen."

It is remarkable that Epiphanius applied the passage before us to the practice of certain persons in his time. "That father, who was very zealous against the worship of saints and images, which was then springing up in the church, loudly complains of some Arabian Christians, who made a goddess of the blessed Virgin, and offered a cake to her as the queen of heaven. He condemns their heresy as impious and abominable, and declares that 'upon these also is fulfilled that of the apostle: Some shall apostatize from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of demons; for they shall be, saith the apostle, worshippers of the dead, as in Israel also they were worshipped.' . . . . Epiphanius recites this addition as the very words of the apostle; . . . . but if it was only a marginal reading added by way of explication, as Mr. Mede and Dr. Mill suppose, it still evinces that Epiphanius, and some before his time, understood the passage in the same manner that we have explained it."

The bishop intimates his opinion that by "the latter times," in the strict application of the term, we are to understand the times of popish worship. But it is evident, from what he elsewhere says, that he would not limit the date precisely to so late a period, and that he considers the apostasy to have begun during the third and fourth centuries, although it did not reach its height until afterwards.

"Having shown wherein the great apostasy of the latter times consists, namely, in reviving the doctrines concerning demons and worshipping the dead, the apostle proceeds to describe by what means and by what persons it should be propagated, and established in the world. . . . 'Through the hypocrisy of liars, having their conscience seared with a hot iron.' . . . . It is impossible to relate or enumerate all the various falsehoods and lies which have been invented and propagated for this purpose; the fabulous books forged under the names of apostles, saints, and martyrs; the fabulous legends



of their lives, actions, sufferings, and deaths; the fabulous miracles ascribed to their sepulchres, bones, and other relics; the fabulous dreams and revelations, visions, and apparitions of the dead to the living; and even the fabulous saints, who never existed but in the imagination of their worshippers: and all these stories, the monks, the priests, the bishops of the church have imposed and obtruded upon mankind, it is difficult to say, whether with greater artifice or cruelty, with greater confidence or hypocrisy and pretended sanctity, a more hardened face, or a more hardened conscience." These remarks are just, to a very considerable extent, if applied to the history of the fourth and fifth centuries.

"A further character of these men is given in the following words, 'forbidding to marry.' The same hypocritical liars who should promote the worship of demons, should also prohibit lawful marriage." The clergy were forbidden to marry by the council of Elvira, A.D. 305, and by that of Neocæsarea, A.D. 314. A motion to nearly the same effect was made at the first general council of Nicæa, A.D. 325; in which instance, however, it was overruled. "But the monks had not yet prevailed; the monks soon overspread the eastern church and the western too: and as the monks were then the first who brought single life into repute, so they were the first also who revived and promoted the worship of demons. It is a thing universally known, that one of the primary and most essential laws and constitutions of all monks, whether solitary or associated, whether living in deserts or in convents, is the profession of single life, to abstain from marriage themselves, and to discourage it all they can in others. It is equally certain that the monks had the principal share in promoting and propagating the worship of the dead; and either out of credulity, or for worse reasons, recommended it to the people with all the pomp and power of their eloquence, in their homilies and orations. Read only some of the most celebrated fathers: read the orations of Basil on the martyr Mamas, and on the forty Martyrs: read the orations of Ephraim Syrus on the death of Basil, and on the forty Martyrs, and on the praises of the holy

Martyrs; read the orations of Gregory Nazianzen on Athanasius, and on Basil, and on Cyprian; read the orations of Gregory Nyssen on Ephraim Syrus, and on the martyr Theodorus, and on Meletius, bishop of Antioch; read the sixty-sixth, and other homilies of Chrysostom; read his oration on the martyrs of Egypt, and other orations; and you will be greatly astonished to find how full they are of this sort of superstition, what powers and miracles are ascribed to the saints, what prayers and praises are offered up to them. All these were monks, and most of them bishops too, in the fourth century: and the superstitious worship which these monks began, the succeeding monks completed, till at length the very relics and images of the dead were worshipped as much as the dead themselves."

"The last note and character of these men is 'commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth.' The same lying hypocrites, who should promote the worship of demons, should not only prohibit lawful marriage, but likewise impose unnecessary abstinence from meats: and these too, as indeed it is fit they should, usually go together, as constituent parts of the same hypocrisy. . . . It is as much the law and constitution of all monks to abstain from meats as from marriage. Some never eat any flesh, others only of certain kinds and on certain days. Frequent fasts are the rule, the boast of their order; and their carnal humility is their spiritual pride. So lived the monks of the ancient church; so live, with less strictness perhaps, but with greater ostentation, the monks and friars of the Church of Rome: and these have been the principal propagators and defenders of the worship of the dead, both in former and in later times. The worship of the dead is indeed so monstrously absurd, as well as impious, that there was hardly any possibility of its ever succeeding and prevailing in the world, but by hypocrisy and lies: but that these particular sorts of hypocrisy,—celibacy under pretence of chastity, and abstinence under pretence of devotion,—should be employed for this purpose, the Spirit of God alone could

foresee and foretell.”—(*Dissertations on the Prophecies*; Diss. xxiii.)

Such is the judgment of the learned Bishop Newton, respecting the state of the church during the fourth and fifth centuries. He considers that it had been marked beforehand, by the Spirit of truth, with the brand of APOSTASY; and that its actual apostasy, or its very prevalent departure from the principles of the gospel, was indicated chiefly by its idolatrous *reeneration of the dead*,—its *ascetic spirit and institutions*,—and its *superstitious celibacy*.

On the whole, therefore, while our brief survey of the doctrines and practice of the early church affords reason for thankfulness to the Giver of all good, by whose mercy a large amount of truth and godliness existed, as we hope, in that portion of the Christian body, it also leaves us great cause to mourn over the ignorance and infirmity of human nature, to which we trace no inconsiderable degree of error, superstition, and corruption. Let it not, however, be supposed that, because ancient churches afford no pattern of perfection, the study of their rites, institutions, and history is therefore superfluous and useless. We may derive benefit by following their example, so far as it is good. And we may also take many lessons from them otherwise than by copying their practice,—sometimes even by rejecting it and adopting its opposite. If, indeed, any persons are inclined to propose the church of the fourth and fifth centuries as a model for close and faithful imitation, deeming its standard of truth and its practice of religion superior to our own, it is not too much to say that they labour under a serious practical mistake. Such an error, however, is directly opposed to the judgment of our church. There was, indeed, a time when the clouds of the fourth century appeared to be gathering around the borders of our sanctuary. But let us hope that, by divine mercy, we have escaped such a calamity completely and for ever. The following anecdote will at once identify the miserable period to which I refer, and convey an intimation of the mournful result which would almost certainly ensue from the prevalence of a blind

admiration of the ancient church, and especially from an extensive recurrence to its false principles and mistaken practices. “The daughter of the Earl of Devonshire having embraced the Romish faith, was asked by *Laud* her reason for changing her religion. ‘It is chiefly,’ she replied, ‘because I hate to travel in a crowd.’ The meaning of these words being demanded, she gave the following explanation. ‘I perceive your grace, and many others, are *making haste to Rome*; and, therefore, to prevent my being jostled, I have gone before you.’”

Si veteres ita miratur laudatque poetas  
Ut nihil anteferat, nihil illis comparet, errat.

§ 4.—*A Plea for Episcopacy, Charity, and Peace.*

APPEAL has been often made to the records of the ancient church with reference to various forms of ecclesiastical government, and especially concerning episcopacy as it is established in this country. It has been proved, I believe, from Scripture and history, first, that the episcopal form of church government is lawful, and, secondly, that it has prevailed among Christian churches from the earliest times. It is not perhaps too much to say, that these points have been placed beyond all reasonable doubt. But there are some further inquiries connected with this subject which cannot be so clearly determined. Such are the questions whether the establishment of the episcopate as a distinct order from that of presbyters is to be regarded as a divine institution, or simply as an ecclesiastical arrangement;—whether such an institution is of universal and perpetual obligation, for the preservation of a distinct authority, and the conveyance of a peculiar grace;—and in what respects, or to what extent, this difference subsists. In the following Manual I have stated, in connexion with these subjects, more than one set of arguments drawn from the testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity. Hence perhaps it may happen, that, because I have not chosen to appear as the decided advocate of either hypothesis, I may be regarded by some persons as leaning towards the high apostolical succession scheme, and by others as enter-

taining too low and mean a view of episcopacy altogether. The truth is, however, that while I reject the more lofty claims which are sometimes urged in favour of the hierarchical constitution, I am yet persuaded that a moderate episcopacy rests upon good and sufficient grounds,—that it is entitled to the preference of many Christians, and to the respect of all,—and that its claim to this preference and respect can be forfeited only by a certain amount of internal mal-administration or abuse, or by arrogant pretensions, and an uncharitable bearing with regard to the members or constitution of churches otherwise ordered. Nor shall I dismiss the subject with these few words. I design to state distinctly what I conceive to be some of the strong grounds of episcopacy, so far as relates to the testimony of Scripture and the ancient records of the church. And I shall venture also to mention what are those points connected with the question which some persons may reasonably regard as doubtful, and with reference to which it ought to be understood among Christians that a certain latitude or variety of opinion and practice must remain. In offering these remarks, I shall plead honestly, however feebly, the common cause of episcopacy, charity, and peace.

There is no dispute concerning the identity, or rather the continual interchange, of the terms *bishop* and *presbyter*, in the apostolical writings. It is generally agreed that at an early period of the church, the title of *bishop* was modestly substituted for that of apostle, or at least was applied only to those whom the church consented to regard as its chief pastors or governors after the death of the apostles; and that the term *presbyter* continued to denote those ministers to whom the New Testament gives indifferently the title of presbyter or bishop.

It may also be taken for granted, as a position which no serious and humble Christian will dispute, that any manifestations of the divine will, with reference to the government and administration of the church, ought to be unhesitatingly and thankfully obeyed. All churchmen, at least, will cordially agree with a pious and judicious nonconformist in the following remarks. “God’s work must be done, in everything, according

to his own will. His institutions neither need nor admit men's inventions to make them either more beautiful or more likely to answer the intention of them. Add thou not unto his words. God is pleased with willing worship, but not with will-worship\*."

But then comes the question, what reasons have we for supposing that the well-understood distinction which prevails between the titles and offices of bishops and presbyters is in conformity with a divine institution, or in accordance with the divine will? In answer to this question, the following considerations may be urged, besides others unconnected with the records, or early practice, of the church.

It is obvious that a standing ministry was appointed during the time of the apostles, and under their immediate sanction. By this I mean, that certain pastors were attached to the several churches or congregations which were formed from time to time, and that these pastors were charged with the especial and perpetual duty of conducting religious worship, of preaching and expounding God's word, and labouring for the edification of the people,—in one word, with the cure of souls. Some Christians were placed "over" others "in the Lord;" and an apostle says expressly to believers, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account †." And it was plainly the design of the apostles that the office of this distinct and responsible ministry should be continued in the church. The apostles enjoined those who had heard the Gospel from their own lips to commit the precious deposit to "faithful men, who should be able to teach others also ‡." Mutual edification was enjoined upon believers in general, and was doubtless practised; but yet the general instruction and spiritual oversight of the people, as a body, was not left to the people themselves. Certain individuals were placed in the definite and responsible situation of pastors, or overseers of the whole flock; and this arrangement was made immediately by the apostles, or with their concurrence,—that is to say, under the guidance and

\* MATTHEW HENRY, *Commentary* on Exod. xxxix. 32, 42.

† Heb. xiii. 7.

‡ 2 Tim. ii. 2.

authority of divine inspiration. So that a standing ministry, or the existence of a class of men peculiarly and perpetually entrusted with the duty of teaching others, and promoting their spiritual welfare, is an apostolic or divine institution.

The advocates of episcopacy ought, I think, to state this position clearly, and give it some degree of prominence, because it is one which lies among the foundations of their system. Not only were ministers of the Gospel appointed under the sanction of the apostles, but it was the declared intention of these divinely-commissioned founders of the church, that a succession of ministers should be kept up. Timothy, for example, was required by St. Paul not only to discharge the duties of a teacher in his own person, but to train up other teachers, by qualifying them for the discharge of the same duties in their turn.

It appears then, that a standing ministry, such as episcopacy necessarily implies, is in accordance with the will of our Lord and Master, declared by the injunctions and practice of his apostles. It may be observed, however, that although episcopacy implies a standing ministry, such ministry does not necessarily involve episcopacy. But yet it constitutes its basis. And we may now proceed to inquire, in the next place, whether or not the apostles made any regulations, or established any precedent, affecting the station, interests, or relative position of the men who had been appointed, with their sanction, to the sacred office of ministers or teachers of the people. Did they leave these ministers in the exercise of their functions without any control or supervision, committing them entirely to God and their consciences? Did they place them in the hands of their several congregations, making them answerable for their conduct to the people? Or did the apostles themselves exercise authority over them concerning their ministry? And, still more particularly, did they commission any persons besides themselves to exercise a like jurisdiction?

To such questions the Apostolical Epistles return sufficient answers. The apostles did continue to interfere, and to exercise authority, in the affairs of infant churches, notwithstanding the

previous appointment of presbyters. St. Paul tells us, for instance, that the care of all the churches devolved upon him. And since no one can doubt that the churches, when thus spoken of, include ministers as well as people, it is plain that *the first presbyters were subject to the jurisdiction of superiors, in the persons of the apostles*. Nor is this all. It is certain, moreover, that *this power of jurisdiction or superintendence was delegated by the apostles to other men*; as appears from the commissions which were given to Timothy and Titus. It is probable that those commissions were only of temporary duration; but, whether temporary or permanent, they prove, beyond all dispute, that presbyters and deacons, as the ordinary ministers of churches, were required by the apostles to submit to certain persons, appointed as their superiors or superintendents. We should weaken our ground exceedingly, if we were to contend that Timothy and Titus were in all respects bishops, according to our present ideas of the office. But the point in their history which is certain, and which alone is of real importance, is this:—that an apostle invested Timothy and Titus with (at least a temporary) authority over the pastors of several churches, during his own absence from those churches. It is probable, too, that although the appointment of those individuals was only temporary, yet the office of delegated superintendent in Ephesus and Crete was perpetual even in the apostle's time, or at least as permanent as his absence: for successors appear to have been provided when Timothy and Titus were recalled. At all events, such an arrangement, whether in force for a longer or a shorter time, was, substantially, a commencement of episcopacy. Perhaps also a still nearer approximation to this system, or rather its first regular and permanent establishment, may be found in the appointment of James to the office which he held at Jerusalem, during the life-time of the apostles. And this, say some, holds good especially if we agree with certain critics in regarding James the Just as a different person from the apostle St. James the Less. But, this example of primitive episcopacy, and others which could be adduced, whether strong or weak, may be easily dispensed



with; and, as the evidence concerning them is open to objection, it is perhaps unwise to rank them with the clear instances of episcopal jurisdiction which we find in the histories of Timothy and Titus.

The facts which have been stated, few and simple as they are, form a sufficient ground for the defence and recommendation of an episcopal form of church government. These facts involve great principles. Men of humble, serious, and candid minds may well be justified in regarding them as solemn indications of the Lord's will, with reference to a constitution of his church, which, although he does not positively enjoin or universally require, he is yet ready to sanction, accept, and bless. A standing ministry was appointed in the church under the sanction of the apostles:—the body of ministers thus constituted was subject to the jurisdiction of the apostles, whenever they were present, or could otherwise communicate their intentions and commands:—and the apostles, during their absence from certain churches, or in the multiplicity of their engagements, commissioned other men to exercise the same kind of superintendence, at least for a time, or when occasion required. Is it, then, too much to conclude that, in this well-known practice of the inspired teachers of the Christian church, we find the stamp of divine approbation impressed upon a system of ecclesiastical government and subordination such as that which obtained in the church after the death of the apostles? The final removal of the first governors of the infant church may naturally have been regarded by the members of that church as a warning that the time was come in which their temporary provisions and regulations (if they were no more) should be made permanent. If absence from the Churches of Ephesus or Crete, or inability to give a personal attention to their affairs, caused St. Paul to supply them with temporary governors, or perhaps with a succession of governors to the end of his life, was it too much to infer, that the final departure of all the apostles from the world rendered it necessary that permanent governors should be appointed in all the churches, if they did not already exist? And may not an episcopalian of

the present day be permitted to say, that he feels himself bound to regard the apostolic precedent as an indication of his Lord's will, which extends in its consequences to the existing church?

It is certain, moreover, that such a view of the case was taken by many individuals and churches within the space of a hundred years after the death of the apostles; and even that a form of episcopal government was generally established, so far as circumstances would permit, before the close of the second century;—that, during a considerable space of time, no diversity of views respecting this form of government subsisted among even those Christians or communities who differed from each other on points of doctrine;—and that, in more modern times, the opinion of disinterested and impartial judges has been often given in its favour. As to the antiquity of the institution, it may be remarked that Tertullian, who flourished about the year 200, declares that the line of bishops extended from his time upwards to the days of St. John; (*ordo episcoporum ad originem recensens, in Joannem stabit auctorem. Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. c. 5.*) And, with reference to opinions on the subject deducible from Scripture, it may be worthy of notice, that a learned commentator of our own age and country,—himself not a member of the episcopal Church of England,—has recorded his decision in the following terms:—"Episcopacy in the church of God is of divine appointment, and should be maintained and respected." "Deacon, presbyter, and bishop, existed in the apostolic church, and may, therefore, be considered of divine origin." (DR. ADAM CLARKE, on 1 Tim. iii. 1, 13.)

To these considerations no man can charitably forbid us to add a conviction, that, in the present state of society and of the church, an episcopal constitution is, in many respects, the best and most efficient, at least in our own country. We may claim a right also to cherish a persuasion, that it is at once lawful and expedient, under such a constitution of the church, to commit certain functions exclusively to the chief ministers or bishops, and especially to follow the example of early churches in entrusting to them the power of ordination, at least so far as to enact that the laying on of the hands of presbyters shall be null

and void without the concurrence of a bishop. And, lastly, we may be allowed to attach some importance to a conscious feeling of security in our preference of an episcopal constitution over every other; to entertain a pleasing belief, that, in a matter which has given rise to great discussion, and in which many learned arguments have been adduced on opposite sides, we are certainly safe in conforming to an institution which seems to be supported by at least as many reasons as any other, and which has, moreover, the preference of ancient churches in its favour.

On these grounds, few and simple as they are, we may safely defend a conscientious adherence to episcopacy, and may claim liberty to retain and to act upon the conviction that it is a wise and good institution, and in its origin divine. But, together with this assertion of our own liberty, we are undoubtedly bound to exercise charity and candour towards other men, and other institutions. And perhaps we fall very short of a due degree of charity and candour, unless we are ready to forego any exclusive claims or pretensions in our own favour. We may reasonably believe that episcopacy is a divine institution; but we have no right to contend that it is the only system to which that honour is attached. It is generally allowed by the advocates of episcopacy that, at first, the system of subordination was established only in the larger cities, or the more extensive churches. It may be as easy to prove the early existence, and the present lawfulness, of a presbyterian constitution (for instance), as to establish the same points in favour of an episcopal establishment. And as it may be wise and useful to adopt the primitive episcopal model in one age or country, so it may be equally wise and useful to adopt the primitive presbyterian model in another.

But, although we should enter on dangerous ground, and commit a breach of the Christian peace, by seeking to uphold the dignity or credit of an episcopal institution to the exclusion of all others, we may yet feel ourselves unalterably secure in our own adherence to it. From some parts of the practice of the apostles, and from some notices in the early history of the

church, we infer the propriety, and even the divine designation, of an episcopal government; and hence we may not only feel ourselves bound to conform to such an institution, but may claim a right, in the face of the whole Christian church, to act upon this conviction. This ground is clear, and the position impregnable. If we are content to occupy it, no arguments or sophistry can avail to weaken our attachment to episcopacy, or to induce a doubt respecting the propriety of our choice. We build upon facts which history can never fail to confirm. We are not guilty of any breach of charity or kindness, and we are therefore exposed to no misgivings respecting our right, as Christians, to persevere in an attachment to our cause. And, more than this, we feel confident that no man can censure our most determined and pertinacious adherence to our chosen system, without a want of humility and candour on his part, sufficient of itself to give us an immeasurable superiority in the argument. All rival claims, as moderate as our own, may be freely allowed without the slightest detriment to our cause; while others, less temperate or more overbearing, will stand self-condemned, not only as being less easily supported by historic facts, but also as manifesting a comparatively unchristian spirit, and thus occupying a far lower position.

Having stated what appear to be the strong grounds of episcopacy, I must now take notice of another argument in favour of the system, drawn from the analogy of God's providential dealings with mankind, and especially from his dispensations with reference to the church. The order of the hierarchy, it is said, is perfectly like that which we observe in nature, and in those institutions which are confessedly divine. It resembles, also, that form of church polity which certainly proceeded from divine appointment. Nor can we suppose, it is sometimes added, that the great head of the Christian Church would have omitted to make some such provision for the harmony and consistency of His spiritual body, as that which would be found in the apostolic episcopal church if universally established and duly respected. The idea is very beautiful; and it is one which may easily present itself to a devout Chris-

tian mind. But any arguments of this kind are open to serious objection; and to insist upon them may perhaps only weaken our cause. Different analogies may present themselves to different minds; and hence, in many cases, such reasoning in favour of episcopacy would be at least powerless. Besides, if the system of arguing from analogy be admitted at all, in connexion with this subject, it may be pursued to a dangerous extent, or in a direction altogether unfriendly to the conclusions we would establish. For instance, one man may argue, from the analogy of the Jewish institutions, that if our Lord had indeed designed to establish episcopacy, he would have given clear and positive instructions on the subject, and these instructions would have been recorded in the written word. Or again, even supposing that our Saviour had designed to introduce the system merely by force of example, and had chosen to try the faith and humility of his church by waiting for its compliance with a slight and obscure expression of his will, still, it may be said, in order to remove doubt and difficulties in after ages, he would probably have exercised such a providential care over the history of the infant church, that we should now possess a clear and indubitable testimony concerning the appointment and succession of bishops in the second century, instead of the few broken fragments and documents of doubtful authority which have, in fact, come down to us. Analogy would lead us to suppose that He would have done this; for He has mercifully preserved the precious volume of inspiration against the malice of enemies, and amidst the wrecks of time.—Analogy may be very useful in confirming the views of a person whose mind may have been already convinced by sound and strong reasons for episcopacy; but it would be unwise to insist upon it as a real and independent proof, or to place it in the foreground of an argument.

It is surely at once a part of Christian charity, and a matter of obvious expediency, not to insist too strongly upon doubtful points in ecclesiastical matters; or to claim as on our side what may perhaps prove to be against us. The study of Christian antiquities may show that questions do exist, in connexion

with the origin and claims of episcopacy, which, if positively decided and maintained in the affirmative by any one set of persons, must lead to unpleasant differences, and perhaps to a want of Christian sympathy, between those who ought to "love as brethren." Let the advocates of different systems of church government treat each other, not merely with forbearance, but with unfeigned respect. None of the prevalent systems of the present day can afford to maintain any exclusive or haughty claims in the face of history. Nor can such claims consist with charity. I do not think that the advocate of any other form of church government, or the member of any other church, can tell me, consistently with truth and charity, that my own episcopal church, as such, is anti-scriptural and sinful; but neither can I feel myself at liberty to declare the same concerning his church or churches, be their constitution what it may. I may also exercise and manifest a decided opinion in favour of episcopacy; but, with all this preference, I can have no just cause to treat any other institution with contempt or scorn. And besides this, there are strong reasons why my conclusions in favour of episcopacy, although sufficient to satisfy my own mind and to influence my choice, ought yet to be not too positive, universal, or exclusive. There are many particulars of detail connected with every episcopal constitution, which, though they have been often strongly asserted, can never be proved. The following questions, for example, may well be left open; being such as will always receive different answers from different inquirers.

Did our Lord design to establish, by precept and example, one or more permanent, unalterable systems of government and ministry in his church,—or did He deem it sufficient to lay down general principles on this subject, leaving each church at liberty to arrange its particular form of government and method of administration, always indeed in conformity with the general principles established, but yet with variety of detail, according to the differences of time, country, civil government, and other circumstances? Facts may be adduced in support of either hypothesis. Some persons, also, may regard the former dispen-

sation as alone agreeable to the nature of an all-wise and unchangeable Founder, and consistent with the unalterable nature of truth and the fitness of things; while others may be disposed to prefer the latter, and to think that they discover, in its plastic nature and facility of adaptation, a remarkable trace of the wisdom and benevolence of its Author, an accordance with the genius of a religion designed for universal adoption, and an admirable provision for love, harmony, and peace among all the branches of the great family of Christ in every age and nation.

Did not the apostles construct the Christian church, for the most part, upon the model of the Jewish synagogue, intending that several presbyters or elders should preside over the conduct of divine worship, some of whom should "labour in the word and doctrine," while others should act as presidents or rulers of the synagogue? And is it not possible that they designed that each society should be complete and independent, after the first settlement of the churches by themselves and their coadjutors, or by any others who should act as evangelists or missionaries? Doubtless there are strong reasons in support of those who reply to these questions in the negative; but are there not also grounds for the affirmative, sufficient to justify any man who may view the matter in this light, and who may choose to regulate his practice accordingly?

Did the apostles intend that the power of ordination should be exclusively assigned to a certain class of ministers, who should succeed themselves in the government of the churches, —that is, to bishops? And did they intend that a succession of such ministers should be preserved by a formal and visible derivation of authority from themselves and the first bishops? Or did they expect that ministers would be continually provided by the choice or authority of whole churches, with the concurrence of those who already sustained the office of presbyters or pastors? Did they, in any way, sanction the doctrines commonly connected with the theory of apostolic succession? If an apostolic succession had been designed from the first, it may reasonably be supposed that the apostles would

have made some pointed allusion to such a provision [for the transmission of the faith and for the peace of the church, especially in the course of their warnings against false doctrines and divisions. But although such warnings are numerous, they contain no intimations of any such bulwark of sound doctrine and centre of Christian unity. St. Paul, in full prospect of the attempts of false teachers, did not charge the elders of Ephesus to abide by the decisions and doctrines of a bishop, but he desired them to take heed to themselves, and then commended them to God. St. Peter, in the prospect of his death, and with direct allusion to the expected event, when some reference to his "successor," or to the bishop for the time being, would seem to have been almost unavoidable, contents himself, however, with endeavouring to keep up the remembrance of the truth by composing a written document, and by referring his readers to the ancient prophecies and to the immediate teaching of the apostles,—in other words, to the Old and New Testaments. "Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. . . . We have also a (Gr. *the*) more sure word of prophecy." (2 Pet. i. 15, 19.) "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you. . . . This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance; that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour." (2 Pet. ii. 1; iii. 1, 2.) Now here is a simple reference to the Bible as the defender of the faith, with complete silence as to the necessity, or safety, of adhering to the opinions or decisions of a bishop in matters of Christian doctrine. But no such silence is observed by the writer of epistles ascribed to Ignatius.—perhaps some interpolator who wrote after the introduction of novel doctrines concerning the episcopal office and the nature of the church, and probably for the very purpose of propagating those doctrines. Thus, in the epistle to the Trallians, after a warning concerning the danger of false doctrines and their teachers, we read, "Be on your



guard therefore against them. And this you will be, if you are not inflated with pride, and if you remain inseparably attached to God—Jesus Christ, *and to the bishop*, and to the ordinances of the apostles. He who is within the altar is pure, [but he that is without is not pure,] that is, he who does anything without the bishop, and the presbytery, and the deacon, he is not pure in his conscience." (*Ep. ad Trall.* § 7.) To the Philadelphians the following advice is given:—"Children of light and truth, shun division and false doctrine, but where the shepherd [*i. e.*, the bishop] is, thither do you follow as the sheep. For many grievous [or, plausible] wolves, by means of false pleasure, captivate the followers of God; but in your unity they will find no place. (*Ep. ad Philad.* § 2.—*Conf. Ep. ad Magnes.* § 13; *ad Smyrn.* § 7, 8.)—Whatever may become of apostolic succession as a theory or institute, it is impossible, at all events, to prove the fact of such succession, or to trace it down the stream of time. In this case, the fact seems to involve the doctrine; and if the fact be hopelessly obscure, the doctrine is irrecoverably lost. But can we suppose that the divine author of our religion has suffered any part of his Gospel to perish? It is, of course, possible that a truly apostolic succession may have existed, although the traces of it may have entirely disappeared; but must we not allow men to regard such a loss as contributing to render the whole doctrine and institute extremely doubtful? Should we not weaken the good cause of episcopacy by insisting upon pretensions which cannot be established, and which may really be fictitious? It is impossible to prove the personal succession of modern bishops, in an unbroken episcopal line, from the apostles, or men of the apostolic age. As a matter of history and fact, apostolic succession, in this acceptance of the term, is an absolute nonentity. Call it a theory, a fiction, a vision, or whatever you choose, you cannot give it a name too shadowy and unsubstantial. It exists, indeed, as an honest prejudice in the minds of many sincere Christians, and so far it is entitled to consideration and respect. But in itself it is an empty sound. Doubtless, the custom of setting apart men for the Christian ministry by the laying on

of hands has existed in the church from the apostolic age; having been originally derived from the practice of the Jewish synagogue, under which institution all who were appointed as fixed ministers, to take care of the performance of religious duties, were solemnly appointed to their office in this manner. The hands of the apostles and their contemporaries form, therefore, the first link of a chain which has extended to the present day; and this circumstance is a pleasing subject of contemplation to the minds of many persons, and especially to the members of those churches which have retained the custom. But we must be in possession of many other particulars, which are irrecoverably lost, in order to build upon this fact the doctrine of a succession, derived from the apostles themselves, in the line of bishops alone, and for the conveyance of a peculiar grace!

Again:—The various modifications which the Christian ministry has undergone since the days of the apostles and the second century, although they furnish no arguments against episcopacy itself, will yet present serious difficulties if the institution be defended on false grounds, or maintained with too haughty claims.—We learn, for example, from the records of Christian antiquity, that, after the formation of the hierarchy, it was the theory of the church that the bishop was the administrator of the word and sacraments throughout his diocese, while the presbyters were regarded as acting only in the capacity of his substitutes, or by virtue of a commission received from him. Now, this ancient theory was founded upon a still more ancient *fact*. And some persons may be disposed to maintain that, because theory is one thing and fact another, and because the functions of the minister now called a bishop are not identical with the functions of either the apostles or the bishops of the primitive church, we have therefore departed from the original institution, and consequently the church of the present day possesses not only no successors of the apostles, but not even their counterparts or resemblance. An episcopalian may be permitted to say, that the changes which have taken place are not essential,—that they are only such as the

church had authority to make, from time to time,—and that, therefore, they furnish no argument against his favourite form of church government. But here, though he may be firm, he must be modest. In the due exercise of moderation, and of a love of truth, peace, and concord, he cannot but allow that the matter may easily appear in a different light to the mind of another man, and that such an one may be more than justified in preferring a church constructed differently from our own. The duties of bishops in the early part of the second century were not confined, either in theory or practice, to the office of ordaining and governing presbyters, and of administering confirmation; but such bishops were the ordinary ministers of divine offices in the congregation. And it is remarkable that St. Paul, in his addresses to Timothy and Titus, lays greater stress upon their qualifications as ministers of the gospel, that is, expounders of God's word and teachers of Christian truth, than upon those which related to their duties of superintendence and government. Besides this, the bishops of the primitive churches were immediately concerned with the administration of discipline; and they were expected to possess a personal acquaintance with all the individual Christians of their diocese, whether ministers or people. The shadow of all this remains to the present day; although it is true that our bishops, as such, are not the fixed ministers of any parish or congregation; and that they do not personally watch over the morals and conduct of laymen. To the mind of an episcopalian, however, the identity of their office with that of earlier bishops may satisfactorily appear. But can we, consistently with Christian charity and love of truth, contest the point very strongly with any man who may say that, in his judgment, our bishops are not bishops according to the primitive pattern? Is not this a point on which, while we may claim the right of retaining our own opinion and practice, we are also bound to concede to any other man the liberty of thinking or acting differently?

Other modifications of the Christian ministry may be discovered upon inspecting the records of antiquity. Thus, the mode of appointing bishops and presbyters to their office has

been repeatedly changed. Election by the people, for instance, has been discontinued. This is, indeed, in the estimation of episcopalians, a great improvement: but still, as they must allow, it is a change.—Again, bishops have been lately appointed by secular princes. This also is a system which many persons would strenuously uphold, thanking God that kings and queens have been nursing fathers and mothers to the church. But yet, it was not thus from the beginning.—Several offices of the Christian ministry, which were known to the apostles, have been discontinued. We call those offices extraordinary and temporary, and think that their discontinuance does not affect the doctrine of three orders in Christ's church "from the apostles' time." But other Christians may be otherwise minded on this subject. They may contend that the office of an evangelist or itinerant missionary, empowered to preach to the heathen, to found and settle churches, and to ordain ministers, was designed to be as perpetual as that of a bishop, or, at least, to be attached to the church as long as there should remain any portions of the world unconverted to the faith of Christ. And this bears upon the doctrine of episcopacy, because it is closely connected with another more general doctrine, namely, that of the three orders.—And for the same reason the following considerations may be brought into the account. The office of deacon has suffered great modifications since the primitive times. The *functions* of deacons are not exactly the same as they were at first; and long was the tradition retained that, according to the apostolic institution, the *number* of these ministers was necessarily limited to seven, even in so large a church as that of Rome. Deaconesses, again, were recognised by the apostles among the regular ministers of the church; but in our episcopal communion they are not found. The Church of England may reasonably claim permission to differ in this respect from the apostolic church (for instance) of Cenchrea. She may demand in this particular, as well as in many others, to be left unmolested in the exercise of her own judgment, and to be suffered to dwell at peace in the midst of her own harmonious

institutions, rejoicing in having wisely copied some parts of the primitive and apostolic model, and in having as wisely neglected others. But then, at the same time, she cannot, consistently with a love of truth and peace, censure or despise any other Christian churches which may have been constituted upon principles different from her own.

Such modifications as those which have taken place in the constitution of the church demand, or rather presuppose, a considerable liberty of sentiment and latitude of practice. We have departed, to a certain extent, from the primitive model, without essentially deviating from the rules and example of our Lord and his apostles. Let this be granted. But, then, what follows? Certainly, that if any church should depart from our own model, and recur to that of the primitive times in every respect, such a society would be at least as apostolic as our own:—and even that if any society should make other variations in a different direction, but yet no greater than our own, that society also would be equally apostolic, so far as may relate to its polity. It has often been thought that our dioceses are much too large; and Bingham very truly remarks that, in case of a considerable reduction of the dioceses all over England, such an arrangement would be only “a change from one primitive model to another.” In like manner, if a church should resolve to acknowledge no archbishops but such as should succeed each other from among the diocesans according to seniority, this would be only a recurrence to a model which existed at an early period in Africa. If another church should resolve that its presbyters should succeed to the office of bishop according to the same rule, such an institution, although in our opinion extremely inconvenient, would perhaps be a correct imitation of primitive practice, and could not be censured as a greater or more essential change than many which have occurred. Or even, as an instance of more decided variation, if a church should resolve to be governed by bishops holding office only for a term of years, we could not be justified, after all our own modifications of the episcopal office, in charging such a church with having made an unwarrantable innovation.

Would not that church be able to contend that its modifications, although different from our own, were yet no greater or more fatal?

Lessons of moderation, candour, and Christian charity may be continually learnt by a careful examination of church history and antiquities. Great mischief and many dissensions have arisen from refusing to acknowledge certain questions to be doubtful or open, which yet have never been determined, and which it is not needful to compress within narrow limits. Many disputes would have been avoided, for example, if a certain latitude of opinion had been generally conceded with reference to the nature and number of clerical orders. If the question concerning the identity of the orders of presbyter and bishop had always been treated with perfect candour, how many refinements upon truth, contradictions of truth, and breaches of charity, would have been avoided! The Church of Rome acknowledges the identity of the orders of presbyter and bishop; and accordingly enumerates the "three greater or holy orders," as those of priest, deacon, and subdeacon; but some Romish writers (Medina, Bellarmin, Estius) maintain that the episcopate is an order distinct from that of the priesthood. The Church of England reckons the three holy orders as those of bishop, priest, and deacon; but divines of her communion have differed among themselves concerning the identity of the two orders of bishop and priest. Presbyterians, Independents, and others, look upon this matter in altogether a different light. It were vain to hope for any settlement of this question by reference to Scripture, to history, or to both combined. It were useless to attempt to produce any uniformity of opinion on such a subject, as long as the records remain unaltered, and the mind of man continues to be what it is. But, surely, there yet remains "a more excellent way." Without any precise agreement in opinion, without any prevailing uniformity of practice, there yet may be harmony of feeling, and true unity and concord, throughout the churches. Only let Christian charity have her perfect work, and she will reveal herself in all majesty and beauty, as at once the friend of truth and the minister of peace.

It is worse than vain for one church or party to upbraid another with ignorant or wilful departure from the principles or institutions of the Gospel, on questions relating to church government. On such a subject, any charge of want of honesty and candour is almost as bad as the fault alleged. Not only have individuals and churches differed from each other on these points, but even learned divines have changed their own opinion. Cranmer and Stillingfleet, for instance, changed their views with regard to the original identity of presbyters and bishops. And to what cause must we attribute such a change? Should we be justified in charging those great and learned men with dishonesty, intention to deceive, unjustifiable carelessness, or any other dereliction of their duty as ministers and advocates of truth? We should scorn to cast such an imputation upon their memory on any such grounds. *Honi soit qui mal y pense!* But yet there must be some cause for the conflicting statements which appear upon the face of their writings. What is it? Perhaps, either the difficulty of the subject concerning which they maintained different opinions,—or its extreme simplicity, combined with the apprehension of a difficulty where there was really none.

I have thus put together a few thoughts which have arisen in my mind while I have been particularly conversant with works relating to the history and antiquities of the Christian church. Perhaps even those grounds of episcopacy, which I have described as certain and strong, may be regarded by some persons in a different light; while others may think that clear certainty and evidence attach to those which I have ventured to describe as doubtful. But such difference of opinion will not trouble either my readers or myself if we are duly influenced by Christian humility and a peaceful love of truth. Pride has been one great cause of controversies and contentions in the church; and therefore humility, and a modest opinion of self, may justly be regarded as one great means of preserving peace. Humility in the heads and counsellors of churches would preserve peace between their own communities and others. Humility and modesty in the inferior ministers of

religion, who have voluntarily made themselves subject to ecclesiastical authority, would compel them cheerfully to render canonical obedience to their superiors, to manifest all due respect to their persons, and to pay a becoming deference to their opinions. A love of truth, indeed, will forbid more than this; but Christian humility will be satisfied with nothing less. And, in like manner, a due measure of humility and self-distrust in all members of the church would induce them to submit themselves, in a meek and docile spirit, to all their “governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters,” while yet they properly regard God’s written word as the only authoritative teacher, and, in one sense, “call no man master upon earth.” “Only by pride cometh contention; but with the well advised is wisdom.” (Prov. xiii. 10.) Humility, indeed, does not require us to submit our judgment unreservedly to the decrees of general councils, or to the opinion of any individual teacher: but it forbids a petulant or contumacious opposition even to the most manifest errors; it enables a teacher to endure the manifestation of doubts or contradiction, while it obliges an objector to propose his doubts modestly, and to offer contradiction with gentleness and meekness;—and it effectually extracts all fury, bitterness, and venom, from theological controversy.

Who that has read the history of the church can repeat that term—*theological controversy*—without a sigh? Investigation and exposition of facts or opinions, if conducted in a Christian temper, tend to the discovery or establishment of truth, and are followed by no evil consequences. But quarrels and dissensions, concerning either truth or error, tend to obscure and mystify the subjects under debate, and lead to no good result. Such wretched controversy cannot benefit the church, or assist in enlightening the world; much less can it cherish the flame of pure religion in the souls of individuals, or help them towards the attainment of everlasting life. “I wis,” says the pious Bishop Hall, “it will be long enough ere we shall wrangle ourselves into heaven. It must be true contrition, pure consciences, holy affections, heavenly dispositions,



heartly devotion, sound regeneration, faith working by love, an humble walking with God, that shall help us thither\*.”

There are some sound and practical remarks in Bishop Butler's second sermon upon the Love of our Neighbour, which bear very strongly upon this subject. The following passage cannot be too often quoted, or too attentively considered. “As to the spirit of party, which unhappily prevails amongst mankind, whatever are the distinctions which serve for a supply to it, some or other of which have obtained in all countries, one who is friendly to his kind will immediately make due allowances for it, as what cannot but be amongst such creatures as men, in such a world as this. And, as wrath and fury and overhearing upon these occasions proceed, as I may speak, *from men's feeling only on their own side*; so, a common feeling, for others as well as for ourselves, would render us sensible to this truth,—which it is strange can have so little influence,—that *we ourselves differ from others just as much as they do from us*. I put the matter in this way, because it can scarce be expected that the generality of men should see that those things which are made the occasions of dissension and fomenting the party spirit are really nothing at all: but it may be expected from all people, *how much soever they are in earnest about their respective peculiarities*, that humanity, and common good-will to their fellow-creatures, should moderate and restrain that wretched spirit.”

Would that churches and disputants were content to say to each other concerning many points of controversy,—and especially concerning subjects of debate relating to the constitution and government of the church,—These questions are either so difficult that we shall never settle them, or they are so broad that we need not quarrel over them; and therefore, whatever may be the difference of our views, we will at all events live in peace, and love as brethren, as we hope to dwell together hereafter in the regions of harmony and bliss!

OXFORD,

J. E. R.

October 11th, 1839.

\* Preface to *Select Thoughts*.



# CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

---

## BOOK I.

### LIVES AND WRITINGS OF THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

---

#### PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

It is the object of this Introductory Book to give a general account of the writings of the earliest Christian Fathers, arranged, as far as possible, in chronological order. An accurate acquaintance with the whole works of the Ante-Nicene writers, in the original languages, such as ought to be possessed by every ecclesiastical controversialist or critic, must be the fruit of much learning and study; but there is a lower degree of knowledge on this subject, which ought to be attained by students who seek to profit by the labours of more profound theologians; and this, like much of their early information, may be profitably received at second hand. And it appears to be more especially important that the readers of a work on Christian Antiquities should not be altogether strangers to those early records to which, in the course of such a work, appeal or reference is continually made. Under this impression, I have resolved to lay before the readers of the following pages some preliminary information respecting the lives and writings of the Fathers who flourished during the first three centuries; and I have confined my notices to authors of this early date, both because the high antiquity of these works imparts to them a peculiar importance, and because it would have been impossible to give any useful analysis of the voluminous works of the following century, within the limits of the present undertaking.

In the following work, the writings of the Fathers are used historically, as monuments bearing witness to the customs and observances of the times in which they were composed. It is, indeed, chiefly in this point of view that these venerable remains of ecclesiastical writers are valuable to the student of the present

day. We do not profess to assent to all their arguments, to receive all their interpretations, or to adopt all their opinions and doctrines. In these particulars, their works present us with a most heterogeneous mixture of what is good and bad, true and false, sound and fanciful, sober and extravagant; and we take the liberty of rejecting whatever may be wrong or unprofitable, while we thankfully appropriate to our own use whatever may be instructive, rational, or devout. But these writers are also historians of the Church, and reporters of its customs and practices in successive ages; and therefore we have recourse to their writings for information on matters of ecclesiastical antiquity, just as we refer to the works of heathen orators, historians, and poets, for a large proportion of our knowledge relating to the antiquities of Greece or Rome. It is obvious, however, that a learned inquirer, in endeavouring to derive from the writings of the Fathers the historical or antiquarian knowledge which they are adapted to convey, must read those works throughout; and that, in the course of his studies, he must become acquainted with the various arguments, opinions, and speculations, which they record. It is plain, also, that the mere reader of the works of modern ecclesiastical historians or critics labours under a great disadvantage as long as he is an entire stranger to the names of the authors, and the titles of the works, which are cited as the sources of information; while, on the other hand, a general knowledge of the history of those writers, and of the date and contents of their particular treatises, may serve not only to give an interest to such allusions or references, but to lead to some just estimate of their value, and to infix them on the memory. In order, therefore, to enable the reader of this Manual to make a profitable, though not a learned, acquaintance with the Ante-Nicene Fathers, I propose to draw a short sketch of their lives or personal history, to represent the order in which they succeeded each other, to arrange the works of each writer chronologically, and to give an analysis or outline of those books which have been preserved entire. And, still with no higher design than that of assisting the reader to form, so to speak, some kind of personal acquaintance with these Fathers, I shall sometimes state a few of their private opinions or speculations, their philosophical tenets.

or their interpretations of holy Scripture; selecting especially such of these as may possess any peculiar or striking features.

These outlines and sketches will, doubtless, exhibit many particulars in which the writings of the Fathers are more curious than useful, inasmuch as they record errors and false reasoning, rather than correct views of truth, or sound expositions of Scripture. But let it always be remembered that such failings may be attributed not so much to the writers themselves as to the times in which they lived; that these are matters on which our divines do not appeal to their authority; and that their value as historians or reporters of the actual transactions of the existing Church is not diminished by the weakness of their reasoning, the absurdity of their speculations, or their fanciful and mistaken systems of doctrine or of scriptural interpretation.

Concerning this portion of the volume, I may with especial propriety address the reader in the following words of an old English author:—"If thou beest learned, as thou needest it not, so I humbly entreat thee to know that I writ it not for thee; yet I bar thee not the reading, but most willingly submit it to thy censure. Some, and worthily, in regard of their great activity and judgment, like nothing for themselves but that which transcendeth common capacities. I do not think myself able to give them satisfaction. For thee which art but a beginner have I laboured<sup>1</sup>."

The writers whose lives and works will thus fall under our notice are the following:—Clement of Rome; Ignatius; Polycarp; Justin Martyr; Hermias; Hegesippus; Tatian; Dionysius of Corinth; Athenagoras; Theophilus of Antioch; Irenæus; Clement of Alexandria; Tertullian; Minucius Felix; Origen; Cyprian; Dionysius the Great, of Alexandria; Gregory of Neocæsarea, or Thaumaturgus; Arnobius; Lactantius; and Eusebius. The book will conclude with a notice of the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons.

<sup>1</sup> For the substance of this book I am indebted chiefly to the first six volumes of SCHROECK'S *Kirchengeschichte*. See also DU PIN'S *Bibliotheca Patrum*, or *History of Ecclesiastical Writers*; SCULTETI *Medullæ Theologiæ Patrum Syntagma*.

## CHAPTER I.

## CLEMENT OF ROME.

CLEMENT, bishop of Rome, is supposed by some writers to have been the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians<sup>2</sup>. Neither the date of his appointment to the superintendence of the church, nor the time of his death, can be exactly ascertained; but it is probable that he succeeded two former bishops, Linus and Anacletus (or Cletus), at the latter end of the first century, perhaps about the year 91 or 92, and that he died about A.D. 100.

Some disorders having arisen in the church of Corinth, in consequence of opposition offered by certain members of that church to their presbyters or teachers, Clement wrote an epistle to that community, with a view to allay these dissensions. This celebrated *Epistle to the Corinthians*, written probably about the year 96, was addressed in the name of the church of Rome to that of Corinth; nor does the writer, in any part of it, speak of himself by name. It was so highly esteemed by the early Christians, that it was publicly read in their religious assemblies, in the same manner as the apostolical epistles, (EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 16.) It contains gentle and brotherly exhortations to peace, expressed in a simple style, resembling that of the apostles in the practical or hortatory parts of their epistles. The writer frequently quotes and refers to the books of the New Testament, which, at the time he wrote, were generally known to Christians, although not collected into one volume. The first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians is mentioned by name; quotations are made from other Epistles of that apostle, from the

<sup>2</sup> This is, at least, uncertain. It has been remarked that Irenæus, in recounting the advantages enjoyed by Clement, in having had personal intercourse with the apostles, omits all mention of the apostolic testimony in question,—an omission which can hardly be supposed to have taken place, if Clement of Rome had been, indeed, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul. But this identity is affirmed by Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 15), Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 4, 15), Origen (*in Johan.* i. 29), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxvii. 6).

Epistle to the Hebrews, and from the Epistles of St. Peter and St. James, but without name. The epistle displays no assumption of authority on the part of the bishop or church of Rome: it contains incidentally some remarkable allusions to the true and proper divinity of our Saviour; but it consists for the most part of exhortations to concord, humility, and other Christian virtues.

This venerable remnant of antiquity appears to have been disfigured by interpolations in later times; and it has been supposed that various passages have been transferred hither from the writings of Clement of Alexandria. Allusions to the existence of a high-priest, priests, and Levites, among Christians, (or, as some suppose, to the Jewish high-priest, priests, and Levites, but still with a significant reference to the Christian ministry,) and to the distinction between clergy and laity, are evidently the work of a later date; for Clement himself was not even aware of a distinction between bishops and presbyters,—terms which, in fact, he uses as synonymous (c. 42, 44).—It is quite possible that some of the errors contained in the epistle may have proceeded from Clement himself. Among these, we may reckon various misapplications of Scripture; and an allusion to the fabulous story of the phoenix and its restoration, in proof of the possibility of the future resurrection of the dead.

There is a *fragment of a Second Epistle to the Corinthians* attributed to Clement, which, however, is usually regarded as spurious. It is supposed by some writers to have been forged about the middle of the third century<sup>3</sup>. Other writings have been attributed to Clement, which are undoubtedly spurious. These are *The Recognitions*, which may have been written as early as the middle of the second century; *An Epistle to James, our Lord's brother*; *Clementines (Homilies)*; and *The Apostolical Constitutions and Canons*, of which more hereafter<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Ἡδη δὲ καὶ ἕτερα πολυεπῆ καὶ μακρὰ συγγράμματα ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐχθές καὶ πρόην τινὲς προήγαγον, Πέτρον δὲ καὶ Ἀπίωνος διαλόγου περιέχοντα· ὧν οὐδ' ὄλωσ μνήμη τις παρὰ τοῖς παλαιαῖς φέρεται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ καθαρὸν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀποσώζει τὸν χα-

ρακτῆρα. EUSEB. *Hist Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 38.

<sup>4</sup> “The *Recognitions* and *Homilies* which bear his (Clement's) name, and the *Constitutions* and *Canons* of the Apostles, which have sometimes been ascribed to him, are such palpable

Two epistles under the name of Clement, in Syriac, published by Wetstein in 1752, have been abundantly proved to be the work of a much later hand. (VENEMA, *Epist. ad Wesseling.*; LARDNER'S *Dissertations upon the two Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome.*)

The following is an analysis of Clement's genuine *Epistle to the Corinthians*.—In the beginning of this epistle, the writer, having commended the good order and peace which formerly prevailed in the Corinthian church, laments the rise of disorders and dissensions, which he traces to the prevalence of jealousy and ill-will; the evil effects of which he details at large, especially as displayed in many instances recorded in holy Scripture, (Gen. iv. 3—8; xxviii. 37; Exod. ii. 14; Numb. xii. 15<sup>5</sup>; xvi. 33; 1 Sam. xviii. 8, seq.; 2 Cor. xi. 23—27.) Clement then exhorts the Corinthian Christians to return to a better mind; and brings forward several examples and quotations from Scripture in proof of the benefits of repentance, faith, and obedience, (Noah, probably with allusion to 2 Pet. ii. 5; Jonah iii.; Ezek. xxxiii. 11; xviii. 30; Ps. ciii. 10, 11; Jer. iii. 19—22; Isa. i. 16—20; Enoch; Noah; Abraham, with reference to James ii. 23, or Isa. xli. 8; and quotations from Gen. xii. 1—3; xiii. 14—16; xv. 5, 6; Rom. iv. 3; deliverance of Lot from Sodom; Rahab, with quotations from Josh. iii.,) adding a particular commendation of humility and meekness, (Jer. ix. 23; Luke vi. 36—38; Isa. lxvi. 2.) He advises the Corinthians especially to have nothing to do with quarrelsome persons, and movers of sedition, (Prov. ii. 21; Ps. xxxvii. 35—37;) but to attach themselves to those who piously studied peace, and not to such as made a merely hypocritical pretence of a peaceable disposition, (Isa.

forgeries, if they were really meant to deceive, that it would be a waste of critical labour to prove that they were not written by Clement. They are not without their use, as speaking the sentiments of the times in which they were really composed; but they have no connexion with the ecclesiastical history of the first century, except as preserving a few traditions, which may perhaps have been founded upon

truth." BUNTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*, Lect. xi.

<sup>5</sup> The allusion to this passage, made apparently from memory, is not quite correct; inasmuch as the author speaks of both Aaron and Miriam as having been excluded from the camp, while the sacred text mentions Miriam alone as having suffered that punishment.



xxix. 13; Ps. lxii. 4; lxxviii. 36, 37; xxxi. 18; xii. 3—6.) He exhorts them to humility, by reference to the example of our blessed Saviour, (Isa. liii.; Ps. xxii. 6—8; Matt. xxvii. 43;) and of several saints whose history is recorded in the Old Testament, (Abraham, Gen. xviii. 27;—Job, Job i. 1; xiv. 4, 5;—Moses, Heb. iii. 2, compared with Exod. iii. 11; and a quotation either from some apocryphal book, or from a Jewish tradition, or (possibly) with allusion to Hosea xiii. 3;—David, Ps. lxxxix. 20, compared with Ps. li. 1—17.) Clement adverts in the next place to the order observable in nature, and the subjection of the inanimate creation to the will of the Creator; and then founds a claim to obedience and concord upon the acknowledged goodness of God, and his intimate acquaintance with the thoughts and feelings of the heart, (Prov. xx. 27; Psalm xxxiv. 11—17; xxxii. 10.)

The writer then commences an exhortation to faith in the great Christian doctrine of the resurrection, (with allusions to James i. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Matt. xxiv. 32; Mal. iii. 1; Hab. ii. 3.) He refers to various natural indications of the resurrection, in the alternations of day and night, (*conf.* TERTULLIAN, *de Resurrectione*, § 12; EPIPHAN. *in Ancorato*, § 84;) the decay and growth of seed, the (fabulous) history of the phoenix, (*conf.* TERTULLIAN *de Resurrectione*, § 13; EPIPHAN. *in Ancorato*, § 84; CYRIL. HIERSOL. *Catech.* xviii. 8;) to the declarations of Scripture, (Ps. iii. 5; Job xix. 26;) and to the faithfulness and omnipotence of God, (Wisdom xi. 22; xii. 12; Ps. xix. 1—3.) He exhorts the Corinthians to fear Him who is omnipotent, and from whom no one can escape, (Ps. cxxxix. 6;) and to live in holiness and peace as becomes those whom God has chosen for his own, (Deut. xxii. 8, 9, *Sept.*; allusions to Deut. iv. 34, and some other passage; Prov. iii. 34, or 1 Pet. v. 5; Job xi. 2, 3.) He shows how we may obtain the divine blessing, by reference to the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; that we are justified by divine grace through faith; that we ought not, however, to neglect good works and charity, but rather to be zealous in the performance of every good work, following herein the example of God himself, (who will render to every man according to his works,) and of the holy angels, (Dan. vii. 10; Isa. vi. 3.) He

speaks in high terms of the excellency of the future reward of the righteous, (1 Cor. ii. 9,) and describes the method by which we may become partakers of it; while the way to incur the divine displeasure is that marked out in Ps. l. 16—23<sup>6</sup>. He then speaks of our Lord Jesus Christ in language evidently borrowed from the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially from the first chapter. Afterwards, he exhorts to unity and mutual subjection, with reference to the obedience of soldiers to their officers, and the concord of the several members of the human body, (with evident allusion to 1 Cor. xii. 12—26; recommends sympathy, and a cheerful interchange of good offices; and shows the littleness of man, by quotations from the Book of Job, (iv. 16—18; xv. 15; iv. 19—21; v. 1—5.) The writer then admonishes the Corinthians to preserve order, in matters of divine worship, with regard to time, place, and persons.—(It is here that we find mention of the high priest, priests, deacons, and laity, and such a description of the platform of the Christian ministry and worship, as to induce a strong suspicion in the minds of many critics, that

<sup>6</sup> This part of the epistle contains a beautiful delineation of Christian hope and character. The following extract is important as containing an accurate description of the way of salvation, made known to us in the Gospel. And I quote it the rather, because I have seen various garbled extracts from this part of the epistle which altogether fail to represent the sense of Clement on the subject.—“Let us then earnestly endeavour to be found in the number of those who wait for Him, that we may be partakers of the promised rewards. And how will this be, beloved? If our mind be firm in faith towards God, if we seek the things which are pleasing and acceptable to Him, if we do the things which are agreeable to his holy will, and follow the way of truth, casting away from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strife, malice, and deceit, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vain glory, and the niggardly love of

self. For they who commit such things are hateful to God; and not only they who commit them, but such as take pleasure in them; for the Scripture says, *But unto the ungodly saith God, &c.* (Ps. l. 16—23, here quoted at length.) This is the way, beloved, in which we find our salvation, Jesus Christ, the high priest of our sacrifices, our defender and the helper of our infirmities.” § 35, 36. Clement had previously stated the great doctrine of justification by faith, in the following terms:—“All these obtained glory and honour, not by themselves, or their works, or the righteousness which they wrought, but by His will. And we, therefore, being by His will called in Jesus Christ, are not justified by ourselves, or by our own wisdom, knowledge, or piety, or by works which we have wrought in holiness of heart, but by faith, by which Almighty God has justified all those who have been justified from the beginning of the world.” § 32.

the passage is the work of a later writer, and must be regarded as an interpolation made with a view to support the growth of episcopal authority. Reasons have been advanced for attributing the passage to Clement of Alexandria, from whose works it may have found its way into this epistle. The tone of the suspected passage is unquestionably very different from that of the rest of the epistle.)—The writer reminds his readers that the saints of old were persecuted, not by the righteous, but by the wicked; exhorts them to follow the example of good men, (Ps. xviii. 26;) speaks of the mischiefs occasioned by the Corinthian schism, (Matt. xxvi. 24; xviii. 6; Luke xvii. 2, quoted as one passage;) refers them to St. Paul's first Epistle to their church, (1 Cor. i. 10, &c.,) and describes their present dissensions as more disgraceful than those which had called forth the reproof of the apostle; exhorts them to return to a spirit of concord and brotherly love, (Ps. cxviii. 19, 20; and perhaps an allusion to 1 Cor. x. 33;) and recounts the excellent qualities and benefits of charity, (1 Pet. iv. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 7; Isa. xxvi. 20; Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.) The writer then exhorts the offenders to repent, pointing out the danger of hardening their hearts, with reference to the destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the overthrow of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea; and shows that repentance is acceptable to God, (Ps. lxix. 30, 31; L. 14, 15.) He commends the charity and compassion of Moses, as recorded in Deut. ix. 12—14; Exod. xxxii. 32; and recommends those on whose account the dissensions had arisen to retire, and submit to the will of the majority, "that the flock of Christ may be in peace with its appointed presbyters." Many princes and generals among the heathen, says he, have sacrificed their own lives, or have gone into voluntary banishment for the sake of promoting the public good, or preserving tranquillity; and many among ourselves have surrendered their own liberty, in order to redeem their brethren from captivity,—and he recounts the famous exploits of Judith and Esther, as noble examples of public spirit, even in pious females. He exhorts the Corinthians to the practice of intercessory prayer, and mutual kind reproof, intended for each other's benefit; as the chastisements of God are designed for the good of his children, (Ps. cxviii. 18; Prov. iii. 12; Heb. xii. 6; Ps. cxli. 5; Job v. 17—26.)

The epistle concludes with an exhortation to the authors of the existing dissensions to submit themselves "to the presbyters," (Prov. i. 23—31;) a sublime prayer for the flourishing of Christian graces in the Church<sup>7</sup>; a note respecting the return of the messengers by whose hands the epistle had been sent; and an apostolical benediction and doxology.

#### NOTE CONCERNING SOME SPURIOUS WRITINGS.

"A book entitled *The Shepherd*, (*Ὁ Ποιμὴν*), ascribed to Hermas, who is mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, became generally known about the middle of the second century. It was received by many as the genuine production of the apostolical Hermas, and was publicly read in the Oriental churches. By Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, it was regarded as spurious, or at least of doubtful authenticity. Some suppose it to have been the work of a certain Hermas, brother of Pius I., bishop of Rome; and to have been written by him about the year 140.—It is a moral fiction, well meant, but weakly conceived. An angel, in the form of a shepherd, is represented as appearing to the author, and instructing him in various points of Christian duty, by visions and similitudes. A great part of the book consists of an imitation or accommodation of the Apocalypse. It contains some erroneous and strange doctrines; such as, that every man is attended by a good and a bad angel, the former of whom entices him to holiness and virtue, and the latter tempts him to sin; and that marriage is not dissolved by adultery and divorce. It is uncertain whether the writer of this treatise intended to impose upon the church by these pretended revelations, with a view to establish his peculiar opinions, or was himself deceived by the influence of an overheated imagination. Perhaps we may not be wrong in supposing that the author

<sup>7</sup> "May all the-seeing God, the ruler of spirits and Lord of all flesh, who has chosen the Lord Jesus Christ, and us by him for a peculiar people, grant unto every soul that calls upon his glorious and holy name, faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, tempe-

rance, holiness, and wisdom, unto all well-pleasing, through our high-priest and advocate Jesus Christ; through whom be unto Him all glory, majesty, might, and honour, now and for ever. Amen."

ought not to lie under either of these imputations; but that the work was professedly published as a fiction or allegory, designed for the conveyance of supposed truth; resembling, in this respect, the *Pilgrim's Progress*, which has been written, with happier effect, in later times.

2. *Epistle of Barnabas*.—An epistle, in Greek, is ascribed to Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul. This treatise undertakes to prove the truth of the Christian religion from the prophecies and types of the Old Testament; and then proceeds to give various exhortations to godliness and virtue. The method of quoting Scripture, the fabulous narratives, and the erroneous notions, contained in this epistle, abundantly prove that it cannot have proceeded, in its present form, from an apostolical writer. If any part of it were indeed composed by Barnabas, it is yet extremely difficult, or rather impossible, to separate the genuine remains from the spurious and interpolated matter with which they are mixed up. It is certain that the epistle was extant in the second century; and it is frequently referred to by Clement of Alexandria as a genuine writing. But Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 25; lib. vi. c. 13, 14,) and Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 6,) speak of it as spurious, or doubtful; thus confirming an opinion which may be reasonably formed from the contents of the epistle itself. It has been supposed that some genuine epistle may have formed the basis of the writing now extant; but it is generally agreed by the learned that the epistle, in its present form, if not a forgery throughout, is yet so filled with interpolations, that it is quite impossible to distinguish any genuine matter, if such there be, from the spurious.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### IGNATIUS.

IGNATIUS was a contemporary and disciple of the apostles, especially of St. John. He presided over the Church of Antioch, eminent alike for his zeal and ability as a Christian teacher, and for his practice of piety and virtue, in accordance with the doc-

trines which he taught. The Emperor Trajan, in passing through Antioch, sentenced this memorable leader of the Christians to be conveyed under a guard of soldiers to Rome, and there to be exposed to the wild beasts in the Amphitheatre<sup>1</sup>. This event is dated by some as early as the year 106 or 107, and by others as late as 115 or 116<sup>2</sup>. A great sensation, we are told, was occasioned in the churches of Asia Minor, by the journey of the condemned bishop towards the coast; the bishops of several churches, as the representatives of those communities, waited upon him to take a solemn leave; and to several of these churches he afterwards addressed epistles, thanking them for their demonstration of Christian sympathy, and conveying some seasonable and important admonitions. From Smyrna he wrote to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles; and from the same place he also addressed a letter to the Christians at Rome, entreating them not to make any attempts to save his life. From Troas he wrote to the Churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Polycarp, the venerable bishop of the latter church, who had been, like himself, a disciple of St. John.

These epistles are extant in two forms, a shorter and a longer; the genuineness of which has been a subject of great doubt and controversy. Isaac Vossius and Usher have strenuously contended for the genuineness of the shorter epistles; and they have been followed by other writers, especially by Pearson in his *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii*. Daille and others, on the contrary, have laboured to show that both the longer and the shorter epistles are spurious productions. Some, who admit the shorter as genuine, reject the longer. On the whole, it appears to be

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. *De Viris Illustr.* c. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Anno Christi, 107, Trajani decimo Ignatii martyrium illigant. Usserius, *Not. in Ignatii Acta*, p. 36. Tillemontius, *Mémoires*, ii. 195. Ruinartus, *Act. Sinc. Mart.* p. 10. Dodwellus, *Dissert. Cypr.* xi. 18. Baraterius, *De Successione*, p. 92. Gallaudius, *Proleg.* p. lxii. Burtonus, *Lectures*, ii. 23. Pearsons autem . . . Ignatium in anno 116 occubuisse statuit, quem secuti sunt Loydus; Pagi, *Critic. in Annal.*

*Baronii*, 107, num. 3—6. Gratius, *Spicil.* ii. 9. Le Quienius, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 701. Clericus, *Hist. Eccles.* ann. 116, § 7. Benedictini, in opere *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, inscripto. Venema, *Hist. Eccles. sæc.* ii. § 7. Gieselerus, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 117. Guerickeus, *K. G.* i. 169. In medio relinquit Schroeckius, *K. G.* ii. 336, 337.—Jacobson. *Patres Apostolici*, 1, xxi.

generally agreed that the shorter epistles are substantially the work of Ignatius, but that they contain many interpolations of a later date.

The great objects of these epistles are to establish the churches in the doctrine of the apostles,—to inspire them with respect and obedience towards their teachers,—to warn them against rising heresies, especially that of the Gnostics,—and to urge upon them the duties of love, concord, and all Christian virtues, especially steadfastness in suffering. They contain some mystical expressions, and others which appear to savour of heterodoxy respecting the person and nature of our blessed Lord: whence it has been supposed that the work of interpolation was effected by some Arian writer. But one of the most remarkable features of these epistles, and that which has been really the cause of so sharp a controversy respecting their genuineness, is the high tone which they assume respecting the authority of Christian ministers, and the duty of complete or unlimited obedience and submission on the part of their hearers. We are here told, for instance, that Christians ought to look up to the bishop as to the Lord himself. (*ad Ephes.* c. 6:) that they ought to follow their bishop, as Jesus Christ complied with the will of the Father, and to submit themselves to the presbyters as to the Apostles, (*ad Smurn.* c. 5:) and that he who should do anything without the consent of his bishop would be a servant of the devil, (*Ib.* c. 9.) In expressions such as these, some writers suppose that they find proofs of the early exercise of power, and claims of apostolical authority, by the teachers of the Church, and testimonies to the duty of submission to that authority: while others believe that the spirit of these passages is entirely at variance with the doctrines and practices which really prevailed at the beginning of the second century: and that the passages themselves proceeded from some writer who lived when the relations between minister and people began to be misrepresented and misunderstood. It has been remarked by learned men, that various portions of these epistles bear internal marks of spuriousness; and that there is every reason to believe that even these shorter compositions, commonly called genuine, have

been tampered with<sup>3</sup>. Certain it is, at all events, that we cannot appeal to these suspected documents, or to the epistle of Clement, in favour of any particular form of church government, unless we are content to argue in a very loose and unscholarlike manner.

Five other epistles which were, for a long time, reckoned among the genuine writings of Ignatius, addressed to the Churches of Tarsus, Philippi, and Antioch, to Heros, a deacon of the Church of Antioch, and to a woman named Mary, are now universally rejected as spurious.

Two epistles to St. John, and one to the Virgin Mary, were also forged in the name of Ignatius.

## CHAPTER III.

### POLYCARP.

POLYCARP, bishop of Smyrna, a disciple and friend of St. John, survived all other teachers of the Christian church, who had enjoyed the privilege of living and conversing with the apostles<sup>1</sup>. He lived to witness the spread of Gnosticism, and the disorders thereby occasioned; and he addressed several epistles to the neighbouring churches, with a view to keep them steadfast in the true faith of the Gospel. Of these epistles the only one extant is that to the Church of Philippi, supposed to have been written soon after the martyrdom of Ignatius. Of the original Greek a part only has been preserved; but we possess an old Latin translation of the entire epistle.—In it the author speaks of the joy which he had felt on account of the kindness shown by the Christians of Philippi to their persecuted brethren, and on account of their steadfastness in the faith of the Gospel. He admonishes them concerning various particulars of their duty;

<sup>3</sup> “Not only were the spurious epistles added to the number, but the seven which are genuine, were interpolated and enlarged, so as to retain for their basis the sentiments of Ignatius, but very frequently to speak the language of a later age.”—BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*; Lect. xiv.

<sup>1</sup> HERON, *de Viris Illustribus*, c. 17.



declares (in accordance with the language of St. John,) that any one who denied that Christ had been made man, was an antichrist; and that such as perverted the word of God according to their own pleasure, maintaining that there was to be neither resurrection nor judgment, were the first-born of Satan. He exhorts the Philippians to imitate Jesus Christ, the apostles, and various martyrs, (naming particularly Ignatius,) in patience and the endurance of suffering. He expresses his sorrow for the fault of Valens, who had been a presbyter among them, and his wife; with a wish that they might recover themselves, and an intimation of the duty of Christians not to regard such persons as enemies, but to endeavour to bring them back from their errors. He exhorts them to pray for kings and princes, and even for their persecutors and enemies; and says that, at their request, he had sent to them the epistles which Ignatius had addressed to himself and his church.

This epistle is ascribed to Polycarp by Irenæus, (*Ade. Hæres.* lib. iii. c. 3,) Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 14, 15,) and Jerome, (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 17.) Eusebius has quoted a passage from it, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 36.) It was read, together with other writings of celebrated teachers, by the Asiatic Christians in their Churches.

The epistle, in its present form, is, on the whole, correct in its doctrine, simple in style, and such as might have been written by a contemporary of the apostles and an early teacher of the church; but it is not without some appearance of interpolation. An admonition which it contains, to the effect that Christians must be subject to their presbyters and other ministers, as unto God and Christ, savours of a later date in the annals of the church. The genuineness of the whole epistle has been called in question by some critics.

It is worthy of remark that Irenæus, speaking of the traditions delivered by Polycarp, declares them to have been in perfect harmony with the Scriptures<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Διὶ γὰρ ἐκ παίδων μθήσεις συναύ- | καρπος, καὶ τὰς προόδους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς  
ξουσαι τῇ ψυχῇ, ἐνοῦνται αὐτῇ ὥστε | εἰσόδους καὶ τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ βίου,  
με δύνασθαι εἰπεῖν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ | καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰδέαν, καὶ τὰς δια-  
καθεζόμενος διελέγετο ὁ μακάριος Πολύ- | λέξεις ἅς ἐποίηίτο πρὸς τὸ πλήθος, καὶ

Polycarp suffered martyrdom, in the most honourable manner, at Smyrna; probably about the year 160 or 167. An interesting account of the sufferings of this holy man for the sake of truth has been preserved in an epistle of the church of Smyrna, still extant.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### JUSTIN MARTYR.

JUSTIN was a Greek by birth, and a native of Flavia Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, capital of Samaria, which had been peopled with Greeks after the first Jewish war. Some writers have dated his birth as early as the year 89; others as late as 103; it is most probable that he was born about the beginning of the second century. He went to Ephesus for the purpose of studying philosophy, and applied himself successively to the masters of the Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic schools; but was at length convinced of the insufficiency of all human systems of philosophy, and of the truth of Christianity; of which he professed himself a disciple. Still wearing the mantle, or peculiar dress of the philosophers, he employed his time and talents in zealously defending the Christian religion; travelling for this purpose from place to place, holding conferences with the different opponents of Christianity, and embodying in written treatises the various arguments which he believed to contribute to the establishment of the truths of the Gospel, and the pleas which might be fairly urged in behalf of its professors. Justin was beheaded at Rome, probably in the year 165. His life and writings are highly spoken of by TATIAN, *Orat. ad Gentiles*, c. 18, 19; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 11, 12, 16—18; JEROME, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 23.

τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναστροφὴν, ὡς ἀπήγγελλε καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἑωρακῶτων τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν, καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τίνα ἦν ἂ παρ' ἐκείνων ἀκροῖε· καὶ περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὡς παρὰ τῶν

αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρειληφῶς ὁ Πολύκαρπος, ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς. — IRENEÆUS. *Fragm. Epist. ad Florinum*. Opp. p. 340. ed. Massuet. (ROUTH. *Script. Eccl. Opusc.* i. p. 32.)

The principal works of this author which have come down to us are Two Apologies on behalf of Christians and their religion, and a Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew. The following brief outlines of their contents may be sufficient in this place.

*First Apology.*—Justin presented his first apology on behalf of the Christian religion to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, at Rome, about the year 140, or 148. In this treatise he shows, first, how unjust it was that Christians should be condemned without a lawful hearing and trial, and how undeserving of punishment they really were;—that their religion was adapted to make men good citizens, rather than to injure the state;—that their principles did not tend to atheism;—that the dangers and privations to which they exposed themselves evinced the sincerity of their belief;—and that they were not guilty of the immoralities which were sometimes laid to their charge. He then proceeds to adduce proofs of the truth of Christianity;—showing that Jesus was the Messiah, from ancient prophecies, which he supposes to have been at the foundation of many fables by which the evil spirits (who had become acquainted with them) had imposed upon mankind. He asserts that Plato had derived his doctrine concerning the formation of the world from the Mosaic account of the creation. In the concluding portion of the work he gives a circumstantial (and to us very important) account of the habits and customs of Christians in his day, and especially of their mode of celebrating divine worship.

There are some weak points in the arguments brought forward in this apology. Such especially is the author's appeal to the Sibylline books of the day as genuine and inspired;—an error, however, which belongs to the times rather than to the individual writer<sup>3</sup>. The work is disfigured also by various marks of care-

<sup>3</sup> "Justin is not the only one of the Fathers who entertained this belief: and though such a conclusion may lead us to impugn his critical powers, it does not prove him less sincere in his attachment to the Gospel, or weaken his other arguments in support of it. In the present day there is, perhaps, no person who does not conceive the Sibylline oracles to be forgeries: and

yet in the age of Justin Martyr there was, perhaps, no person who did not believe them to be inspired. The verses of the sibyls were known to the heathen from a remote antiquity; the Jews, as well as the Christians, appealed to them; and the prohibition of their perusal by an imperial decree is a sufficient proof of the effect which they were calculated to produce. If

lessness, and by some errors in matter of fact. But, on the whole, this apology contains a fair exhibition of the Christian religion.

*Second Apology.*—Justin's second apology appears to have been composed at the beginning of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, on occasion of the persecution of the Christians, which had then arisen at Rome. In this treatise the author complains that the Christians were unjustly condemned;—maintains that the circumstance of their being left in the power of their enemies was no proof that God was not on their side;—traces the origin of all murder and cruelty to the influence of demons, who, says he, were descended from the daughters of men by angels, to whom God had committed the management of the world, and who abused their power by indulging in lascivious intercourse;—declares that these demons will eventually be consigned to eternal punishment, together with all their adherents and worshippers;—shows the superiority of Christianity to all human systems of philosophy, pointing out especially the superiority of our blessed Saviour to the celebrated philosopher Socrates;—and appeals to the steadfastness of Christians under sufferings in proof of their innocence and virtue<sup>4</sup>.

some of the oracles which were quoted by the Fathers could be proved to be genuine, the conclusion would seem irresistible, that the writers of them were inspired. They allude to the personal history of Christ, and the leading doctrines of his religion, with much greater plainness than the prophecies in the Jewish Scriptures: Justin Martyr and several of the Fathers appeal to them as documents which no one could dispute; and yet no rational person can doubt, that they were written subsequently to the publication of the Gospel."—BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*; Lect. 17.

<sup>4</sup> "I ought, perhaps, to notice a charge which has been brought against Justin Martyr, in modern times, of having corrupted the Gospel from Platonism. It has been said, that he in-

troduced the doctrine of the personality of the Logos, having met with it in the philosophy of Plato: and hence it is argued, that the Christians before the time of Justin did not believe Jesus Christ to be a divine person, or truly the Son of God, but merely an ordinary human being. A few words may prove the utter groundlessness of such a charge. It is built on the assumption that the personality of the Logos is to be found in the writings of Plato; but, though these writings contain many obscure passages concerning the Logos, or mind, or reason of God, it is demonstrable that Plato never imagined this Logos, or mind, to be a person, in the sense in which Christians believe the Son of God to be a person. The later Platonists endeavoured to twist their master's expressions to bear this meaning; but not till the Gospel

*Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew.* (Πρὸς Τρυφῶνα Ἰουδαίου Διάλογος.)—In this dialogue, which is probably fictitious, and composed after the manner of the dialogues of Plato, Justin brings forward arguments from the Old Testament Scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, and obviates the chief objections which were current among the Jews of his day.

Justin wrote also—*An Exhortation to the Gentiles*, (Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας.) in which he shows that the sacred books received by Christians are the only true sources of religious knowledge; a *Treatise on the Supreme Dominion of God*, (περὶ Θεοῦ Μοναρχίας;)—perhaps, also, a shorter Address to the Heathen, recounting the reasons which had induced him to abandon idolatry, and pointing out the excellences of the Christian religion; a *Book against Marcion*, and other Heretics; and *Explanations of several books of Scripture*; both of which have been lost.

The Epistle to Diognetus, and that to Zenas and Serenus, once attributed to Justin, are now considered spurious; internal evidence being sufficient to prove that they must have been productions of an age later than that of the alleged author.

had made great progress, and when they wished to prove that the doctrines of Jesus Christ had been anticipated by Plato. In endeavouring to establish this point, they palpably perverted the tenets of their founder; and instead of it being true that Justin Martyr corrupted Christianity from Platonism, it is well known that Platonism was corrupted, and wholly changed its character, in consequence of the Gospel. The charge which is brought against Justin Martyr is an acknowledgment that he believed in the divinity of Jesus Christ; a fact,

which cannot be denied by any person who studies his writings: and though, in establishing this point, he quotes the authority of Plato, as if that philosopher had spoken of a divine person in the character of the Logos, it is plain, as I said before, that in using this argument he wrote as a Christian, and not as a Platonist. The argument may be rejected as founded upon a mistake, but it proves that Justin had no design of making his religion bend to his philosophy."—BUNTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*; Lect. 17.

## CHAPTER V.

## HERMIAS.

HERMIAS, a Christian philosopher, is generally supposed to have written about the end of the second century (perhaps about the year 170); but some critics place him many years later.

In his short treatise, entitled *A Satire on the Heathen Philosophers* (*Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἕξω Φιλοσόφων*), he ridicules the numerous discrepancies found in the several systems of the Greek philosophers; and endeavours to show that, in consequence of such disagreement, all their speculations were useless. He instances in the various opinions which had been maintained respecting the nature of the soul,—the chief good,—and the elements and matter of the world. The book is not without its merits; but, from the nature and course of the argument, it was not adapted to make any great or wholesome impression upon the minds of those for whose benefit it was designed.

I subjoin the following analysis of the work of Hermias, extracted from Dr. IRELAND'S *Paganism and Christianity Compared*.

He begins with the soul, but is utterly at a loss what to determine concerning it, from the definition of the philosophers; whether it be fire, air, or motion,—whether it be intelligence, or nothing but an exhalation. Some describe it as a power derived from the stars, and some call it an additional essence, the result of the four elements compounded. One calls it harmony, one the blood, one the breath of man, and another a monad. These contests concerning the nature of the soul are a sure pledge of differences as to its duration. “For a moment,” says he, “I fancy myself immortal; but this illusion is presently resolved by one who maintains that my soul is as subject to death as my body. Another is determined to preserve its existence during three thousand years. I pass into other bodies, and become a beast or a fish; nor is it possible for me to call myself by any determinate name. I am a wolf, a bird, a serpent, a chimera. I swim, I fly, I creep, I run, I sit still, and am made to partake of all opposite conditions in rotation.” He indulges the same vein of

humour in the disputes about God and nature; and describes the fluctuations of his mind under the successive tuition of a number of Pagan masters, each teaching him a different lesson. "Anaxagoras tells me that all things are derived from an Intelligent Mind, the cause of order, motion, and beauty. In this I should acquiesce, if Melissus and Parmenides did not object, who contend, both in verse and prose, that the universe is one, self-subsisting, eternal, infinite, immoveable, and unchangeable. Awed, therefore, by this double authority, I begin to drop my attachment to Anaxagoras. Yet neither do I rest with Melissus and Parmenides; for Anaximenes now proves to me, that all things are produced from air. I begin, therefore, to lean towards his philosophy; but on a sudden I hear a voice calling to me out of Etna, and commanding me to believe that the system of the world arose from the collision of love and hatred, by whose operation alone can be satisfactorily explained the things similar and dissimilar, finite and infinite. Thanks to you, Empedocles; and in gratitude for so important a discovery, I am ready to follow you even into the crater of your volcano," &c. He then passes rapidly through a number of other systems:—the heat and cold of Archelaus; the God, matter, and ideas of Plato; the active and passive principles of Aristotle; the æther, earth, and time of Pherecydes; the atoms of Leucippus; the existence and non-existence, the plenum and vacuum, of Democritus; the fire of Heraclitus; and the numbers of Pythagoras. Imitating, too, the well-known sentiment of Anaereon, he declares, that his enumeration is yet imperfect, and that other multitudes of names rush upon him from Libya, &c.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### HEGESIPPUS.

HEGESIPPUS, a convert from Judaism to Christianity, wrote the first ecclesiastical history; of which no more than a few fragments remain. This history was composed in four books; it extended from the date of the birth of Christ to the author's own times,

that is to say, somewhat later than the year 170 (EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23; lib. iii. c. 19, 20, 32; lib. iv. 8, 22; PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* 232; HIERON. *de Viris Illustribus*, c. 22.)

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### TATIAN.

TATIAN, an Assyrian by birth, after having for a long time studied Grecian literature, and philosophy in particular, and having travelled to Rome in prosecution of his studies, was there converted to Christianity, by means of his study of Scripture. He became a friend of Justin Martyr, whom he assisted in composing his *Defence*, and whose place at Rome he supplied for some time after the martyr's death, until at length he returned to his own country; where he died, probably about the year 176.

Tatian composed *A harmony of the Four Gospels* (Τὸ Διὰ Τεσσάρων), (omitting, however, the genealogies of our Lord, and all those passages in which he is called the son of David;) and other works, which have not come down to us. The only treatise of this author now extant is *An Address to the Gentiles* (Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας), the main object of which is to assert the antiquity and excellence of the Christian religion, and its superiority over that of the heathen.

In discoursing on the nature of the Divine Being, Tatian makes the same misuse of the Platonic philosophy as that which has been ascribed to Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch; and, in addition, he introduces the doctrine of the emanation of all things from the divine essence, together with some other dogmas of the Oriental philosophy. He speaks of the resurrection of the dead,—of the creation of angels and men by the divine Word,—and of the fall of man, which he supposes to have arisen from the circumstance of man having paid divine honour to the first-born angel; from whom, and his followers, all evil spirits or demons proceeded. According to Tatian, there are two kinds of spirits; namely, the human soul, and another essence of a still higher order, which is the image or likeness of God.



Both these, says he, were possessed by the first man. The soul in itself is neither mortal nor immortal; it may die or not. If it does not receive the knowledge of the truth, it dies, and is dissolved together with the body; but will at last rise together with it, in order to receive due punishment. On the other hand, a soul which has attained the knowledge of God, does not die, even though it may be for a time dissolved. When the soul has been united to the divine Spirit, it is never deserted, but rises to a place to which that Spirit conducts it. At first, the divine Spirit and the soul dwelt both together; but the divine Spirit quitted the soul, because the latter would not obey it; and, although the soul has retained some remains of its former power, yet, being separated from the divine Spirit, it has fallen into error. But this Spirit unites itself to the righteous, dwells in their souls, and reveals to them things hidden from others.

At first sight, this may appear to be no other than the Scriptural doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the souls of believers; but with the addition of certain refinements, and systematic niceties. It is plain, however, from the whole drift of the discourse, that we have here, in fact, the traces of a philosophy distinct from the truths of Christianity; for Tatian appears to have understood by the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, only the immortal part of man, as distinguished from the soul; and we must look for the source of his opinions to the dogmas of Plato and other philosophers, who treated of the several parts of man's intelligent nature in a similar manner. Indeed, Tatian often adopts the very terms which the philosophers had used on this subject;—as when he says that the perfect Spirit was as the wings of the soul; and that after the soul had lost this companion, it could fly no better than a hen, and was prone to sink down to the earth.

The author subjoins many warnings against the influence and delusions of evil spirits;—he contrasts the Christian doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God with the fabulous stories concerning some of the heathen deities;—ridicules some of the heathen customs and laws;—points out the excellence of Christian institutions, and answers objections which had been urged against them;—and concludes by claiming for the Christian philosophy (such is his expression) a higher antiquity than that which

belongs to any of the heathen sciences, or writers; instituting a comparison between the dates of Moses and Homer; and interspersing various remarks on the two rival systems of religion.

The writings of Tatian are characterized by harshness and obscurity of style, want of method, a perplexed and mystical philosophy, and a less happy use of learning in his explanation or defence of Christianity, than in his exposure of the errors of Paganism, and his attacks upon that system.

Some critics think that they find traces of Gnostic error in the Address to the Gentiles. It may not, perhaps, be easy to substantiate this charge; but it is certain that Tatian became involved in serious error during the latter part of his life. Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.* lib. i. c. 28) says that after the death of Justin, he was led astray by his own confidence and self-conceit; others say that he was seduced by the Gnostics; but, be this as it may, it is certain that he began publicly to depart from the simplicity of Christian faith about the year 170. He spoke of Æons, said to have been created by the Supreme God; and of a Creator of the world distinct from the latter. He made arbitrary alterations in the Sacred Writings, and especially in St. Paul's Epistles. It is probable that he acceded to the Gnostic system of belief in many particulars; and we know that his views of morals coincided with those which were adopted by that sect, exceeding them, however, in gloom and severity. He taught that marriage is sinful; or, as some say, that it is a great impediment to Christian perfection. He forbade the use of meat and wine; and to such an extent did he carry this prohibition, that he substituted water for wine in the administration of the Lord's Supper. For these and other particulars respecting Tatian, see IRENÆUS, *adv. Hæres.* lib. i. c. 28; lib. iii. c. 23; CLEM. ALEXANDR. *Strom.* lib. i. p. 378; lib. iii. p. 547, seq., ed. Potter; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 16, 21, 28, 29; lib. v. c. 13; Hieronym. *Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 29; EPIPHANIUS, *Har.* 46, 47; Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* lib. i. c. 20.

The followers of Tatian spread through several provinces of Asia Minor; and afterwards, as it seems, in Italy, Gaul, and Spain; continuing to be distinguished until the end of the fourth century. They were called Tatianists, or, more commonly, Encratites (the Temperate). On account of their habit of

drinking nothing but water, they were called also Hydroparastatæ, and Aquarii (water-drinkers). But, as Tatian held the doctrine of abstinence from marriage in common with many Gnostic sects, it would perhaps be incorrect to regard all who bore the name of Enekratites as his disciples. As might naturally have been expected, some of his followers, such as Severus and Cassian, departed more or less widely from the principles of their master. And among these may be reckoned the Apotactites (Renouncers), so called from the circumstance of their renouncing the possession of all property.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Corinth, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, addressed various epistles to the churches of Lacedæmon, Athens, Nicomedia, Crete, and Pontus, containing instructions and remonstrances on points of Christian doctrine and discipline. These epistles have perished; but an account of their author is preserved by EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23.

## CHAPTER IX.

### ATHENAGORAS.

THE next Christian writer and apologist whose works have come down to us<sup>1</sup> is ATHENAGORAS. He was a native of Athens, where he taught philosophy. Having read the Scriptures with a view to find materials for a treatise which he intended to write against the Christians, he became, by divine grace, a convert to their religion. Like Justin Martyr, he retained the philosopher's

<sup>1</sup> Melito, bishop of Sardis, addressed an apology, on behalf of the Christians, to Marcus Aurelius, of which only some fragments are preserved in EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 26, together with the titles of his other works, which

were numerous. About the same time, A.D. 170, or a little later, Miltiades, and Claudius Apollinaris, drew up apologies, no parts of which have been preserved.

mantle after he had professed himself a Christian. He was appointed teacher of the catechetical school at Alexandria; in which city he is said to have taught both religion and philosophy; declaring his preference of the Platonic Philosophy, as superior to all other systems of mere human origin.

Athenagoras wrote a defence of the Christians, entitled, *An Embassy in behalf of the Christians* (*Πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν*), addressed to Marcus Anrelius and his son Commodus, A.D. 176. In this treatise he sets forth the injustice of persecuting the Christians simply on account of their religion, while all other subjects of the empire were permitted to exercise various rites of worship, how absurd soever, without molestation; especially as the Christians yielded to none in respect of piety and loyalty. The apologist undertakes to refute particularly the calumnies of the heathen against the professors of the Christian religion. He shows, first, that they were not atheists, but worshippers of the one true God; and here he takes an opportunity of explaining the Christian doctrine respecting the holy Trinity in Unity:—a subject which he ventures to explain a little too much; endeavouring, by the aid of his Platonic philosophy, to *expound* those mysteries concerning the divine nature which Scripture simply *declares*; and thus attempting to bring down to the level of human understanding a subject which is necessarily above it, and to make plain to other men what he himself had no means of fully comprehending.—Athenagoras attempts, also, in this part of his treatise, to improve upon the heathen systems of gods and goddesses; by describing the (supposed) parts which angels take in the government of the world, in subordination to the Supreme.—With greater force of reason, he adduces the holy lives of Christians, and their habits of prayer, in proof that they were no atheists. And, in answer to the argument used by the heathens in defence of their own practices, that they did not offer worship to the images in their temples, but to the deities whom those images represented, Athenagoras asserts that those deities themselves were unworthy of divine honour, being no other than giants or demons, who were the offspring of the illicit amours of fallen angels with the daughters of men, which angels became the founders and promoters of idolatry.

The second and third charges which Athenagoras refutes relate to the alleged existence of immoral practices in the celebration of Christian worship. In the course of his answer to this calumny, he advances a position which was afterwards adopted and defended by many of the Fathers; namely, that a second marriage is a kind of adultery,—a proposition, it is almost needless to observe, quite at variance with the doctrines of Scripture. In refuting the accusation of eating the flesh of infants, he represents such a practice not only as opposed to the views entertained by Christians concerning the crime of murder (which led them to denounce the practice of exposing new-born infants, prevalent among the heathens), but also as totally inconsistent with their expectations of the resurrection of the dead, which was one of the main and peculiar features of their religion. Respecting this doctrine of Christianity, he says that the truth of it had been recognised by many philosophers, and that it is in perfect accordance with the principles of Pythagoras and Plato.

It was perhaps the latter part of this defence which gave rise to another treatise of Athenagoras,—that *On the Resurrection of the Dead* (*Περὶ Ἀναστάσεως τῶν Νεκρῶν*).—In this book, the author first refutes objections commonly urged against the doctrine, by arguments drawn from the power and will of the Creator; and he then argues in support of it, upon the following grounds; namely,—the end of man's creation,—the constitution of his nature,—the justice and providence of God;—especially, says he (by a philosophical speculation, not founded upon Scripture), as all sin originates with the body, and as we cannot imagine either virtue or vice existing in the soul alone, since the divine laws have been imposed upon the whole man, and not merely upon any particular portion of his nature.

---

## CHAPTER X.

## THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH.

THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, is highly commended by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23) and Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 25). He wrote a defence of Christianity, and commentaries on Scripture, which have perished, with the exception of a small fragment preserved in one of the Epistles of Jerome. He died in the year 181.

His *Treatise* addressed to his friend *Autolychus*, a learned heathen, with a view to convert him to Christianity (*Περὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν Πίστewος*), is still extant. In this work, the heathen system of religious belief and worship is successfully encountered by a judicious use of the writings of Greek authors; but the description and defence of Christianity itself is less skilfully managed. The treatise consists of three Books.

*In the First Book*, the bishop replies to a demand of his friend "to show him the Christian's God," by affirming that God, like the soul of man, cannot be seen by the bodily eyes,—that He is visible to us only in his works,—and can be beheld now only by the eyes of a pure understanding, but that we shall be permitted to see God in the eternal world. He then advances arguments, natural and moral, in support of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

*In the Second Book*, Theophilus shows the folly of the heathen system of religion, and the uncertainties in which it was involved, by reference to the absurdities of its mythology, and the mutual contradictions and disagreements of philosophers and poets; in opposition to which, he adduces the consistency of the sacred prophets in their doctrines concerning the true religion, and especially in their account of the creation of the world,—a subject on which great ignorance and confusion of thought prevailed among the heathen. In common with Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, Theophilus does not forget to declare that the world was created by the Eternal Word, or Son of God; but like them, also, he refines too much on this high subject. (He

explains the words, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," as equivalent to "God created the heaven and the earth by the Word, which is the beginning," ἀρχῆ; and he interprets the passage which speaks of the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters, as relating to the wind, or some other principle of life: agreeing in this particular with the views of other early ecclesiastical writers, but differing from the interpretation of the text adopted by later, and more learned, expositors of Scripture<sup>1</sup>.) Then follow comparisons of the world with the sea, of God with the sun, of man with the moon, and various other allegorical interpretations or speculations equally frivolous and tedious. Theophilus understands the words, "Let us make man," as spoken by God the Father to his Word or Wisdom. He says, "It was not God the Father of all things, but his Word by whom all things were made, that was present with Adam in Paradise;" referring, on this head, to the words of Adam, "I heard thy voice, (*i. e.* says he, thy Word.) in the garden." He affirms that God made man neither mortal nor immortal, but capable of either death or immortality. Lastly, he compares a great number of the Sibylline verses, and some of the thoughts of heathen writers, with the books of the prophets, from which he supposes them to have been borrowed.

*In the Third Book*, the bishop attacks the writings of heathen philosophers, which Autolychus continued to prefer to the sacred books; pointing out their discrepancies and inconsistencies, together with the uselessness of their positions, and their immoral

<sup>1</sup> Theophilus appears to be the first writer who used the word "Trinity," to express the Scriptural doctrine concerning a distinction of persons in the one Eternal Godhead. "Though some persons have objected to the mixture of Christian ideas and expressions with those which belong to the Platonic philosophy, a careful perusal of the work [of Theophilus] will confirm the remark already made, that Platonism had by this time been materially altered; and that when a Christian spoke in the language of Plato, he adapted it to doctrines which the fol-

lowers of Plato had never heard of till they came in contact with the Christians."—BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*. Lect. 19. "The passages which have been brought to prove that anything like the Christian Trinity was held by Plato, have entirely failed to substantiate the point. . . . The later Platonists, as the followers of Ammonius were called, were the bitterest enemies of Christianity; but still they endeavoured to show that it resembled Platonism."—*Ib.*, Lect. 24.

tendency. He then exhibits the superiority of the Christian religion, by giving a short sketch of its code of morals from the Old and New Testaments; and hence he takes occasion to show how improbable and absurd were the charges of immoral and cruel practices in Christian worship, with which the professors of the Gospel were continually reproached by unbelievers.—In conclusion, the writer attempts to prove, historically and chronologically, that the Jewish Scriptures are as old as they profess to be; and that early profane history is full of mistakes and uncertainty. These points he establishes, on the whole, pretty well; but not without error in some particular instances.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### IRENÆUS.

THE first Christian writer that appeared in the western parts of the Roman empire was IRENÆUS, bishop of Lyons. He, however, belonged originally to Asia Minor; where, in his youth, he had enjoyed the friendship and instruction of some of the immediate disciples of the Apostles, especially Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna; and for this reason he is himself ranked among the Apostolical Fathers. Having carefully studied, not only the doctrines of Christianity, but also the principles and opinions of the chief philosophical and religious parties of his day, he afterwards settled at Lyons, where he was ordained a presbyter by Pothinus, bishop of that church. During his discharge of that office, he was sent as a deputy from the Christians in Gaul to the Roman bishop, with a view to recover the peace of the church, which had been wounded by the errors of the Montanists. Pothinus died in the year 177, and Irenæus was elected to succeed him as Bishop of Lyons; in which capacity he became distinguished by his zeal in maintaining the soundness of Christian doctrine against the various errors of the age, and by his success in the conversion of the heathen to the faith of the Gospel. He died in the year 202, or somewhat later; but there is no clear evidence of his having suffered martyrdom.



Of his writings many are known to us only by name, their titles having been recorded by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 20, 26). But, happily, the most important of his works has been, in a great measure, preserved. This is a Treatise in five Books, in which he undertook to develope and refute the error of the Valentinians, and other Gnostics, entitled, *A Refutation of Knowledge, falsely so called* (*Ἐλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή τῆς Ψευδωνύμου Γνώσεως*); but more generally called, for sake of brevity, his *Treatise against Heresies*. It does not, indeed, treat of all the heresies which had arisen in the church; but its plan is very extensive, inasmuch as it embraces all errors which stood in any connexion with Gnosticism from the days of Simon Magus down to Tatian. It was the first regular polemical work of a Christian writer; would that, circumstances permitting, it had been the last! The treatise was written in Greek; the greater part of the First Book, and some fragments of the others, are extant in the original; but the rest of the work has been preserved only in an old Latin translation. It was translated not long after its publication, perhaps for the use of the Gallic and African Christians, among whom Greek was but imperfectly understood; and there is reason to believe that Tertullian made use of it. The translation, however, is badly executed; and appears to have proceeded from the pen of a writer who was not thoroughly acquainted with either Greek or Latin, and who was, moreover, but little versed in the subject-matter of the book. But this work is valuable, as introducing us to some acquaintance with the Latin version of the Scriptures at that time in use, from which the translator quotes the various texts which occur in the course of the work.

*In the First Book*, Irenæus describes the doctrines of the Gnostics, especially of the Valentinians, and more particularly still of the followers of Ptolemy. He declares at large the opinions of the Valentinians respecting the *Æons* and their generations, the creation of the world, and other matters; and quotes the passages of Scripture which they had wrested, or misinterpreted, in support of their peculiar notions. He then shows that the several advocates of the erroneous system were at variance among themselves; and that thus they in fact furnished an argu-

ment in favour of the truth of the doctrines generally received in the Christian Church. He then gives a summary view of this universal Christian doctrine, which had been delivered, as he says, by the apostles and their disciples; and he states it as consisting in—a belief in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of all things; in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was made man in order to redeem us; and in the Holy Spirit, who, by the prophets, foretold the divine dispensations, the birth, sufferings, resurrection, and ascension, of our dear Lord Jesus Christ, and his coming again from heaven, in the glory of the Father, to raise all men from the dead; in order that unto Jesus Christ, our Lord, God, Redeemer, and King, all knees in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, should bow, and that every tongue should confess him; and that he should exercise a righteous judgment upon all, so that he should condemn the fallen angels and wicked men to everlasting fire, and bestow upon the righteous and godly, life, immortality, and eternal glory. These words present us with the substance of the earliest creed or confession of faith adopted in the Christian church<sup>1</sup>; and the author expressly adds, that “neither the churches established in Germany, nor those of Spain and Gaul, (the first historical record of churches in Germany and Spain,) nor those in the countries of the East, in Egypt, Libya, or the middle of the world. (*i. e.*, the centre of the Roman empire,) believe or teach differently in any respect.” The merely literary or verbal debates which arise among Christian teachers do not, says he, affect this uniformity of belief. It is easy to discover, in the short sketch of Christian doctrine thus given by Irenæus, the groundwork of the confession afterwards known by the name of the Apostles’ Creed; and we may observe also, that while it contains, or plainly and certainly implies, all the essentials of the Christian faith, it denies to any teacher or church whatsoever the right of imposing additional articles of belief as necessary to salvation. Happy, indeed, would it be for the cause of truth and holiness, if the terms of communion in all Christian churches could be safely made to rest upon a basis as broad as the confession of faith thus carefully and

<sup>1</sup> For an exact translation of the whole passage, and the original, see book iv. chap. I, sect. 11, and note.

scrupulously recorded by Irenæus, who had sat at the feet of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John! With this perfect agreement in matters of faith which prevailed in the Christian church, Irenæus compares the discrepancies existing in the tenets of the Valentinians, as exhibited in the difference between the doctrines of Valentinus himself, and those of his followers, Secundus, Epiphanius, Ptolemy, Colorbasus, and Marcus; detailing minutely some of the errors, impostures, and vices, which attached to the latter, and his adherents the Marcionites. Here he mentions incidentally the custom of public penance (*ἐξομολόγησις*) as it then existed in the church, or the discipline exercised with regard to those members who had given offence by any misconduct.—At the close of the book, having stated the Christian doctrine concerning the nature of God and the creation of the world, the author describes certain ancient heresies, in order to show that the tenets of the Valentinians had descended from those corrupt sources.

*In the Second Book*, the author undertakes to refute the errors which he had described, by natural and moral arguments, or proofs from reason and the nature of things. He answers, also, some of the Valentinian arguments, founded upon perversions of Scripture. Here, in refuting the foolish opinion that the thirty Æons of the Valentinians were mystically alluded to in the fact that our Lord was baptized at the age of thirty years, Irenæus erroneously asserts that our Saviour was nearly fifty years old at the time of his crucifixion. The author then makes some good remarks concerning the use of the understanding in matters of religion, and on the use and interpretation of Scripture; giving also some seasonable warnings against a desire to pry into the mysteries of the divine nature, or any other of the “deep things of God.” The continued exercise of miraculous gifts and powers in the church is then expressly asserted, with an enumeration of the particular kinds of miracles which frequently took place; and the Valentinians are upbraided with the absence of these powers among themselves:—a remarkable assertion, especially if we consider the challenge with which it is accompanied, and one which strongly tends to confirm the opinion (I suppose I may say generally held) relating to the *gradual* cessation of miracles

in the Christian church, after the age of the apostles. Towards the conclusion of this book, (c. 32,) Irenæus asserts, in accordance with other early ecclesiastical writers, that the soul of man is not of itself immortal, but lives only as long as God pleases; a doctrine which he resolves into that of the absolute and universal sovereignty of the Most High.

*In the Third Book,* Irenæus refutes the errors of the Gnostics by proofs from Scripture, and the teaching of the apostles. He remarks that the sacred writers did not record the doctrines of religion without having first received an extraordinary and accurate knowledge of them by divine inspiration. Hence, says he, they are certain guides; and he who does not assent to them (mentioning particularly the Evangelists, or writers of the Gospels) despises Christ and the Father. But, adds Irenæus, when we refute the opinions of the heretics out of these sacred books, they complain that these books have been corrupted, and are not in themselves a sufficient authority in matters of faith; and that the truth cannot be gathered from the Scriptures by those who are not also acquainted with oral 'tradition.' He represents them as referring to the words of St. Paul, "We speak wisdom among the perfect, howbeit not the wisdom of this world;" and adds, that each leader of the different sects supposes his own fancies and inventions to be the wisdom to which St. Paul alludes; so that, according to their doctrine, truth is to be sought sometimes from Valentinus, sometimes from Marcion, sometimes from others. But, on the other hand, says Irenæus, when we appeal (*i. e.* be it observed, in confirmation of the truth *recorded in Scripture*,—not for the establishment of any addition to that truth) to tradition, derived from the apostles, and preserved by the presbyters who have succeeded each other in the church, then they reject this tradition, and affirm that themselves alone have discovered the pure truth, being wiser than the presbyters, and even than the apostles.

Hence we learn that the false teachers who sprang up in the early church were the first who maintained that the testimony of Scripture is not of itself sufficiently clear and explicit in matters of faith, and that, in order to arrive at the whole truth of our religion, recourse must be had to various oral explanations and

additions handed down from the days of the apostles; a position equally false and dangerous, sufficient to alter or destroy the whole fabric of Christianity. The written record was, in fact, at once the depository and safeguard of the true faith. The vagueness and inefficiency of oral tradition, even with reference to matters of fact, was abundantly proved by the dissensions which arose in the early church respecting the time of celebrating Easter.

Irenæus affirms that apostolical tradition, in all churches, was in accordance with Scripture; and refers especially to the church of Rome, which was particularly valuable as a witness in this matter, inasmuch as it was the earliest, (that is, among the western churches,) and consisted of Christians gathered from all parts of the world. He mentions the succession of Roman bishops from the time of the apostles, and says that other churches, also, such as those of Smyrna and Ephesus, had possessed the same advantage of an unbroken line of pastors; and then takes occasion to relate some sayings attributed to St. John and Polycarp, expressing their detestation of Gnostic errors.—From all this, Irenæus concludes that the truth is to be sought, not in the modern sects, but in those churches in which the apostles themselves had taught. If, says he, these apostles had not left any writings behind them, we must in that case have adhered to the faith as orally delivered and propagated by their disciples. Such a process must have taken place among a barbarous people, ignorant of the art of writing. But, inasmuch as he was not thus compelled to have recourse to oral tradition in support of Christian truth, he again refers the Gnostics to the Holy Scriptures, and refutes many of their errors by proofs drawn from the sacred volume.—In the course of this demonstration, after having made quotations from each of the gospels, he falls into the silly conceit of pretending to show that it was necessary the gospels should have been four in number, because there are four quarters of the world, four cardinal winds, and four living creatures mentioned in the Apocalypse!—Afterwards, he maintains correctly that the Old Testament does not contradict the New.—He bestows great praise upon the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, relating its history according to the fabu-

lous tradition of the Jews, and supposing its authors to have been qualified for the execution of their tasks by divine inspiration. In this latter opinion he is supported by Justin Martyr and other early ecclesiastical writers.

Having hitherto referred chiefly to the writings of the apostles, Irenæus proceeds, in the *Fourth Book*, to appeal to the writings of the prophets, and the discourses of our Saviour himself. He treats particularly of the nature of the deity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is to be regretted that this author, who justly blames the Gnostics for professing to be wise above what is written, should himself have fallen, in some measure, into the same error. But such is the fact. He tells us a great deal more concerning the divine nature than we find in Scripture, and therefore more than himself, or any other man, can have means of knowing; as, for example, when he affirms that God the Father is immediately served by his own offspring and form (*progenies et figuratio sua*), that is, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Word and the Wisdom of God; and that these other persons of the Godhead are served by all the angels, who are subject to them. He maintains (against the Gnostics) that the Old and the New Testaments have the same author and the same end; and that Christ did not abolish the law of nature contained in the Ten Commandments, but only the Mosaic law; which he did, in order that men might serve God with greater liberty, and call upon him as their Father with greater confidence. He applies his remarks concerning the divine origin of the Old Testament more particularly to the institution of sacrifices under the law; and describes the celebration of the Eucharist, according to Christ's holy institution, as having taken the place of all these abrogated ceremonies, and as having been foretold by the prophet Malachi (ch. i. v. 10, 11), under the character of Incense (*i. e.* as Irenæus explains it, the prayers of the saints) and a pure offering. The whole of this passage concerning the Eucharist has given rise to much debate, but this is not the place for a critical examination of it; and it may suffice to observe that, without declining into any serious error on the doctrine of the Lord's supper, Irenæus does appear to have refined a little too much upon the subject, and to have overlooked the simple and real meaning of the institution, by a desire to draw a

parallel between it and the sacrifices or oblations of the Mosaic economy. He concludes, however, with these words, which perhaps are sufficient to prevent any serious mistake:—"The altar is in heaven; for thither do we direct our prayer and our offering." Of the various explanations of texts from the Old Testament given in this book, some are sound and edifying, while others are erroneous and absurd; but the great doctrine of the unity of the Godhead is successfully established against the Gnostics. At the conclusion of the book, the author combats, with great zeal, the false doctrine that some men are good, and others bad, by nature. He represents all men as both able and free to choose and to perform either good or evil; maintains that we cannot explain, upon any other supposition, the exhortations to holiness and good works addressed to mankind by the prophets, and Jesus Christ himself; and asserts that the fault lies entirely with men themselves, if they come short of perfection, by neglecting to make a good use of their moral liberty and capacities.

*In the Fifth Book*, Irenæus argues principally from the words of our Lord and the apostles. He proves the real humanity of Christ against the Valentinians and Ebionites, and maintains the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead against the Gnostics. He again adverts (and still with too much explanation and refinement) to the nature of the Holy Trinity in Unity. He institutes a comparison between Eve and the Virgin Mary; the latter of whom he calls the *advocata* (in the original the word was probably *παράκλητος*) of the other, but without attributing to her any office of intercession or the like. In fact, his object is simply to contrast the disobedience of Eve, with the obedience and submission to the divine will manifested by the holy virgin. The author then touches upon various other matters in which the Gnostics had departed from the true standard of Christian faith, and at length mentions their opinions concerning Antichrist. His testimony to the authenticity of the Revelation of St. John is express. He intimates (but rather obscurely) his own opinion that by Antichrist was meant the Roman empire, and especially one particular emperor who would fill the throne. But he observes, very wisely, that it is far better and safer to wait for the accomplishment of the prophecies contained in that book,

than to frame conjectures respecting their meaning and application. Irenæus deems it evident that the world will last six thousand years, because it was created in six days, and it is said that a thousand years is with the Lord as one day. He maintains the eternity of future punishment. And from the fact of our Saviour not having risen from the dead until the third day, he concludes that the souls of the faithful are not admitted to the presence of God immediately after their departure from the body, but rather that they go to some invisible place, set apart for their reception, where they will remain until the general resurrection; after which, they will be admitted, in their perfect natures, that is, with body and soul united (as in Christ himself at his ascension), to the beatific presence. He supposes that, immediately after the resurrection, the Lord Jesus Christ will set up a kingdom upon earth, in which his saints will reign with him, (giving here another instance of his credulity, by appealing to the testimony of former teachers, especially Papias, in proof of St. John having reported a saying of our Saviour, that the produce of the vine would be wonderfully abundant during this happy reign;) and labours industriously to prove that the descriptions given by the Jewish prophets of the kingdom of Messiah, are to be understood, not in a spiritual sense, but literally. He asserts (with appeal to the doctrine taught by the disciples of the apostles) that some of the saints will be taken up into heaven, others will enjoy the happiness of paradise, and others will possess the beautiful city, New Jerusalem, (according to their respective merits,) but that all will see God.

It is evident, from even the foregoing sketch of the Treatise against Heresies, that it contains much sound and valuable matter, mingled with much also that is weak, useless, and erroneous. Irenæus cannot be charged with having wilfully corrupted Christian doctrine; in fact, he represents it, on the whole, in its primitive simplicity, when he states its leading doctrines in opposition to false teachers. But, by his desire to develop and explain minutely all the doctrines of the gospel, and to say something concerning every word and metaphor, every passage, similitude and allusion of Scripture, by way of explanation, he was not unfrequently betrayed into mistaken expositions,



fruitless speculations, and vain fancies. He was often led astray by attempts to deduce a true doctrine from passages of Scripture which have nothing to do with it, and for this purpose he had recourse to the most violent and perverse interpretations. In his efforts to expose the false tenets of the Gnostics, and to give an honourable representation of the faith which they had so badly disfigured, he was seduced into the practice of giving a mystical or allegorical exposition to various passages of Scripture; and by his zeal against the doctrine of the Gnostics concerning the state of mankind after death, he was induced to advocate low views concerning the nature of the future kingdom of Messiah. He was led also into many errors by reposing too great confidence in the opinions and dicta of earlier teachers in the church, whom he regarded with too much respect, as if the name of a 'disciple of the apostles' were a security against their having propounded wrong interpretations of Scripture, or having admitted as true what were in fact no better than fictitious narratives or idle dreams. Great praise, however, must be given to Irenæus, if we regard him simply as an opponent of Gnostic errors. These he combated with complete success, and left their advocates without a refuge. But it is greatly to be wished that he had done sometimes more, and sometimes less, in this matter. He represents them throughout his book as wild and irrational enthusiasts; but, it must be remembered that, together with all their errors and absurdities, they held some sound opinions, and were influenced by some right motives; and as Irenæus found it so easy to expose their weaknesses and follies, it would have been well if he had written against them less copiously, with less refinement of argument, but with greater accuracy and a more lucid arrangement. In one word, his work would have been far more valuable than it is, if it had been reduced to one-half of its size, by the omission of numerous excrescences, and the absence of many extravagant or foolish interpretations of Scripture, with which it is disfigured.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

## CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS was born of heathen parents, either at Athens or Alexandria. The time and manner of his conversion to Christianity are uncertain; but we learn from his own testimony that he enjoyed the instructions of able and zealous teachers of religion in Greece, the south of Italy, Palestine, Cœle-Syria, and Egypt. One of these was Pantænus, whom Clement succeeded as head of the catechetical school at Alexandria; of which church he was ordained a presbyter. He taught in that school with great success and reputation, until the year 202, when he was compelled by the persecution under Severus to seek refuge in a foreign country. He lived some time during this period at Jerusalem, (then called *Ælia Capitolina*,) where he became instrumental in confirming and enlarging the Christian church. He afterwards returned to Alexandria, where he appears to have died about the year 218.

Clement surpassed all earlier teachers of the Christian church in learning, and especially in an extensive acquaintance with the works of heathen authors, and in those powers of rhetoric which enabled him to apply his stores of knowledge to the purposes of instruction. Pantænus had established a close connexion between the Greek philosophy and the Christian religion; and the same course of study and teaching was pursued to a still greater extent by his successor. In whose writings the two systems are elaborately interwoven with each other. Clement, like his master, did not adopt the tenets of any one school of philosophy, but borrowed from them all, in the manner of the Eclectics, what he deemed true and useful; being, however, chiefly indebted to the writings of Plato, and the doctrines of the Stoics. He thought that he was pursuing the course most likely to reconcile the unbelievers of his day to Christianity, by showing that the seeds of that religion had already lain scattered up and down in the best doctrines of heathen philosophy. With this view he composed a threefold work, in which his readers

were gradually made acquainted with the whole contents of his system, after the manner of instruction adopted by the Pythagoreans, and with a certain resemblance to the accustomed mode of initiation into the heathen "mysteries." In the first of these books he exhorted the heathen to adopt the Christian religion, grounding his exhortation upon a comparison of heathenism and Christianity. In the second, he prescribed to the new converts rules for a religious life. And, at last, in the third, he fully developed those high and spiritual doctrines for the reception of which he had previously prepared his readers.

His *Exhortation to the Heathen*, (*Δόγος προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας*;) resembles, in general, treatises of a similar kind, which had already proceeded from the pens of other Christian writers. He objects to the heathen, that their whole religion, and especially their secret religious services, their oracles, mythology, and sacrifices, were founded upon fiction and deceit. We, says he, are taught other wisdom and truths by the Word of God, which has descended from David, and yet was before him. Say not that our truth is new. We existed before the creation of the world; since, with a view to our future being, we were already born in God. We are the rational offspring of God the Word; by him we are from the beginning; for in the beginning was the Word. This Word, who as the Creator of the world gave us life, has appeared among us as a teacher, and instructed us how to live, so that hereafter, as God, he may bestow upon us eternal life and happiness. In ridiculing the ceremonies observed at the heathen festival of Bacchus, the author gravely remarks, that the cry of *Evan*, used on that occasion, had reference to *Eve*, who first introduced error into the world. He refers to *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Xenophon*, and other philosophers, as having taught the existence of only one supreme God; but, says he, they derived their doctrine from the *Sibyl*, a Jewish prophetess, and from the other sacred writings of the *Jews*. Of the poets who had taught the same doctrines, he mentions *Aratus*, *Hesiod*, *Euripides*, and *Orpheus*. But he refers his readers to the writings of the *Jewish prophets* for further information concerning the divine nature; and gives some extracts from these books by way of specimen. He concludes this book with

exhortations to the heathen to embrace Christianity; and some powerful representations of the responsibility which lay upon them, in consequence of their having had the truth declared to them.

The second treatise, entitled *Παιδαγωγός*, or *The Tutor*, is divided into three books. In these he shows, *first*, that the only true guide of man, at once most wise and most compassionate, is Jesus, the Son or Word of God: he collects a large number of scriptural texts in which children are mentioned, with the addition of many mystical and forced explanations, borrowed partly from Philo (but without mentioning his name): he maintains that all who seek truth are the children of God, in a high and noble sense (contrary to the views of the Gnostics): from the mention of the Logos, (Word, or reason,) he proceeds to lay down his principles of morals, which he does rather in the manner of a Stoic philosopher than of a Christian teacher; maintaining that faith consists in obedience to reason, (or the Word,) and describing the Christian life as a connected series of rational acts, which the believer has learnt from his guide, the Word. Having entered, in the Second Book, upon the details of Christian duty, he confines himself chiefly to matters of outward decorum, giving many rules and directions respecting temperance, correct and seemly behaviour, and especially gravity of manner and speech. He praises the beauty of benevolence, and maintains, in the manner of the Stoics, that the Christian alone is the truly rich man. The author supports his rules of conduct by many quotations from Scripture. Such is the substance of *the Second and Third Books* of the *Pedagogus*. It was, perhaps, most in accordance with the writer's general design, to confine himself here to the externals of conduct, and the lower degrees of Christian virtue; and we shall not be greatly surprised or offended at the absence of the higher principles and motives of Christian morality, if we consider that the object of this treatise was chiefly to draw a comparison between the appearance or developement of heathen and Christian morals, in favour of the latter. The precepts of Clement may indeed be deemed, in some cases, too rigorous and precise; his expositions of Scripture are often forced and mistaken; and his style is prolix. But this

book is of considerable value, as containing a description of many of the prevalent manners and customs of the age.

The most important work of Clement is his third Treatise, entitled *Στρώματα* or *Στρωματεῖς*, (*Stromata* or *Stromates*; *Miscellanies*; literally *Tapestry*,) or *Gnostic Dissertations concerning the True Philosophy*. In this book the author proceeds to declare the higher principles, or more abstruse doctrines, of the religion which he taught; and to show, in opposition to the Gnostics, commonly so called, that orthodox Christians had their secret and deep mysteries, and were in fact the only people who deserve the name of Gnostics, as being alone truly learned on these subjects. He maintains, that it is dangerous to impart the real mysteries of the true philosophy (meaning Christianity) to those who are unprepared to receive them, and are ready only to turn them into ridicule. And he professes to have aimed at a certain difficulty or obscurity of style in this treatise, in order to exercise the patience and ingenuity of his readers. We can perhaps hardly persuade ourselves, that the apologies of Clement for his reserve in communicating religious knowledge were directly derived from the practice of the apostles, who, while they gave milk to babes and meat to strong men, yet gloried in not wearing a veil like Moses. Nor can it be affirmed that Clement's studied obscurity of style is formed upon the pattern of the simple and easy language of the New Testament. In short, it is difficult not to regard this learned writer rather as a well-meaning philosopher, than a plain Christian teacher.

On account of this confessed want of arrangement in the *Stromata*, it is difficult to give any regular analysis of the treatise. It consists of eight books, the beginning of the first of which is lost.

*In the First Book*, the author speaks of the preservation of Gospel truths by apostolical tradition. He informs us also, that our blessed Saviour did not impart to the multitude those truths which it was not convenient for them to hear; but that He disclosed certain doctrines to a few of his disciples, who were prepared to receive them, and to act rightly under their influence. Another passage to the same effect, from a work of the same author, now lost, is preserved by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii.

c. 1,) in which it is expressly said, that our Saviour, after his resurrection, imparted these sacred doctrines, (*τῆν γνῶσιν*;) to St. Peter, St. James, and St. John, who conveyed them to the other apostles; and these, in their turn, to the seventy disciples. This information can hardly be regarded as correct; but it was very convenient for the system of Clement, whether true or false; a system, the establishment of which may be regarded as the first stage in the corruption of Christian doctrine. It must, however, be borne in mind, that Clement did not reckon among these secret doctrines any of the essentials of the Christian religion, or truths necessary to salvation; but he supposed them to include only philosophical explanations of the divine religion, and mystical expositions of the literal sense of certain passages of Scripture. It is uncertain from whom Clement received the hint which he has thus recorded; but there can be no doubt that it was adopted by himself and his followers in the hope of making the Christian faith appear the more respectable in the eyes of heathen philosophers, and perhaps especially of meeting the haughty claims of the Gnostics. It may have appeared to them that a fiction, intended for the honour and advancement of Christianity, was perfectly justifiable; and Clement, in particular, with such views, could have had little scruple in adopting a system of allegorical interpretation of Scripture from Philo, of whom he was an ardent admirer. But the principle was altogether unsound, and in its effects most pernicious; it was unsound, because it was a practical departure from honesty and truth; and it was pernicious, because, although at first it did not profess to touch the vitals of Christianity, yet it tended to bury the truth under a gradual accumulation of fiction, error, and imposture.

Clement professes to treat of these secret doctrines only so far as his memory served, and also so far, and in such manner, as he thought the discovery might be made without liability to gross abuse. He labours strenuously to show, that philosophy was not, as some supposed, the work of an evil genius, intent upon injuring mankind, but that it ought rather to be considered as a gift of divine providence. It was useful, says he, before the coming of our Lord; and it has its use even now. God is the author of all good things; of some directly, as of the Old and

New Testaments, and of others indirectly, as of philosophy. Philosophy leads the Gentiles to Christ, as the law leads the Jews. Its office was mystically foreshadowed in the history of Sarah and Hagar, as Philo had observed. But, says the author, by philosophy I do not mean either the system of Plato, or that of the Stoics, or any other sect; but that which is really good belonging to any or all of them. The arts of sophistry, however, are altogether useless; just as, on the other hand, we deceive ourselves, if we expect to understand the Scripture merely by faith, without the aid of philosophy and learning. The philosophy both of the barbarians and the Greeks contains scattered fragments of the theology of the ever-present Word; and he who collects those fragments into one system, will safely discover the perfect Word,—the truth. He maintains that the Greeks derived much of their philosophy from the barbarians, among whom the Jews were the most ancient people; that we must not interpret our Saviour's words, "All who came before me are thieves and robbers," to the disparagement of sound philosophy; and that St. Paul, in speaking of the Athenian altar to the Unknown God, has given his testimony to the fact, that the Greek philosophy contains some truth; and that this philosophy is to be used as one means, in conjunction with others, of arriving at a knowledge of divine truth. Our Saviour's doctrine, says he, is perfect in itself, and the Greek philosophy adds nothing to the truth; but it is adapted to ward off the attacks of sophistry, and it ought to be regarded as the hedge or fence around the Lord's vineyard. The author proves at large, that the philosophy (or religion) of the Jews is older than any other, and for this purpose institutes a comparison between the Jewish and Greek chronologies. Among his chronological notices, he places the birth of our Saviour in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Augustus, to which he attributes a duration of forty-six years; and he says that some, having carefully inquired into the day of the nativity, had fixed it at the twenty-fifth of May; but that others had made various calculations respecting the day both of our Saviour's birth and of his crucifixion. It is obvious that no importance ought to be attached to any particular views of questions, which were attended with so much uncertainty at even

this early period of the church. Clement then proceeds to relate the history of the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, according to the accounts of Aristobulus and Irenæus; and agrees with the latter, in supposing the translators to have been assisted by divine inspiration. From the saying of Numerius the Pythagorean, "What is Plato, but Moses speaking in the Attic tongue?" Clement takes occasion to relate the history of the Jewish lawgiver, mixed up with a variety of fabulous stories; and then points out many particulars in which he supposes Plato to have been indebted to his writings.

He begins *the Second Book* with bringing against the Greek philosophers a charge of having corrupted the philosophy which they had taken from the Jews. He shows the value of faith, as that which leads to the knowledge of God; and the importance of the fear of God. He describes the virtues and properties of a Christian philosopher, or real Gnostic. He divides faith into two parts; the one relating to things past, the other to things future. With Hermas in his *Shepherd*, he teaches a twofold repentance; the one pertaining to those who, on their conversion to Christianity, seek the pardon of sins committed by them in their heathen state; the other for those who had fallen into sin after baptism. And he affirms that, when the latter may have been once restored, there is no further room in their case for penitence, properly so called. Hence he is led to speak of the nature of sins of infirmity,—of the passages of Scripture in which human passions are attributed to God,—and of the different kinds of knowledge. He endeavours to show that the principles of morals, as taught by the Greek philosophers, are to be sought in the laws of Moses. The real Gnostic, says he, who has one virtue, possesses, by natural consequence, all the rest; he imitates God, especially in doing good, but also in patience and temperance.—After having recounted the various opinions of philosophers, concerning the chief good or supreme happiness of man, he shows that Plato, teaching that it consisted in the knowledge of good, and in resemblance to God, agreed with the doctrine of Scripture. Hence he is led to speak of pleasure; and afterwards of the benefits of marriage.

*The Third Book* opens with a continuation of observations



respecting marriage. The author remarks that Basilides had rejected marriage altogether; that the disciples of Carpocrates and Epiphanes, on the other hand, had introduced a community of wives; while Plato and other ancient philosophers had entertained a dislike of marriage, because they considered that it was a misfortune and punishment to men to be born into this world. Clement then refutes the errors of the heretics on this subject, and enters into an examination of the different arguments, and passages of Scripture, which they advanced in support of their opinions. He grants that men may abstain from marriage out of love to God, and with a view to the advantages to be derived from such abstinence; but he adds, that it is alike impious and unreasonable to do so on the grounds alleged by the false teachers. He understands the promise of our Saviour, that where two or three are gathered together in his name, there he will be in the midst of them, as relating, especially, to his presence with a man and his wife and child; but, not being quite satisfied with this interpretation of the passage, he adduces other mystical explanations; which, as may be easily supposed, are not deserving of notice. The author gives, however, in this part of his work, some expositions of a better description, and some good advice respecting the interpretation of Scripture in general. To the assertion that birth and life are in themselves evils, which the false teachers in the Christian church supported by an appeal to the words of Jeremiah in which the prophet curses the day of his birth, and to a verse in the Septuagint version (but not in the Hebrew text) of Job, Clement replies, that one who has not yet done evil, cannot have become subject to Adam's curse,—that though a man may be, as David says of himself, conceived in sin, yet he is not himself involved in sin until he has experienced some ungodly motion of the heart,—and that life may be a good, as well as an evil, according to the use which is made of it.

*In the Fourth Book*, the author treats of martyrdom, and Christian perfection. He teaches that the soul of man ought to raise itself to God, above all sinful emotions in itself, and all the infirmities of the body. Death, says he, consists in that union of the soul with the body, by virtue of which the former is brought under the dominion of sin; whereas, life consists in being

delivered from the power of sin. So that the separation of the soul from the body upon which a philosopher is intent throughout his life, produces in him that Gnostic buoyancy of spirit which enables him to submit to natural death with ease. Such a Gnostic willingly surrenders his bodily life to any one who demands it. He hereby gives a testimony,—concerning himself, that he is true to God;—concerning the tempter, that he rages in vain against one who is faithful through love;—concerning the Lord, that a divine and convincing power attends his word, and that he (himself) was not induced to forsake him even by fear of death: and, hence, he departs joyfully to his friend the Lord, for whom he has willingly laid down his life, and is honoured by our Saviour with the title of ‘dear brother,’ on account of his having endured sufferings so like his own. We call martyrdoms, says he, a perfection, or consummation; but this, not on account of the man’s having attained the end of life, but because he has performed a work of perfect love. Every soul that lives purely with the knowledge of God, and in obedience to his commandments, is in fact a martyr, in what way soever it may depart from this mortal life.—He condemns the practice of rushing eagerly or unnecessarily upon martyrdom, as a species of self-destruction.—He commends a contempt of pain, poverty, and other outward evils; describes the happiness of practising the virtues of the Gospel; and makes some further remarks respecting a bold and persevering confession of the Christian faith.—In conclusion, he gives a description of the perfect or Gnostic Christian; whom he represents as a man who knows God, and who loves God and his neighbour, not from fear of punishment or hope of reward, but simply out of affection to what is good; one who loves the persons of sinners, but hates their sins; one who, under the influence of high motives, refrains from the pleasures of life, but does not despise the creatures.—He describes a three-fold object of divine punishments; first, the reformation of the offender; secondly, the admonition and warning of those who would be saved; and, thirdly, the maintenance of God’s honour and the authority of the divine law.

*The Fifth Book* opens with a description of faith in Christianity and in the divine Word; illustrated by quotations from

heathen writers relating to faith in general. Concerning the nature of Christ, Clement says, The Word of the Father of all things, is not a word uttered or pronounced; but the wisdom and manifest goodness of God; an almighty and really divine power, not unintelligible even to those who refuse to acknowledge it; a will which contains all things potentially in itself.—Passing from faith, the author next treats of hope; and says, among other things, that Socrates looked forward to a future state of existence. He shows at large, that not only heathen philosophers, as (especially) Pythagoras and the Egyptians, but the Jewish sacred writers, found it useful to deliver their doctrines concerning divine things under the cover of images and allegories; instancing particularly in the Jewish tabernacle, of which he declares what he supposed to have been the mystical signification. This ancient kind of philosophy, says he, by which truth was taught covertly, or by means of outward and visible emblems, tends to assist the memory, to excite a desire of learning in the minds of men, and gives to the doctrine taught a kind of solemnity and dignity, while it withdraws it from the apprehension of those who are not worthy to receive it. St. Paul himself retained this old system of concealment or reserve; and by the ‘meat for the strong men,’ of which he speaks in the third chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, we are to understand the flesh and blood of the Word, that is, the apprehension of the power and being of God.

After these remarks, the author gradually discloses the way to the knowledge of God, which consists in a withdrawal of the mind from all earthly and sensual objects. Hence it was, says he, that Socrates described philosophy as “a meditation of death” and that Pythagoras imposed upon his disciples a silence of five years. This, he continues, they learned from Moses, who commanded that the burnt-offering should be cut in pieces, after the skin had been taken off:—for the Gnostic soul must be consecrated to the light, after it has been delivered from its gross flesh; having been freed from all corporeal uncleanness, passion, errors, and sensual desires. Euripides speaks of our Saviour, unknowingly, when he says, “Thou bearest in heaven the sceptre of Jupiter, and rulest also over the earth.” But when we have

attained to the knowledge of God, we see not so much that which is, as that which is not; for God cannot be positively comprehended in any way. God has no name; but we apply honourable names to him, in order to assist our thoughts. We must, however, believe Christ and the prophets as the true witnesses of God; for the Lord is the true Son of God, and the prophets have been declared the children of God. And this agrees with the sentiments of Plato, who says, that "we must believe the ancients in this matter, who, as they said, were themselves born of the gods, and, therefore, must have been well acquainted with their ancestors. We cannot but believe the children of the gods, even though they do not adduce any certain or probable proofs of their doctrine." The author then proceeds to prove at length, that the Greek philosophers were greatly indebted to the sacred writings of the Jews; instancing in various particulars of (supposed) agreement between the writings of the former and the contents of the Old Testament; and pointing out a mistaken view of certain passages of Scripture, as the probable foundation of some of their errors.

In the beginning of *the Sixth Book*, Clement is still engaged in proving that nearly all the Greek philosophy was derived, more or less directly, from the Jewish records. He supposes that God was known to the best of the Greeks, by a kind of revelation; which he proves from a book falsely ascribed to St. Peter; and hence he argues that the pious heathen worshipped the same God as the Christians, only not with a perfect knowledge of Him, not having learnt the doctrine declared by the Son;—that the Jews and heathen had received an old covenant from God, and the Christians had received a new one;—and that God was honoured by the Greek philosophy, having qualified good men among the heathen to execute the office of prophets in their own language.—He maintains, also, that our Saviour, in Hades, preached the Gospel to the heathen, in order that they might not be unjustly condemned for not having received a message which they had never heard.—Then follow some remarks descriptive of the character of a perfect Gnostic or Christian; and in praise of the Jewish religion and Greek philosophy, as introductory to Christianity. The perfect Christian, says Clement, is like the

angels;—he is a true presbyter and deacon of the church, that is, a servant of the divine will, and, although not honoured with the chair of a bishop in this world, yet will he hereafter, as St. John says in the Revelation, sit upon the four and twenty thrones, judging the people. For the offices of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, are, I suppose, imitations of the angelic hierarchy; and of that condition which, according to the Scripture, awaits those who have lived according to the example of the apostles. Concerning these, the Apostle writes that they will be caught up in the clouds, first as deacons, then by an advance in glory reckoned among the presbyters, until at last they attain unto ‘a perfect man.’—This passage is remarkable, as an instance of an arbitrary combination and amplification of several different passages of Scripture; and as containing expressions of distinguishing respect with regard to the office of bishops.—The fancies and suppositions of good, but mistaken, men in these early ages of the church, were afterwards employed for the establishment of unscriptural pretensions in favour of the growing ecclesiastical hierarchy.

In accordance with the doctrines of Pythagoras and Plato, Clement teaches here (and in the fourth and seventh books) that those Christians who may have fallen into sin after baptism will undergo a purification in the state after death. He is the first Christian writer in whose works we find any intimation of this kind;—and it is evident that here we discover the first trace of something like the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory. Clement supposes not only that those men, who had yielded to the dominions of their passions, will be purified from their sins by punishment before their admission into heaven; but that others, whom he calls faithful, will be subject to a similar process on account of their failings, and even afterwards will not be permitted to attain to those high degrees of felicity which will be the portion of the perfect, who will be equal to the angels. He does not give any close description of this mode of future purification by certain punishments; but he says that the faithful will grieve over the comparative lowness of their attainments, and will be smitten with shame on account of their trans-

gressions; which will be to them a severe chastisement.—The fiction of a purgatorial fire is, however, of later date.

Then follows another extraordinary position of our author. He maintains that God gave to the heathen the sun, moon, and stars, as objects of worship, in order that they might not be quite without a God and religion, and so perish entirely;—an opinion which he founds upon Deuteronomy iv. 19. But, says he, they have been ungratefully neglectful of this command, and have turned to the worship of images; and, therefore, they will be condemned, unless they repent. Some will be condemned because they would not believe in God when they could; others, because, though there was no want of will, yet they would not take the pains requisite in order to the attainment of faith; and others, because they did not pass on from the worship of the heavenly bodies to that of the creator himself. For this way was pointed out to the heathen, in order that, through their adoration of the heavenly bodies, they should look upwards to God.

The book concludes with some further remarks on the knowledge of God, to which the perfect Christian attains; and on the Greek philosophy as introductory to the religion of the Gospel.

*The Seventh Book* opens with a description of the excellences and virtues of the true Gnostic or Christian. The author's attachment to the subtleties of Greek philosophy again appears, in a refined (and partly erroneous) description of the nature of the Son of God; a subject evidently beyond the grasp of the human intellect, and one upon which men almost always depart from the simplicity of the Gospel, when they attempt to investigate it by the aid of reason. We ought to be content with the declarations of Scripture, which plainly teach us that "the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the Word was made flesh." But our philosophizing author, seeking to teach something more than this, teaches, in fact, something less. He says that the Son of God possesses a perfect, most holy, supreme, and most beneficent nature, *inferior* only to that of the Almighty himself; that he orders all things according to the will of the Father, and governs all creatures for the best; that he is the power of the Father, his chief Word, who existed before all other created things; that

he imparted wisdom to the Greeks by the instrumentality of subordinate angels, who were distributed among the different nations according to an ancient law of heaven ; but that it was the part of the Lord himself to make known the doctrine of the faithful (*i. e.* the Christian religion).—The representations which our author gives of Christian character are better than those which he gives of the doctrines of the Gospel ; but even in this department of his work he indulges, to some extent, in mystery and allegory.—In conclusion, he refutes the argument of the heathen and Jews, that they could not receive the Christian faith on account of the differences and divisions which had been introduced into the church by the various sects of heretics. He shows that among themselves there existed many differences and controversies, while yet they retained some portion of the truth. And we have, says he, an unerring standard or sign by which we can always distinguish truth from error ; for we prove all doctrines by the test of Holy Scripture, from which all false teachers depart. And besides, the heretics are of later origin than the universal orthodox church ; this is as old as Christianity itself ; whereas, those sects, by their very novelty, betray the falsehood of their doctrines. These remarks are, for the most part, in a rational style ; but when we read that the Mosaic law concerning clean and unclean animals was intended to teach us to distinguish true Christians from Jews and heretics, and especially when we read certain mystical explanations concerning the animals with cloven hoofs and those which chew the cud, we feel that we are indebted only to our author's lively imagination for the intelligence conveyed.

*The Eighth Book* of the Stromata was lost at a very early period ; and that which is now substituted for it has no connexion with the preceding books, being probably a fragment of some other work by the same author.

It cannot be considered unfair to say that throughout the seven books of the Stromata we discover a great departure from the simplicity of the Gospel ; and that, in attempting to incorporate the Greek philosophy with the Christian religion, Clement laid the foundation of many corruptions in doctrine, and introduced many refinements and subtle speculations, to the great

detriment of Christian truth. But this work may be highly useful to interpreters of Scripture, as a warning to content themselves with a simple exposition of the sacred text, without presuming to adapt the divine word to their own opinions previously conceived. Clement found the doctrines of the Gospel so clearly revealed, and the literal sense of Scripture so easy and obvious, that he was obliged to have recourse to allegory and a mystical mode of interpretation, *in order to be able to say something more concerning the sacred record than others could say.* This remark holds true, to a certain extent, with regard to other early ecclesiastical writers; but, down to this period in the history of the church, it applies to none so completely as to Clement of Alexandria. It is perhaps extraordinary that a writer who so carefully laid down the principle that the Christian religion is founded exclusively upon the Holy Scriptures, furnished, at the same time, in his own works, an example of extensive abuse and misapplication of the divine records, and *taught men how to find in Scripture whatever they might choose to seek.* Clement often appeals to spurious works (then extensively received in the church), as well as to the canonical books of the Old and New Testament; but perhaps he does not attach to them an equal authority, except indeed to the books entitled *The Preaching of St. Peter*, and *The Shepherd of Hermas*.—It may be almost needless to add that the works of Clement are highly valuable in a literary and historical point of view.

A small treatise, entitled *Λόγος τῆς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*, *What rich man is saved?* is undoubtedly the production of this author. It consists of an explanation of our Saviour's words in Mark x. 17, *seq.*, and resembles the author's larger work in several particular statements and opinions, and in the general style of exposition.

Another treatise, entitled *Extracts from the writings of Theodotus, and the so-called Oriental Philosophy*, is attributed to Clement, but not without some degree of doubt. It contains a delineation of the doctrines of the Valentinians and other Gnostic sects; together with some far-fetched expositions of Scripture.

Of various other works of Clement, fragments only have been preserved. Of these lost works, the most important is his



Ἐποτυπώσεις, or *Expositions* (of Scripture). Photius (*Biblioth. Cod.* 109) gives a general idea of this work; which he represents as containing some true doctrines, mixed up with many absurd, and even heretical and impious, opinions. Eusebius has preserved some fragments of the historical portion of this work in his *Ecclesiastical History*, (lib. i. c. 12; ii. 1, 2, 9, 14, 15; vi. 14.)

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

## TERTULLIAN.

QUINTUS SEPTIMUS FLORENS TERTULLIANUS was a native of Carthage, son of a pro-consular centurion. We know nothing of his history before his conversion to Christianity; except that, by an industrious use of great native talent, he had made considerable progress in various branches of literature, and that, according to his own confession, his manners were dissolute and vicious. We possess no account of either the occasion or the date of his conversion; but we learn that it was attended with a suitable change of moral conduct, and that soon after it had taken place, he was made a presbyter of the Church at Carthage (more probably than, as has been often said, at Rome), where he began to employ his pen in the service of the religion which he had embraced.

About the year 200, Tertullian attached himself to the sect of the Montanists, whose cause he continued to support until his death, which took place about the year 218 or 220. It is said by Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 53), that Tertullian was induced to join this party in consequence of the jealousy and detraction of the Roman clergy; but the account is obscure and unsatisfactory, and we may perhaps rightly ascribe the adoption of Montanist tenets to that severe turn of thought on questions of morals, combined with a vigorous and lively imagination, by which Tertullian had already become distinguished. He did not adopt all the errors and extravagances of all who bore the name of Montanists; but he was a zealous defender of their views, so far as he coincided with them; not hesitating to distinguish the members of his favourite sect by the name of Spiritales, *spiritual*, while he

usually affixed the contemptuous appellation of *Psychici*, *sensual* or *carnal*, to the general body of Christians, whose communion he had abandoned. There can be little doubt that his example and writings contributed materially to increase the numbers of the party he had joined. It must be remembered that the Montanists were a body of religious enthusiasts, or pietists, rather than a sect of heretics, in the usual acceptation of that term. Perhaps the Montanism of Tertullian was, on the whole, beneficial to the cause of religion at the period in which he lived; inasmuch as his powerful advocacy of the tenets and morals of his sect may have excited the body of orthodox clergy to greater circumspection in their conduct, and may have withdrawn their attention from allegorical interpretations of Scripture, and other subtleties, about which they might otherwise have employed their ingenuity to the great detriment of truth.

Tertullian was what may be termed, in modern phraseology, a great genius. His turn of mind was ardent and impassioned; his imagination vivid, his invention fertile, his wit ready and sarcastic; his learning was extensive, and often skilfully applied. But his judgment was not sound, nor was his mode of arguing adapted to produce deep and abiding conviction. His style is often oratorical and turgid, when it ought to have been simple and perspicuous; and it appears as if he was often betrayed by the vehemence of his rhetoric into an overstatement of his own opinions and positions. He was well acquainted with the Greek philosophy; but he disliked it, as being, in his opinion, the mother of all heresies among Christians. He was, however, a powerful advocate of the Christian religion; and, if we make allowance for some peculiar opinions of no great moment, and for his Montanist tenets, we find in his writings a clear and impressive exhibition of Christian doctrine, without the admixture of those miserably artificial explanations, comparisons, and additions with which the works of earlier writers had been disfigured and greatly deteriorated. Even on questions of morals, in which many of his positions are harsh and overstrained, Tertullian often appears to great advantage; his heart, full of zeal for the honour of religion, kindles a corresponding flame in the mind of the reader; and he pleads so powerfully on behalf of piety and virtue,

that we cannot but make a favourable allowance for his conclusions, even when they are extreme or erroneous. He makes continual appeal to Holy Scripture; and although he sometimes adopts the fashion, so common in his age, of using it merely for the confirmation of his own opinions, yet on the whole he may be regarded as an able expositor. He argues with great vehemence, and even in a spirit of animosity, against the various errors by [which Christianity had been corrupted. His style (which forms the foundation of ecclesiastical Latinity) is harsh and peculiar, distinguished by the use of obsolete, newly-coined, and far-fetched words, unusual constructions, difficult allusions, striking inequalities, obscure brevity of diction, daring images, and quaint antitheses. The writings of Tertullian, however, are highly valuable, not only on account of the learning they contain, but especially for their description of the existing state of Christian doctrine,—of the constitution, worship, and customs of the church,—and of the positions assumed by the various sects of heretics. It is important to discover and bear in mind what books were written by Tertullian as a member of the general or orthodox Church, and what as a Montanist. This question has been the subject of some debate, but, on the whole, we are able to make the distinction with some degree of certainty.

His *Apology for the Christians against the Heathen* (*Apologeticus adversus Gentes*), written probably about the year 198 or 199, or at the latest in 205, is not indeed the first of his compositions, but may be regarded as the most beautiful and delightful of them all, as it was undoubtedly the most eloquent and powerful defence of the Christian religion which had yet appeared. This treatise was addressed to the Roman provincial governor.

The author *begins* by showing the combined injustice and folly of condemning truth without a hearing; that animosity against the Christian religion arose, in a great measure, from a want of acquaintance with it, and from prejudice, which existed notwithstanding the wonderful propagation of the faith among all classes of persons. Bad men, he continues, shun the light, but Christians court it; they glory in their religion, and are willing to endure suffering on its account. He upbraids the enemies of Christians with accusing them of monstrous crimes,

while yet, in accordance with the rule laid down by Trajan, they abstained from examination; and convicts them of other inconsistencies and errors in their proceedings, especially that of persecuting good men merely on account of their Christian name.

*In the Second Book* Tertullian maintains the innocence of the Christians, and shows that there is no reason why they should be punished under the sanguinary laws of Nero and Domitian,—urges the improbable and absurd notions of some of the charges brought against the Christians,—points out the low character of the heathen idols, and the unreasonableness of worshipping them,—rebukes the foolish insinuation that the Christians worshipped the head of an ass,—declares the nature of the great and invisible God, the antiquity, authenticity, and divine authority of the Jewish Scriptures, the person and history of our Saviour, the nature and influence of evil spirits whom the heathen worshipped as gods, and the power which was exercised over them by Christians,—retorts the charge of impiety upon the heathen,—asserts the loyalty of Christians, founded upon Scripture, and their respect for the person of the emperor, so far as it was lawful,—describes their spirit of love, and their forbearance towards their enemies, notwithstanding the power they had acquired by the rapid and astonishing increase of their numbers,—and concludes by remarking, that they ought not to be blamed for conscientiously absenting themselves from the public games and exhibitions. The author then goes on to describe the constitution of the Christian society, or church, and the nature and circumstances of its religious worship and discipline. (Many references to this passage are made in the course of the following work.) Tertullian then shows how unreasonable it was to lay public or national calamities to the charge of the Christians, who ought rather to be regarded as (instrumentally) the preservers of their country,—pleads that they were not, as sometimes represented, useless or unprofitable members of the state,—contends that, although the Christians ought not to be regarded as a mere philosophical sect, yet that, at least, they ought to have the liberty and security accorded to such sects,—shows the superiority of Christianity to mere philosophy,—and exhibits the real nature, and the grounds, of that constancy and patience in suffering, which had been miscalled obstinacy by

their persecutors. "The blood of the Christians," says he, "is the seed of the church. You condemn us, but God acquits us." But he makes a sad mistake here, when he implies that, for the shedding of his blood, a martyr receives at the hands of God forgiveness of all his sins.

Tertullian afterwards revised this apology, and enlarged it for the purpose of more general circulation; when it was published under the title *Ad Nationes, Libri Duo*. The second book of this treatise was enriched by a systematic refutation of the heathen theology, philosophical, poetical, and political.

With these two treatises of our author another is closely connected, entitled *On the Testimony of the Soul* (*De testimonio Animæ*). This treatise is devoted to the more ample development of a position laid down in the Apology, (c. 17.) that the soul of man involuntarily bears testimony to the leading truths of religion. The author here calls upon the untutored soul of man to testify what it knows concerning God and its own future destiny. He argues from the common modes of speech,—God grant it! If God will! God is good! God bless you! God will judge between us! and the like,—that the mind of man is naturally impressed with ideas of the one true God, which agree with the Christian doctrine on the subject. From the practice of imprecations and curses, he shows that the mind believes in the existence and agency of evil spirits; and he contends that the mind anticipates its existence after death, from the circumstance that men sometimes speak and think of the dead as miserable or safe, sometimes wish they may experience misery or rest, sometimes say of a person deceased, 'He is gone and must return,' and sometimes are influenced by a desire of posthumous renown, and all this merely as they are prompted by nature, independently of instruction; and he asserts that the mind, with these impressions, ought to attain to the true knowledge of God, or of Christianity—for the rejection of which it must answer at the bar of God. The argument, as it stands in this treatise, is imperfect; but it was, perhaps, effective, under the circumstances of the times, as an argumentum ad hominem.

The treatise *On Prayer* (*De Oratione*), is supposed to be the oldest of Tertullian's writings. It consists of an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, with some remarks on the exercise of prayer

in general. The author speaks highly of the Lord's Prayer, both on account of its author, and as containing a complete summary of Christian doctrine. This treatise contains some mistaken and vain speculations, but it is highly important to us as a record of facts and customs; and in this point of view it is frequently referred to in the course of the following pages.

An *Exhortation to the Imprisoned Confessors of Christianity* (Liber ad Martyras), belongs also to the early portion of Tertullian's writings. Some disagreement of opinion had arisen among these confessors, and it was the immediate object of Tertullian in this treatise to remove any unpleasant feeling which might exist. He recommended concord, especially on the ground that many Christians on whom penance had been imposed sought to obtain, by means of their written intercession, the peace of the church, (that is, reconciliation with the body,) earlier than it could otherwise be accorded. He adds other topics of encouragement, moral and religious.

His *Treatise on Public Shows* (Liber de Spectaculis), appears to have been composed at an early period. Its object is to dissuade Christians from frequenting the public spectacles of the day; and it is addressed more immediately to the catechumens. The author first answers two arguments in favour of these shows; namely, that such pleasures are not dangerous to religion, and that all the means of diversion employed are the gifts of God, and not to be neglected;—he then answers the remark that Scripture does not expressly forbid Christians to partake in such amusements;—he proceeds, in the next place, to bring forward arguments in support of his position, namely, the renunciation of the devil, his pomp, and his angels, made in baptism, (proving that the public shows are included in this renunciation, on account of their idolatrous origin and use;) the inconsistency of the feelings excited by these shows with the gentle and pure operations of the Holy Spirit in the heart; the danger of moral contamination; and the practice of hypocrisy and deception which such exhibitions occasion. He speaks of such scenes as the devil's own territory; and intimates that it is no wonder that evil spirits take possession of persons found on their own ground. Besides, says he, it is here that the name of God is blasphemed, and that plans for the

persecution of the church are formed.—In conclusion, he refers Christians to the far higher sources of pleasure and rejoicing which are opened to them in the Gospel; and reminds them of the tremendous and sublime spectacle which they will all be called to witness in the last day.

As a continuation of this book, Tertullian composed another *On Idolatry* (Liber de Idololatria). His object in this treatise is to show the real extent of the sin of idolatry, under which he includes the making of images of heathen deities, and the like; the practice of astrology; the teaching of heathen literature; and the dealing in wares used for idolatrous or superstitious purposes. He then proceeds to prohibit various other particulars in action or word, as savouring of idolatry; on the whole, with good reason; but in some cases, perhaps, with too much strictness and scrupulosity, carrying his injunctions to an impracticable extent.

His book *On Baptism* (Liber de Baptismo), composed most probably before he had quitted the communion of the orthodox church, is in many respects valuable and important.—Tertullian begins by expressing his admiration of the extreme simplicities of the rite of baptism considered in connexion with its wonderful results, and contrasted with the costly and elaborate ceremonies of idolatry.—He speaks of the antiquity and intrinsic excellence of water, and of the apt significancy of ablution; and maintains, moreover, that the water of baptism is prepared for its mystical use by an angel, as of old an angel officiated at the pool of Bethesda.—He enumerates several ceremonies observed in Christian baptism, which will be mentioned in their place in the following work.—He adverts to the various emblems of baptism contained (or supposed to be contained) in holy Scripture.—He then states and answers various objections relating to the importance or necessity of baptism. Among these are the following. An objector asks why were not the twelve apostles baptized? Tertullian answers, they had, at all events, received the baptism of John. Nor is it unreasonable to regard them as having been baptized when they were sprinkled by the spray of the sea, at the time of their being tossed about in the ship, during the storm mentioned in the Gospel; for that ship is an emblem of the church, tossed on the floods of persecution, until the Lord, being roused by the

prayers of his saints, commands a calm. Another objection is, that since faith is sufficient for salvation, as we see in the case of Abraham, it cannot be truly said that baptism is necessary. It is so, answers Tertullian, according to our Saviour's own words; and it is to be regarded as the clothing put upon faith, previously naked.—The author then speaks of baptism by heretics as no real baptism; explains why it is administered only once; and speaks in high terms of the baptism of blood, (martyrdom,) as a substitute for that by water. He says, that the minister of baptism in the Christian church is the high priest or bishop. (Tertullian was much addicted to the adoption of Jewish phraseology, with reference to the ministers and services of the church; a practice which subsequently led to serious abuse.) Presbyters and deacons also, says he, have a right to baptize, but not without permission from the bishop, for the honour of the church; for where this is maintained, there also the peace of the church is preserved,—and he adds, that the laity also have this right (but not women) in cases of necessity. Baptism, continues Tertullian, ought not to be administered hastily; it is better to defer it for some time, especially in the case of children, who, he thinks, ought to be instructed in the religion of Christ before they enter upon the profession of it by baptism. In this passage we find the first mention of sponsors in baptism. A dread of persons falling into sin after baptism was evidently at the foundation of Tertullian's views respecting the expediency of delaying the administration of the rite. At the conclusion of the book, Tertullian recommends Easter and Whitsuntide as the most appropriate seasons for the administration of baptism; adding, however, that every day is the Lord's, and no time in itself unfit, provided that the candidates have been properly prepared by prayer, fasting, and confession of sins.

To the works of Tertullian which are free from all traces of Montanism, belong also the *Two Books to his Wife* (*Libri duo ad Uxorem*). In the *First Book* of this treatise the author advises his wife, if he should die first, not to marry again, assuring her that this advice is dictated, not by any feeling of jealousy on his part, but by a desire for her welfare, he being persuaded that God, who had instituted marriage, had not sanctioned more than



one such union for each individual. He then proceeds to cite arguments and examples from Scripture, especially from the writings of St. Paul, in support of his theory of the unlawfulness of a second marriage, and to answer some pleas usually urged against it. It is, perhaps, needless to add that he does violence to the sense of Scripture in order to maintain his position. In *the Second Book* Tertullian abates the rigour of his claims, advising his wife, in case of her surviving him, at all events not to marry a heathen, as many Christian widows had done. Against this practice he brings forward sound and powerful arguments; and, in conclusion, represents the benefits and blessings attendant upon a thoroughly Christian marriage.

Besides these writings, which are evidently free from the peculiar tenets of Montanism, there are those concerning which it is difficult to pronounce whether they were written by Tertullian before or after his secession from the orthodox body. Among these we may reckon his *Book on Penitence* (*Liber de Pœnitentia*), although it appears most probable that this book was composed before the author joined the Montanists. In this treatise Tertullian teaches that repentance, (consisting in a sorrow for sins committed, whether in act or thought, arising from a fear of God, and tending to salvation,) is necessary in order to baptism; and that, in case of sin after baptism, there is room once more, (but only once,) for repentance, accompanied by an outward act of penitence, *ἔξομολόγησις*, (such as is described in the following work, book iv., chap. iv., sect. 1.) It is manifest that this book departs from the simplicity of Scripture, and contains various seeds of error.

Another work of Tertullian, of uncertain date, is his *Treatise against the Jews* (*Liber adversus Judæos*). In it the author shows that the heathen had obtained a right to the grace of God through Christ; that the law of nature, on which that of Moses was founded, extended to all people; that the ceremonial worship had attained its end, inasmuch as its spiritual meaning had been developed, and the shadow had given way to the substance; and, lastly, that the Messiah was really come. He traces the error of the Jews, who maintained that the coming of Messiah was yet future, to the fact of their confounding the prophecies which

relate to his first coming in the flesh with those which predict his second coming in glory.

The *Treatise on Patience* (Liber de Patientia), is another of doubtful date; the passages which have been supposed to indicate a leaning towards Montanism being by no means decisive. In it, the author recommends patience by the examples of the long-suffering of God and our Saviour;—describes its opposite, impatience, as of Satanic origin;—points out the connexion which subsists between patience and faith;—recounts at large the benefits of patience;—and concludes with a warning against a false appearance, or vicious imitation of this virtue.

All the other works of Tertullian which remain to be noticed, were undoubtedly composed by him as a Montanist.

Of these, the first is his *Treatise on the Soldier's Chaplet* (Liber de Corona). This book was composed on the following occasion. On a day appointed for the distribution of the emperor's bounty among the Roman army, all the soldiers wore, as usual, chaplets of laurel in honour of the imperial benefactor, with the exception of one, who appeared before the general carrying his chaplet in his hand. On being asked the reason of his singular behaviour, he replied that, as a Christian, he could not consent to a practice which savoured of idolatrous worship; and, in consequence of this confession, he was put to death. The Christians, in general, disapproved of his conduct, regarding his objection as over scrupulous, and calculated to do harm to the cause of their religion. Tertullian, on the other hand, applauded his honesty and boldness; and composed this treatise in his defence, inveighing at the same time against the cowardice of the (so called) orthodox Christians. He maintains, in the treatise before us, that by the ancient and primitive custom of the church, it was generally unlawful for a Christian to wear a chaplet; refers to the renunciation used in baptism, and other ceremonies connected with that sacred rite; then speaks of the celebration of the holy Eucharist, and other practices of the church and of private Christians, including that of the frequent marking of the sign of the cross on the forehead; concerning all which, continues the author, you would look in vain to Scripture for rules and directions, which in fact have been handed down to us by oral tradi-

tion, have been established by custom, and are observed by faith. The reasons of these you may find out yourself, or learn from another. In like manner, among the Jews, and in civil transactions, many things are established by custom, rather than by law.

This first ground of argument against the wearing of the soldier's chaplet, namely, the authority of custom founded on tradition, is followed up by others, derived from the natural use of flowers, and the idolatrous origin of the wearing of garlands. The author then answers certain objections; argues that the profession of arms itself is unlawful for a Christian; and asserts that all the occasions on which chaplets were usually worn, are unbecoming one who ought rather to wear his master's crown of thorns, in order thereby to obtain the crown of life.

In this treatise we find the author appealing to oral tradition, as a guide or rule in matters of form or ceremony. Mention is made of the sign of the cross as usual among Christians, without any trace of superstition or abuse. The subject of which this book treats, naturally led the writer to speak of the Christian as a soldier of Christ; and to this comparison we may trace the use of several terms which, by means of Tertullian and succeeding writers, have been adopted into the phraseology of the church. Thus, days of fasting and prayer are compared to the soldier's posts, and hence called *stationes*; the creed, or confession of faith, by which Christians are distinguished from unbelievers and others, is compared to the military watchword or passport, and hence called by the same name, *symbolum*; while the solemn rites by which Christians are dedicated to the service of Christ, and profess their allegiance to him, are represented as corresponding to the soldier's oath (*sacramentum*), and denominated accordingly. With regard to the word *Sacramentum*, it may be observed that Tertullian uses it in a wide sense, denoting by it sometimes a doctrine of Christianity, sometimes the Holy Scriptures, sometimes a ceremony or institution of the church; herein probably following only the Latin translation of the New Testament, as in Col. i. 27; Eph. i. 9; v. 32; 1 Tim. iii. 16. But, in the narrower signification of a military oath, Tertullian began to apply the term *Sacramentum* to the sacred rites of Baptism

and the Lord's Supper, as being those by which the Christian is especially devoted to the service of his Lord. Hence came the use of the word *sacrament* in Christian theology;—a word which, as being at once ambiguous and figurative, could well be spared. It may indeed be employed, as by our own church, without any leaning towards error; but there can be little doubt that this term, misinterpreted or misunderstood, has assisted in introducing false doctrines and erroneous views, especially concerning the solemn, but simple, rite of the Lord's Supper.

From the uncommon zeal with which Tertullian advocates the peculiar tenets of the Montanists in his *Treatise concerning the Veiling of Virgins* (*Liber de Velandis Virginibus*), it has been supposed that this was the first book which he wrote as a member of that sect. It was the practice at Carthage for the young females to appear at public worship with their heads uncovered; and in defence of this practice, it was urged that St. Paul's rule to the contrary related only to married women. In reply to this argument, our author contends that even established customs (unlike matters of faith) are subject to alteration for the better;—that, as Satan is busy in extending evil, Christians ought to adapt their customs to the counteraction of his designs;—that the Paraclete, or Holy Spirit, has been sent in order to establish a perfect discipline among Christians, but gradually, in condescension to their weakness, and inasmuch as all things require time in order to arrive at their maturity. He says that, in the Greek churches, the young women had already adopted the custom of wearing veils at public worship; and he adduces reasons to show that the practice ought to become general, contending that the Apostle Paul was on his side. In his impassioned and oratorical style, he speaks of those young women who should appear veiled as dedicated to God, and represents the others as being only “for the men,” supposing them to attend public worship for the purpose of being seen and admired. And, in conclusion, he relates a revelation said to have been made by an angel to a sister, or female Christian, by which his doctrine was entirely confirmed.

Similar in their contents are two other treatises of Tertullian; one *On Female Dress* (*De habitu muliebri*), and another *On*

*Female Ornaments* (De cultu feminarum). These are usually, and indeed more correctly, cited as one work, under the latter title. A mournful habit, says the author, rather than gay clothing, becomes that sex through which sin was introduced into the world. Female ornaments were invented by the fallen angels, and brought into fashion on occasion of their intercourse with the daughters of men, in the early ages of the world.—The author then contends for the authenticity of the “Book of Enoch,” which appears to serve his purpose.—He depreciates the value of gold and silver, pearls and precious stones, as of base origin; and of garlands, as an invention of Satan, the falsifier of nature.—He declaims against various particulars of female vanity, such as the use of curls, the wearing of false hair, and painting the face;—gives various directions respecting modesty, simplicity, and moderation;—maintains that God has placed many things in the world for the very purpose of furnishing opportunity for temperance and abstinence;—and, in conclusion, cautions female Christians against even the appearance of immodesty.

Five other treatises were composed by this author in opposition to the common opinions and habits of Christians. One of these, is *A Book on Flight in Time of Persecution* (Liber de Fuga in Persecutione). The author argues that Christians ought not to attempt to avoid persecution, inasmuch as it was permitted by God for the trial of faith; but that they ought, under circumstances of danger, to commit themselves to the care of Divine Providence;—and he answers various objections, exercising his ingenuity in attempting to overthrow the force of our Saviour’s own example, and of his precept, “When they persecute you in one city, flee unto another.”

*An Exhortation to Chastity* (Liber de Exhortatione Castitatis), and *A Treatise on Single Marriage* (Liber de Monogamia), are also to be reckoned in this class. In these books, Tertullian declares the unlawfulness of contracting a second marriage;—an opinion, be it remembered, which (although mistaken) he held in common with many others in his day. The former treatise is addressed to an individual friend; the latter is of a more general character, and more peculiarly marked by Montanist tenets. The arguments adduced are professedly drawn from reason and

Scripture; but, in fact, agree with neither. The *Liber de Exhortatione Castitatis* contains a curious, and in some respects important, passage concerning the character of all Christians,—those of the laity as well as the clergy, (*inter ordinem et plebem*, says Tertullian, in language borrowed from the Roman jurisprudence<sup>1</sup>.) A similar passage occurs in the treatise *De Monogamia*, c. 12. All Christians are called priests (according to the Jewish phraseology) by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, on account of the holy freedom and confidence with which they are entitled to approach God in faith and prayer. In the same way, they are all said to offer sacrifice in common prayer and in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, without any intimation that this was the office of the clergy in particular, but on the supposition that ministers and people possessed equal power, and exercised equal privileges, in this matter. On the same principle Tertullian concludes that, in case of necessity, any Christian could baptize, or consecrate the elements used in the Lord's Supper, in the absence of a minister. But even Tertullian himself sometimes departs from the simplicity of these principles; and gives us to understand that Christian ministers are priests (such as the Jewish) in an exclusive sense;—thus paving the way for the establishment of a false claim, by which the governors and teachers of the Christian church arrogated to themselves peculiar gifts and privileges unknown to the early church, including the sole power of offering to God an awful, but fictitious, sacrifice.

Tertullian defended the peculiar opinions of the Montanists on fasting, in a work entitled *A Treatise on Fasts, against the Sensual* (*Liber de Jejuniis, adversus Psychicos*). In this book, the author upbraids the general body of Christians with the laxity of their ideas and practice respecting fasting, representing them as using religious abstinence only once in the year, namely, “when the bridegroom was taken away from his own,” that is, from Good Friday to Easter day. He brings forward arguments in favour of a more general observance of this custom, and especially for the peculiar fasts of the Montanists (*xerophagiæ et stationes*).

<sup>1</sup> TERTUL. *Lib. de Exhort. ad Castit.* c. 7.

In his *Treatise on Modesty* (*Liber de Pudicitia*), Tertullian contends earnestly on behalf of another peculiar opinion of his sect, namely, that Christians who had become guilty of adultery or fornication after baptism, could never be permitted to do penance, or be received into the church again. He blames the Roman bishop for having promised remission of sins to such offenders, after having performed penance. In the course of this treatise, the author quotes a passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which epistle he attributes to Barnabas; and he speaks of our Saviour's words to St. Peter, "Upon this rock will I build my church, &c.," as meaning that the church should be founded by that apostle, and as having been fulfilled by the circumstance that St. Peter was made the first instrument of converting the Jews, of opening the kingdom of heaven by baptism, of punishing Ananias and Sapphira for their sins, and of delivering the lame man from the bands of his infirmity.

We shall now take a view of some highly important treatises of Tertullian, directed against the errors of those sects of his day, which were considered heretical. Among these is one which treats of the subject of heresy in general; entitled *On the Prescription of Heretics* (*De præscriptione Hereticorum, or De præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos*). The author condemns a spirit of needless curiosity, and all attempts at over refinement, in matters of religion; and maintains that men ought to rest satisfied with an acquaintance with the rule, or general outline, of faith, once known. He then repeats the heads of Christian belief (see book iv. chap. i. sect. 11); and points out the uselessness and danger of maintaining controversy with the determined opponents of truth. The agreement of the apostolical churches among themselves in matters of faith, continues the author, is a token that they are in possession of the truth; and he challenges the erroneous sects to show that their first bishops had an apostle or disciple of the apostles for their predecessor or instructor. If they should pretend to such succession, still, says Tertullian, their want of agreement with the doctrine of the apostles would be a sufficient refutation of their claims; and then he refers them to the apostolical epistles. This passage is remarkable, inasmuch

as the ultimate appeal in matters of faith is here made to the Holy Scriptures, even while the succession of living teachers in the church could be traced from the apostles themselves. Tertullian upbraids the heretics, not only with corrupting the text, and departing from the doctrines of Scripture, but also with the want of that regular constitution and discipline, which are necessary to a true church. In the controversies which have arisen between Roman Catholics and Protestants, appeal has been often made, and sometimes very unfairly, to this treatise of Tertullian. The whole sum of the author's argument, rightly understood, may be stated in the following words:—If any man departs from Christian truth, as it was received by the first churches from the mouths of the apostles and their immediate disciples, and as it has been professed from the beginning *in accordance with the written instructions of the apostles*, this man is, in fact, a modern innovator, and his doctrines are of too late a date to be received as the doctrines of the Gospel.—The members of our own church believe that this position is far more favourable to their own views than to those of their Roman Catholic brethren.

In the *Books against Marcion* (*Libri quinque adversus Marcionem*), Tertullian shows (book i.) that there is but one true God, and that the true God of the Christians is eternal,—the creator of the world,—the author of all good,—perfectly just or righteous,—from whom alone men can receive forgiveness of sins. He shows that baptism ought to be administered to all; and defends the institution of marriage.—He then (book ii.) answers more particularly the arguments of his opponents against the goodness and other perfections of the Deity, as they are set forth in holy Scripture. In the course of these observations, he asserts the freedom of man's will,—*libertas arbitrii, liberum arbitrium*,—in moral and spiritual things, even after the Fall, (c. viii.)—Tertullian goes on (book iii.) to prove against Marcion that Christ is the son of the only true God, the creator of the world;—that the Old and New Testaments proceed from the same divine Author, and agree together;—and that our Saviour assumed a real human body. At the end of this book, the author expresses his expectation (in common with Papias, Justin,



and Irenæus) of our Saviour's personal reign upon earth during a thousand years after the first resurrection<sup>2</sup>; and most unwisely relates a fable, which could not but give great advantage to those against whom he was writing, to the effect that, during the campaign of the Emperor Severus in Judea, a type of the heavenly Jerusalem was exhibited to the heathen, in a city which actually appeared to them suspended in the air during the space of forty days. The argument is continued in *The Fourth Book*, chiefly with reference to the Gospel of St. Luke, the authority of which book (but in a corrupt form) was admitted by Marcion; and in *The Fifth Book*, with reference to ten epistles of St. Paul, which also were received by the same teacher, with such omissions as his purpose required. Tertullian proves the corruptness of the Marcionite text; and establishes his points by a comparison of many passages of genuine Scripture with each other.—This work of Tertullian is one of the most learned treatises of Christian antiquity. It is valuable as furnishing an extensive view of the opinions of the early church concerning the sense of Scripture; and also on account of the representations which it gives of the leading doctrines of Christianity, as they were generally received in the author's time<sup>3</sup>.

In his *Treatise against the Valentiniens* (*Liber adversus Valentinianos*), Tertullian professedly combats the opinions of that sect with ridicule rather than argument. He satirizes their history of *Æons*, their notions respecting the Creator of the world, concerning Christ, and men; and the differences and dissensions which existed among themselves.

In the *Treatise against Praxeas* (*Liber adversus Praxeam*), Tertullian shows that God the Father did not become man and suffer;—that the Christian doctrine of the holy Trinity in Unity does not interfere with the dominion of the One Supreme God

<sup>2</sup> Caius, a presbyter of Rome, afterwards a bishop, contemporary with Tertullian, fragments of whose works are preserved by Eusebius, appears to have been the first orthodox writer who called in question this doctrine concerning the millenium. See EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 28. Caius

reckoned thirteen epistles of St. Paul, not including that to the Hebrews. *Ibid.* lib. vi. c. 20.

<sup>3</sup> For example, in book iv. c. 40, we find the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper correctly described as a figure or emblem (*figura*) of our Saviour's body and blood.

(*Μοναρχία*);—that there is one God, from whom come the three degrees, forms, and kinds, (*gradus, formæ, and species,*) under the names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of one essence, nature, and power, (*unius substantiæ, status, et potestatis.*) The doctrines laid down by Tertullian in this treatise, concerning the nature of the holy and undivided Trinity are, on the whole, in accordance with Scripture; but they are attended with too much definition, explanation, and refinement, and a certain degree of what I cannot but describe as unhallowed speculation; and, moreover, the author asserts that God must have a body, or that the Eternal Spirit must be united to some material substance,—an opinion entertained by many of the good fathers of the early church, by whom it was derived probably from the philosophy of the Stoics.—How can we look into the works of the ancient fathers of the church, without again and again thanking God that even these venerable men are not the dictators of our faith!

In the *Treatise against Hermogenes* (*Liber adversus Hermogenem*), Tertullian shows that God is not the author of evil, although He created all things out of nothing. In his arguments against the doctrine of the eternity of matter, Tertullian draws a hasty conclusion, wholly at variance with his opinions elsewhere declared,—namely, that there was a time when God had no son.

In a treatise entitled *An Antidote against the Scorpions* (*Scorpiace, or In Scorpiacum, adversus Gnosticos, de bono Martyrii*), Tertullian refutes the opinions of those Gnostics who taught, during the persecution under Severus, that it was neither necessary nor expedient for Christians to submit to death on account of their religion.

In his treatise *On the Body of Christ* (*De Carne Christi*), he contends that our Lord assumed a real human body, against the various errors of Marcion, Apelles, the Docetæ, and Valentinus. Upon this book he founded another, *On the Resurrection of the Human Body* (*Liber de Resurrectione Carnis*), in which he argues for the fact of the future resurrection from the dignity of the human body, and especially that of a Christian,—the power, will, and justice of God,—and examples recorded in Scripture.

The author then refutes various objections made against the doctrine, and proceeds to describe the nature and condition of the body after the resurrection. It is one of the best treatises on this important subject which have come down from the early church; and should be read in connexion with the book of Athenagoras mentioned above.

Tertullian wrote also *A Book on the Soul* (*Liber de Anima*), against the heathen philosophers; in which, after having asserted that they were extremely ignorant on the subject, he states his own views concerning the nature and properties of the soul; and then concerning death, sleep, dreams, and the state of the soul after death. He supposes that almost every soul is attended from its birth by an evil genius, from which it is not free until it has been united to Christ. This book is in many respects interesting and instructive; but it contains many strange notions, and is distinguished by a striking mark of credulity in the narrative which it records concerning a certain female, among the Montanists, said to have been favoured with extraordinary visions and revelations (c. 9).

In his *Treatise on the Mantle* (*Liber de Pallio*), Tertullian defends his own conduct in having laid aside the Roman toga or long robe, and having assumed in its stead the philosopher's mantle or cloak, on account of which he had incurred some ridicule at Carthage. A great store of learning is brought to bear upon the point under review; but the style of the treatise is peculiarly obscure and harsh.

An *Address to Scapula* (*Liber ad Scapulani*), was written with a view to moderate the cruelty of that governor towards the Christians in Africa. In it, Tertullian calls upon Scapula to beware lest he should bring down the divine judgments upon himself and the whole country, by persecution of the Christians. He maintains that no man ought to be compelled to adopt any religion whatever;—that the Christians were unoffending and loyal subjects, who even offered prayer to God on behalf of the emperor;—that the displeasure of the Almighty, on account of their oppressions, had already been manifested by great natural calamities and signs;—that a magistrate, in the discharge of his

duty, ought not to forget the claims of humanity;—that many governors, and even emperors, had recognised the Christians as good citizens, and deserving of protection;—and lastly, that toleration ought to be granted to them, if for no other reason, yet on account of their large number in the province. This treatise, though short, contains many interesting particulars relating to the history of the church in the early part of the third century. It was written about the year 211.

Such are the works of Tertullian which have come down to our time. He wrote also a treatise in defence of the Montanists, in seven books; one on the Hope of the Faithful, one on Paradise, and others, which have been lost. The learning and talents of Tertullian are spoken of in high terms by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 2);—Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* lib. v. c. 1);—Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 53; *Epist.* 69, 84), who, however, on one occasion, in answer to an objection urged against him from the writings of this author, thinks it enough to say that Tertullian was no member of the orthodox church (*Advers. Helvidium*, c. 9);—Augustin (*De Hæres.* c. 26);—and Vincen- tius Lirinensis (*Commonitorium*, c. 24).

I subjoin Bishop Kaye's classification of this author's works, from his *Ecclesiastical History of the second and third centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*; which, it may be observed, agrees in the main with the arrangement adopted in the foregoing analysis.

“Works probably written while Tertullian was yet a member of the church:—*De Pœnitentia*, *De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, *Two Books Ad Uxorem*, *Ad Martyras*, *De Patientia*, *Adversus Judæos*, *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*.

“Works certainly written after he became a Montanist:—*First Book against Marcion*, *Second Book against Marcion*, *De Anima*, *Third Book against Marcion*, *Fourth Book against Marcion*, *De Carne Christi*, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, *Fifth Book against Marcion*, *Adversus Praxeam*, *In Scorpiacum*, *De Corona Militis*, *De Virginibus Velandis*, *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, *De Fuga in Persecutione*, *De Monogamia*, *De Jejuniis*, *De Pudicitia*.

“Works probably written after he became a Montanist:—*Adversus Valentinianos*, *Ad Scapulam*, *De Spectaculis*, *De Idololatria*, *The two Books De Cultu Fœminarum*.

“Works respecting which nothing certain can be pronounced:—*The Apology*, *The two Books Ad Nationes*, *The Tract De Testimonio Animæ*, *De Pallio*, *Adversus Hermogenem*.”

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### MINUCIUS FELIX.

MARCUS MINUCIUS FELIX, probably a native of Africa, flourished at about the same time as Tertullian, or perhaps a little later. He wrote an *Apology for the Christian Religion*, composed in the form of a dialogue, partly in imitation of the *Apology of Tertullian*, but with the addition of some new matter, and in a much purer and smoother style. In this dialogue, the speakers are Cæcilius Natalis, a heathen, who brings forward objections against Christianity, Octavius Januarius, who replies to these objections, and Minucius Felix himself who acts as moderator. Cæcilius urges the difficulty of attaining to a knowledge of religious truth,—the absence of divine providence in the government of the world,—the antiquity and usefulness of the system of heathen worship,—the poverty and obscure condition of the majority of Christians,—the often-repeated calumnies concerning their worship, faith, and morals,—the absurdity of some of their doctrines,—the sufferings to which the Christians were exposed, and the subjugation of the Jews, compared with the greatness of the Roman empire under the protection of its gods,—the cheerful manners of the heathen, compared with those of the Christians,—and the propriety of imitating the conduct of Socrates, in forbearing to pronounce positively concerning things not quite certain. Octavius Januarius answers the arguments of Cæcilius seriatim; making a very expert use of the topics usually urged on this side of the question. The treatise, in short, contains a well-condensed statement of the arguments for and against Christianity, which were current at the beginning of the third

century. It was for a long time attributed to a wrong author by the moderns, being reckoned as the eighth book of the work of Arnobius against the Gentiles.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### ORIGEN.

ORIGEN was born in the year 185, of Christian parents, in Egypt. His father Leonides, a learned and pious man, was the first to instruct him in religion and the elements of general knowledge; and afterwards, finding in his son an uncommon aptitude and desire for theological attainments, this watchful parent transferred the task of completing Origen's religious education to the celebrated Clement, head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Not long after, during the persecution under Severus, Leonides suffered martyrdom (A.D. 202); and Origen, then seventeen years old, emulous of dying with his father in the cause of Christianity, was restrained only by the entreaties and efforts of his mother. The property of Leonides having been confiscated, his widow and seven children were left in indigent circumstances. Origen was supported for some time by the bounty of a rich Christian lady; but in about a year after his father's death, he began to earn his own livelihood by teaching languages. At the request of some of his pupils, he added to his philological lectures a course of instruction in the Christian religion; and not long after, Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, appointed him catechist, or instructor of the candidates for baptism in his church (A.D. 204). In this situation, during the continuance of the persecution, Origen was distinguished by his zeal and intrepidity. He visited the Christians in prison, and accompanied them to the place of execution; on which occasions, we are told, he often exposed himself to the danger of being stoned to death by the heathen: besides this, he became an object of popular indignation by his success in making converts to Christianity, among whom were many learned men, and several who afterwards suffered martyrdom. During this period, he attended the lectures of the celebrated

Ammonius Saccas, founder of the system of Eclectic philosophy. He subsequently abandoned his lucrative profession of literary teaching, in order to devote himself entirely to the work of Christian instruction. He even sold his precious manuscripts of ancient authors, in order to live without foreign assistance; and practised a variety of austerities in his mode of life. At this period, under the influence of a zeal not sufficiently enlightened or tempered by sound judgment, he felt himself bound to imitate the example of the eunuchs mentioned in Matt. xix. 12; and acted accordingly. In later life, he recognised his error.

Some time after this (A.D. 213), Origen paid a visit to the church of Rome. On his return to Alexandria, he resumed the office of instructing the catechumens, at the earnest request of Demetrius. He found himself obliged, however, to divide the labours which continually increased with the growing number of catechumens; and accordingly he devolved the care of the lower forms, or beginners, upon one of his most able pupils named Heraclas. At the age of thirty years, Origen began the study of the Hebrew language, in order to obtain a more perfect acquaintance with the Old Testament Scriptures; an attainment, he it observed, which very few of the fathers made, even in a moderate degree, being generally satisfied with the Septuagint, or the Latin translations.

Origen combined lectures on philosophy with those on religion; and attracted universal admiration by an unusual display of learning and acuteness. In the year 215, when Caracalla, having visited Alexandria in person, was exercising extraordinary cruelties in that city, Origen sought refuge in flight. He retired to Cæsarea in Palestine, where he was invited by the bishop, Theoctistus, to expound the Scriptures publicly in the church. As Origen was only a layman, Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, remonstrated with Theoctistus, on account of this proceeding, which he represented as contrary to ecclesiastical discipline. The bishop of Cæsarea, however, defended his conduct, showing by reference to precedents that he had not sanctioned any irregularity by permitting a layman to interpret Scripture in the church; and in this he was supported by the bishop of Jerusalem. During a subsequent visit to Palestine, Origen was ordained presbyter by

Theoetistus, assisted by Alexander of Jerusalem and other bishops. Demetrius, who appears to have become jealous of Origen on account of his great reputation, was highly indignant at this step, which certainly was, in some respects, irregular; and having summoned two councils at Alexandria, he first deprived Origen of his office as teacher of the school, and banished him from Alexandria, and then deprived him of his rank as a presbyter. Origen, however, had previously retired to Palestine (A.D. 230 or 231<sup>1</sup>).

Origen now fixed his residence at Cæsarea. Here he expounded the Scriptures publicly; delivered lectures on theology, philosophy, and science; and proceeded with the composition of his extensive commentaries on the Bible, which he had already begun. In the year 235, during the persecution under Maximinus, he was obliged to flee from Cæsarea, and sought refuge in Cappadocia, where he remained in concealment during the space of two years, busily employed in prosecuting his theological studies and labours, especially his great work of correcting the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, and compiling his Hexapla. In the year 244, Origen having been invited to attend a council at Bostra in Arabia, convened for the purpose of condemning the errors of Beryllus, bishop of that city, concerning the person of our Saviour, he happily succeeded in convincing the bishop of his error, who not only retracted his opinions, but returned thanks in writing to the learned stranger who had been the means of leading him back to the truth. On a subsequent occasion, Origen was again called into Arabia, where he succeeded in correcting some errors which had been maintained concerning the nature of the soul.

During his residence at Cæsarea, Origen composed the greater portion of his voluminous and learned works. It was not until he had reached the age of sixty years, that he permitted his sermons to be taken down by short-hand writers, and afterwards published; but the number thus preserved was very large. His industry and application to study were astonishing; equalled only

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius (*Hæres.* 64, c. 2) gives a different account of the cause of Origen's banishment from Alexandria; but his statement is altogether improbable.



by his piety, his humility, and the gentleness and modesty of his deportment. He was thrown into prison during the persecution of Decius (A.D. 250), where he suffered great cruelties. After the death of Decius he was released from prison; and he died soon afterwards at Tyre, in the seventieth year of his age, A.D. 253, or 254.

There can be no doubt that Origen, in the interpretation of Scripture, borrowed largely from the philosophy of the later Platonists, and also gave too great a play to his own lively imagination. He carried to a great extent the allegorical system of exposition adopted by Philo Judæus, and by many of the Alexandrian Christians. In a word, Origen may be regarded as having materially assisted in laying the foundation of that mystical theology, which afterwards extensively prevailed, to the great detriment of Christian truth. His labours furnish a powerful evidence of the necessity which exists for the exercise of a sound judgment and a modest caution, as well as for learning, piety, and a love of truth, in the exposition and practical application of holy Scripture.

The late learned Professor Burton, whose authority is deservedly high in these matters, takes the following view of the opinions and writings of Origen, in his *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*, and his *History of the Christian Church to the conversion of Constantine*. I quote from the latter of these works.

“The philosophers in Alexandria were obliged to abandon their principles, and to form a new system, which has been called the Eclectic, or the school of the later Platonists. They could not shut their eyes to the fact, that Christianity was gaining rapidly upon them, and that as a scheme of religion it was far purer and sublimer than their own. They therefore endeavoured to prove, that the doctrines held by the Christians concerning the nature of God, his Word or Son, and the Spirit emanating from him, were all to be found in the philosophical system of Plato. In order to establish this resemblance, they gave an entirely new interpretation to the language of Plato, and ascribed to him opinions which he had never held. By this artifice, they thought

to check the progress of Christianity, and to show that after all it was merely a corruption of Platonism.

“ It is greatly to be regretted that Christians incautiously lent their aid in tracing this fanciful resemblance. They thought to do away the objection to the Gospel in the eyes of the heathen, if they showed it to be like to the philosophy of Plato. They therefore asserted that Plato had borrowed many of his ideas from the writings of Moses; and the most mysterious doctrines of Christianity, even that of a Trinity, were said to be found in the works of the heathen philosopher. This compromise between the two parties appears to have taken place at Alexandria, about the beginning of the third century. Ammonius Saccas, who had once been a Christian, was considered as the head of these later Platonists, and Origen, in his younger days, had attended his lectures.

“ Origen, as well as the other Christian writers of Alexandria, has often been charged with borrowing largely from Plato. But it was his language only which they borrowed, not his philosophy. Plato never conceived the ideas which were ascribed to him by the philosophers of Alexandria; and the latter pretended to find them in his writings, merely that they might be able to check the progress of Christianity. Origen, however, was extremely incautious in some of the opinions which he expressed. He was too fond of fanciful speculations into subjects which human reason cannot fathom; and he carried to an unwarrantable length the system of allegorizing the Scriptures. This fanciful method of interpretation was not an invention of Origen, nor of the Christian Fathers; they found it already carried to a great length by the Alexandrian Jews, who seem to have adopted it in order to establish a resemblance between the writings of Moses and those of the Greek philosophers. There was not a passage in the Scriptures, even in the books which are purely historical, which was not supposed to contain a hidden or allegorical meaning. If we read the works of Philo Judæus, we might almost suppose that he did not receive the words of Moses and the other sacred writers in their literal sense at all; he might be supposed to have understood them as if the events recorded had not really taken

place, but as if some moral and religious truth was intended to be conveyed to the reader by the narrative. It would probably be very unjust to Philo and his countrymen to charge them with such extravagance, though their own words and their fanciful method of interpretation have exposed them to it; but it was laid down as a principle with expositors of that school, that every passage of Scripture contained at least three meanings; one, which was the literal or historical; another, which conveyed some moral lesson; and a third, which was still more sublime and mystical, and which, under the semblance of something visible and earthly, was intended to reveal the truths of the invisible and spiritual world.

“It was not unnatural that the Alexandrian Christians should adopt this method in their interpretation of Scripture. They knew that it would be acceptable to the Jews, and even the heathen had learnt to extract meanings from the works of their own writers, which were very different from the plain and obvious sense. Clement of Alexandria belonged to this allegorical school, and his pupil Origen carried its principles to still more unwarrantable lengths. We know from his own words that he was accused of taking dangerous liberties with the Scriptures; and from the causes already assigned, or from others which have not been explained, a disagreement arose between him and his bishop Demetrius. It is most probable that this had something to do with his leaving Alexandria in 229, when he paid a second visit to Cæsarea in Palestine.” (c. 14.)

“It does not appear that the prejudice against Origen existed to much extent in his lifetime, nor for several years after his death. He was looked upon as a man of profound learning, and held the foremost rank among the champions of Christianity: this caused his name to be long held in great respect; and persons were not satisfied with studying and transcribing his works, but he was placed at the head of a school which honoured him with almost a religious veneration. Towards the end of the third century, we read of an attack being made upon him by Methodius, bishop of Tyre; he was afterwards considered decidedly heretical upon several points, and his works have been condemned by bishops and councils; but persons who were able to read many

more of his works than what have come down to our own day, have taken a more favourable view of his opinions; and like other questions which have been treated with a spirit of party, it seems most probable that this has given rise to much misrepresentation on both sides, and that, without attempting to justify Origen for his bold and fanciful speculations, we may still stop short of condemning him as heretical on fundamental articles of faith." (c. 15.)

It would be difficult to determine the chronological order of the works of Origen. In enumerating his labours, it will be convenient to arrange them according to their subjects, and to notice, in the first place, all those which relate to the criticism or exposition of the Holy Scriptures.

His great work, begun at an early period, was *The Hexapla* (*Τὰ ἕξαπλα*) already mentioned. This consisted of an edition of six different Greek translations of the Old Testament, in parallel columns (whence its name),—namely, a new and corrected edition of the Septuagint, which had become full of variations and mistakes; the translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus; and two other anonymous translations. This great work is said to have been the result of twenty-eight years' labour, and was highly useful with regard to the preservation and exposition of the sacred text: but no more than fragments of it are now extant. It is sometimes called *Octapla*, on account of the addition of two columns, containing the Hebrew text, one in Hebrew and the other in Greek characters, making eight columns in the whole. And an edition was published containing only the four earlier translations, hence called *Tetrapla*.

Origen also undertook to collate the manuscripts and to correct the Greek text of the New Testament; a task which had become necessary, in consequence of the unavoidable verbal variations in the genuine copies, which had been carefully preserved by different churches, and especially by the attempts to corrupt and falsify the text, made by the Valentinians and Marcionites, and by the followers of Lucian.

These critical labours of Origen paved the way for his expository works. He appears to have been the first Christian writer who attempted the composition of a literal commentary on the

sacred text. His expositions of Scripture were of three kinds: remarks or brief critical annotations; more copious commentaries; and sermons or lectures on different passages or sections. Of the first kind (*Scholia Excerpta*, and *Σημειώσεις*), none have been preserved, at least in a separate form. Of the commentaries (*Τόμοι*, *Volumina*, or *Commentarii*), some portions are extant. Of his sermons or expository discourses (*Ὁμιλίαι*, *Tractatus*), a large number have come down to us; some of them having been revised and published by Origen himself, while others were printed from the notes of short-hand writers. It appears that the expositions of Origen extended to all the books of the Old and New Testament, except the Apocalypse. His allegorical interpretations abound chiefly in his popular discourses or sermons. In the second homily on Leviticus, Origen maintains that remission of sins, strictly speaking, is accorded to a Christian once only, namely, in baptism; but, he adds, that the Gospel speaks also of other pardons, namely, a second, by suffering martyrdom; a third, by alms-deeds; a fourth, by forgiveness of our brethren; a fifth, by converting a sinner from the error of his way; a sixth, by a superabundance of love; a seventh, by severe penance, when the sinner bemoans his offence day and night with tears, and is not ashamed to confess his sins to the priests of the Lord.

It may be interesting to notice the opinions of Origen concerning the authenticity of certain portions of Scripture, and the character of writings usually regarded as apocryphal. In one place he speaks of the penman of the Epistle of the Hebrews as unknown; but in several other portions of his works he ascribes this book to St. Paul. He expresses his doubts, which he entertained in common with many Christians in those days, of the genuineness of the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, the Epistles of James and Jude; but he does not venture to deny that these books were written by the apostles whose names they bear, and he sometimes quotes passages from them. To the Jewish apocryphal works in general he does not attach a high value; he speaks indeed of the books of Maccabees and of Enoch under the title of Scripture, but without inserting them in the list of inspired writings. He

sometimes quotes from the apocryphal books of the New Testament, such as the gospel of the Hebrews, the gospel of Peter, the history of Paul, but he never declares an opinion in favour of their genuineness. Of *The Shepherd of Hermas*, however, he speaks in high terms, describing it as not only a useful book, but as one written under the guidance of divine inspiration; but granting, at the same time, that other Christians viewed it in a different light.

Next in importance to Origen's *Commentaries on the Scripture* is his treatise *Against Celsus*, in eight books. Celsus, an Epicurean, or, as is generally supposed, Platonic, philosopher, who flourished in the time of Hadrian, wrote a work against Christianity, entitled *The Word of Truth*, in which the old objections against the religion of the Gospel were brought forward with great pertinacity. Origen, in his reply, examined this work passage by passage. *In the First Book*, he answers various objections drawn from the supposed secrecy, or unreasonableness, of the Christian doctrines; from the alleged credulity of those who received the Gospel; from the assumption that the different deities of the heathen were only the one true God under various names. He brings forward the doctrines and power of the Gospel as a proof of its divine origin; and maintains that the truth of the Jewish religion being supposed, that of Christianity necessarily follows; pointing out the application of prophecy to the Messiah, and making some remarks on various particulars of the Gospel history.—*In the Second Book*, Origen vindicates the miracles of our Lord and his apostles. *In the Third and Fourth Books*, the author defends the cause of Christianity chiefly in philosophical and moral points of view. (But here, among other mistakes in matters of fact and of belief, he advances the erroneous, and at that time novel, doctrine concerning the future punishments of the wicked, which teaches that such punishments are not strictly penal and everlasting, but only corrective, and of temporary duration.)—*In the Fifth Book*, Origen apologizes on good grounds for the Jews and Christians who had been justly accused of offering no adoration to the heavenly bodies; but he asserts, with Clement of Alexandria (see above, p. 53), that the worship of the sun, moon, and stars was permitted to the

heathen, in order to lead them to the knowledge of the true God ; and he details various idle fancies and fables respecting the nature of the stars, and the offices of angels in the government of nations. In this work, he also defends the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead ;—describes the ancient constitution of the Jews ;—recounts the various errors which had sprung up among Christians ;—and describes the patience and meekness of Christians towards their adversaries, in accordance with the precepts of our Saviour and the apostle Paul.—*In the Sixth Book*, Origen pleads on behalf of the simple style of the Holy Scriptures, and contends that the authors of those sacred books were not indebted to the Greek philosophy for any portion of their contents.—He speaks in the same manner as Clement of Alexandria (see above, page 44) concerning certain secret doctrines, or supplemental instructions, supposed to have been delivered by our Saviour to his apostles, and conveyed by them to the stronger or more enlightened believers. He shows that many objections urged by Celsus against the whole body of Christians, related only to certain heretical sects who bore that name. His reply to the observations of his opponent on the doctrine of Satanic influence, which occurs in this part of the work, is meagre and inadequate, proceeding upon fanciful or allegorical interpretation.—*In the Seventh Book*, Origen expounds his opinions concerning the state of departed spirits, in accordance with the Platonic philosophy ;—argues in behalf of the divine origin of the Jewish prophecies ;—removes the alleged discrepancy between the doctrine of our Lord and the law of Moses, by means of allegorical interpretations of the latter ;—maintains that Christianity alone conducts men to the knowledge of the true God ;—and defends the practice of Christians in possessing no temples, images, or altars.—*In the Eighth Book*, the author pursues his argument in favour of Christian worship, denying the propriety of praying to departed spirits, but admitting, indefinitely, that a kind of respect is due to angels. He enumerates the festivals of the Christian church ; mentioning first, Sunday, then the Preparation (*παρασκευή*), which is, probably, Good Friday ; then the Passover, with the feast of the Resurrection (*πάσχα*) and Pentecost (*πεντηκοστή*), including under the latter term, as usual at that time, the whole

space from Easter to Whitsuntide. Two remarkable passages occur in this book, in which Origen asserts that the souls of martyrs perform various good offices on behalf of the faithful who are alive, and that the favour of the supreme God is attended with the good-will of his friends the angels and beatified spirits, just as the shadow moves always together with its substance. "They," says he, "see who are worthy of the divine favour; and not only are they kindly disposed towards such persons, but they assist those who desire to serve the most high God, and procure for them his favour, mingling their prayers and wishes with their own. We may maintain, then, that when good men pray to God, there are countless blessed powers who, without being called upon for the purpose, join with them in their supplications." From such opinions it was easy to arrive at the practice of praying to, or invoking, angels and saints. The origin of this novel opinion concerning inferior mediators or intercessors in heaven, is probably to be found in the high and ever-growing veneration which was paid, in the early ages of the church, to the memory of confessors and martyrs. In another portion of his works (*Homil. xvi. in Josuam*), Origen says, "I am of opinion that all our forefathers who have fallen asleep strive together with us, and assist us in our prayers;" and adds, that he had found this opinion maintained by an old teacher of the church, in an exposition of Numbers xxii. 4. He does not support his opinions by proof; and so far was he from teaching that we ought to pray to beatified spirits for their help and intercession, that he affirmed and zealously maintained the contrary.—In this book, also, the author touches upon some questions connected with the morals and customs of Christians; on which points he preserves the severe and uncompromising tone already assumed by preceding writers. On the whole, although this reply to Celsus is disfigured by some errors and false opinions, although the objections of the opponent are met very often by allegorical interpretations and false applications of Scripture, and a portion of Platonic and Stoic philosophy is mixed up with Christian doctrine, yet the work must be regarded as an able and powerful attack upon the system of heathen belief and worship. It must be remembered that Celsus and other pagan writers, in defence of their creed, resorted to



allegorical interpretations of the fables contained in their mythology; and Christian writers, like Origen, supposed themselves justified in adopting a similar method in recommending their sacred books to the notice of heathen philosophers. This was an error in judgment, by which we ought not to be misled, although we may willingly ascribe the best intentions to its authors and abettors. Many of the mistakes committed by Origen in this great work were errors of the times rather than of the individual writer.

A treatise entitled *Four Books concerning the Principles of the Christian Faith* (*περὶ ἀρχῶν*; *Libri Quatuor de Principiis*), is the work which brought upon the author perhaps the largest share of obloquy and censure. The book was translated by Ruffin at the end of the fourth century, with various omissions and modifications, adapted to harmonize it with some of Origen's more orthodox productions. Considerable fragments of the Greek text remain.

The great fault of this treatise is the system of refining and philosophizing upon revealed truth, in a most arbitrary manner, and with a degree of mystical obscurity. "That alone is true," says the author at the outset, "which entirely agrees with the doctrine of the apostles, propagated to this day in the churches. But the apostles, while they declared the most necessary parts of Christian faith very plainly, and in such a manner that they may be ascertained by the most superficial inquirer, left, however, the investigation of the causes or first principles of their system to those who partake of the high gifts of the Holy Spirit. Concerning other things, they have asserted indeed that they are so or so, but they have maintained silence as to how and whence they arise; *without doubt for this very purpose, that the more industrious of their successors may have a field in which to exercise their ingenuity.*" After such an exposition of the author's sentiments, we cannot expect to find the following portions of the work characterized by simplicity of Christian doctrine.—*The First Book* is occupied chiefly with disputations respecting the nature of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; of the stars; and of angels.—*The Second Book* treats of matter, nature, and the origin of the world;—of the incarnation of the Son of God, and of the descent and gifts of the Holy Spirit;—of the human soul, the

resurrection of the dead, and of future torments;—of the divine promises relating to a future life, (refuting the ideas of those who looked for a new earthly Jerusalem, and placing the happiness of the soul in enlarged knowledge,) and of the state of souls after death.—*In the Third Book*, Origen contends for the freedom of the human will;—treats of evil spirits, and their influence;—of the temptations incident to human nature;—of the origin of the world (asserting the existence of several worlds previous to this, and that another will arise after its destruction);—of the future subjection of Christ to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 28);—and of the change effected in the body by death and the resurrection.—*The Fourth Book* relates to Holy Scripture, its divine origin, and its interpretation, (here the author develops his views relating to the threefold meaning of Scripture mentioned above, page 82.)—It is evident that many of the opinions contained in this book, which have given occasion to the charge of heterodoxy against their author, were derived from the Platonic philosophy, and were probably not intended to be so interpreted as to militate against more correct statements in his other works. With regard to his assertions respecting the spiritual power of man since the fall, which have been claimed as favouring the views of the Pelagians, it must be remembered that Origen wrote before the spread of Pelagian tenets, and that he did not guard his expressions as he might have done if he had found it necessary to avoid or oppose a prevalent error. He allegorized Scripture, and interwove Greek philosophy with religion, to a great and dangerous extent, pursuing a path which had been trodden by others before him. But it has been supposed that much of the vituperation which has been bestowed on him originated with jealousy excited by his extraordinary talents, learning, and reputation.

Two other treatises of Origen are extant; one of these is *On Prayer* (Σύνταγμα περὶ εὐχῆς), in which he describes the necessity and nature of prayer, and then gives an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The other is *An Exhortation to the Endurance of Martyrdom*, or to a confession of Christian faith in the face of danger. This was written for the encouragement of his friend Ambrosius, an opulent native of Alexandria, and deacon of the church in that city, and Protoctetus, a pastor of the church at

Cæsarea, during the persecution under the Emperor Maximinus in the year 236. Many of his arguments are such as would be used by a Christian writer of the present day under similar circumstances; but Origen also extols highly the value of the baptism of blood, as a means of obtaining forgiveness of sins. "For," adds he, "as those who stood at the altar, according to the law of Moses, appear to have obtained remission of sins by their ministry through the blood of bullocks and goats, so the souls of those who have suffered death for the sake of Jesus, do not stand in vain at the altar of heaven, but by their ministry they obtain the forgiveness of sins for those who pray. We know that as the high priest Jesus Christ offered up himself as a sacrifice, so also the priests, who are under him, offer up themselves in sacrifice; and hence they were seen at the altar as at their proper place. The steadfast confessor, or the perfect martyr, is such an unblemished priest, as were the Jewish priests of old, and he offers an unblemished sacrifice." "Perhaps," he says, in another place, "as we have been purchased by the precious blood of Christ, some things are purchased for us by the precious blood of the martyrs." There can be no need of words to expose or condemn this piece of false divinity; we know the use which was afterwards made of such hints to the great injury of Christian faith and practice.

Of the other writings of Origen, including his epistles, only a few fragments have come down to us. He wrote two treatises and two dialogues on the resurrection; and a large work, in ten books, entitled *Stromates* (*Στρωματεῖς*), in imitation of Clement of Alexandria, containing a comparison of Christian doctrine with the heathen philosophy. Many pieces appear to have been falsely ascribed to Origen, according to a prevailing custom of seeking to gain attention to a book by prefixing to it the name of some celebrated author.

The ancients who have transmitted to us particular accounts of Origen are,—Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 1—6, 8, 14—21, 23—28, 30—33, 36—39), who writes on this subject with his usual industry and candour;—Jerome (*De viris Illustr.* c. liv.: *Ep.* 41, al. 65), who speaks of our author sometimes in terms of admiration, and sometimes with censure;—and Epiphanius (*Hæres.* 64), who speaks against him with his characteristic virulence

and party spirit. For a careful estimate of the talents, opinions, and labours of Origen, see MOSHEIM, *De Rebus Christianorum ante Const. M. Sec. Tert.* § 27, not., and CAVE'S *Historia Literaria*.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

### CYPRIAN.

THASCIUS CÆCILIVS CYPRIANVS was born in Africa, probably at Carthage, of heathen parents, about the year 200. He soon became remarkable for his abilities, and attained great eminence as a teacher of rhetoric in Carthage. By divine mercy he was converted to Christianity about the year 245, through the instrumentality of Cæcilius, a Carthaginian presbyter. His reception of the Gospel had the happy effect, not merely of changing his opinions and affecting his outward conduct, but of producing, through the grace of God, a real and permanent reformation of heart and life. From a most depraved state of morals and practice, by the enormity of which his past years had been distinguished, he attained to an eminent degree of Christian holiness. It was in gratitude to him who had been the means of his conversion, that Cyprian assumed the prænomen of Cæcilius; while he willingly undertook the charge of the surviving family of his benefactor, which he intrusted to him with his dying breath. Immediately after his conversion to Christianity, Cyprian applied himself diligently to the practical study of the Holy Scriptures; and he readily performed all that the records of the divine will appeared to point out as his duty, not hesitating even to sell his estates, and to distribute all the proceeds among the poor. So great were his attainments in the knowledge of Scripture and the practice of piety, that, contrary to the general rule of the church, he was ordained presbyter in the course of a few months after his baptism; and about the year 248 or 249, at the urgent demand of the church, and contrary to his own remonstrances and efforts, he was made bishop of Carthage. Five presbyters, and no more, opposed his election; and these he afterwards treated with the utmost kindness. As bishop, Cyprian was distinguished, in no

ordinary degree, by his vigilance and zeal; and he succeeded in recommending the doctrines of the Gospel, no less by his bright example, than by his powerful preaching and instruction. In his personal character he was an exemplary Christian, an ornament of the faith, and a monument of the power of divine grace; while in his ministerial and episcopal capacity he displayed a temper truly apostolic. He was an excellent disciplinarian; but he appears to have formed too high an estimate, or, rather, to have taken a somewhat erroneous view, of the power and dignity belonging to his office, and to have been over anxious for the maintenance of his authority and privileges, whether real or supposed.

During the persecution under Decius, soon after his appointment to the episcopal office, Cyprian was obliged to save himself by flight from the violence of the heathen. From the place of his concealment he wrote letters, and issued orders and advice, for the instruction and government of his church, zealously enjoining the maintenance of strict discipline. In the following year, when the persecution began to abate, he returned to Carthage; where he was busily occupied in correcting the disorders and schisms introduced by the conduct of some apostatizing Christians, and the growth of Novatian errors. A new persecution, under Gallus, soon sprung up; to which were added the horrors of a plague, which raged with great violence throughout a large portion of the empire; and under these trying circumstances, the Christian courage and benevolence of the bishop of Carthage were equally conspicuous. About the year 253, Cyprian promoted a contribution for the purchase of Christians who had been made slaves by the barbarians in a recent irruption into Numidia. He held councils, composed various treatises, laboured for the promotion of discipline and order in the church, and at length took an active part in the controversy which arose respecting the validity of baptism administered by heretics; the termination of which he did not live to see.

In the year 257, Valerian commenced his persecution of the Christians. At an early stage of these proceedings, Cyprian was banished by Paternus, proconsul of Africa, to Curubis, a place about fifty miles from Carthage. He was permitted by Maxi-

mus, the next proconsul, to return from exile; but shortly afterwards, (A. D. 258,) refusing to renounce his religion by offering incense to the gods, at the command of the same officer, he was sentenced to death, and immediately beheaded. He died praising God that he was counted worthy to suffer in the cause of Christ; and leaving a most profitable example of Christian character for the benefit of surviving Christians, and to the glory of his divine master. His writings, distinguished by their eloquence no less than by their spirit of genuine piety, benevolence, and prudence, have continued to attract the admiration, and to minister to the instruction, of succeeding ages. He was himself a great admirer of Tertullian, whose works he used to call for with an intimation that he regarded them as models, (Da Magistrum!) nor did he altogether avoid the danger incident to such a case, of imitating some of the defects, as well as the excellences of his favourite pattern.

The life of this excellent bishop was written, but not very circumstantially, by Pontius, his deacon. Many succeeding ecclesiastical writers have recorded his history, (LACTANT. *Div. Institut.* lib. v. c. 19; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43; lib. vii. c. 3; HIERON. *Catal. Script. Eccl.* c. 53, 67, 68; see also GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 18; PRUDENT. *Hymn.* 13;) and no small portion of learning and industry have been bestowed upon his annals by the moderns, (PEARSON. *Annales Cyprianici*; TILLEMONT. *Mémoires pour servir à l'Hist. Eccl.*, *Notes sur St. Cyprien*; PRUDENT. MARAN *Vita S. Cypriani*; LE CLERC, *Bibliothèque Universelle*, T. 12.)

Of Cyprian's writings the first in order of time is his *Treatise addressed to Donatus, on the Grace of God* (Ad Donatum, Liber de Gratia Dei). This was written soon after the author's conversion in the year 246, with a view to give his friend an idea of the surprising and most beneficial change which had resulted, through the grace of God, from his adoption of Christianity and reception of baptism. Having described this effect at length, and in glowing language, Cyprian portrays the vices and enormities of the heathen, especially as they were practised at Carthage, and points out their disastrous and ruinous tendency.

Soon after the publication of this treatise appeared another,

(A. D. 247,) *On the Vanity of Idols* (De Idolorum Vanitate). In this work Cyprian exposes the mean origin of the heathen deities, the gross absurdities of their mythology, and the mischievous tendency of their worship.—He then speaks, in honourable terms, of the nature of the true God, and of Christian worship;—describes the origin and tendency of the Christian religion;—and refers to the history of Christ, and the progress of Christianity in the world. In this treatise Cyprian borrowed largely from the similar works of Tertullian and Minucius Felix.

Another of the early works of Cyprian is his *Three Books of Proofs from Scripture against the Jews* (Testimonia adversus Judeos). This consists chiefly of a collection of texts of Scripture, accompanied with brief remarks, tending to show that the Jews, in rejecting Christ, had fallen from God (Book 1);—that Jesus Christ was the true Messiah (Book 2);—and pointing out certain Christian duties (Book 3). Of the texts, some are well applied; but others, according to the prevailing practice of the age, are forced into the service of the argument by means of fanciful or allegorical interpretation.

A treatise *On the Dress of Virgins* (De Habitu Virginum), is of nearly the same date. It is, to a great extent, an imitation of the writings of Tertullian on the same subject. The book contains some extravagant and unscriptural commendations of the state of voluntary and perpetual virginity.

The treatise *On the Unity of the Church* (De Unitate Ecclesie, to which was afterwards added, Seu de Simplicitate Prælatorum), was written with a view to heal some unhappy divisions which had arisen to the great prejudice of Christian truth and practice. It was directed immediately against the Novatians. In this book, the author admonishes the Christians to combine wisdom with simplicity; and to guard especially against those subtle inventions of the devil, heresies and schisms. These, says he, arise principally from men's neglecting to keep close to the Scriptures, where it may be plainly seen that there is but one Christian church, from which we ought not to suffer ourselves to be drawn away. It was in order to provide effectually for the unity of the church, that our Lord founded it especially upon the apostle Peter; although all the apostles

possessed equal power. Hence there is but one bishopric, of which each bishop has a part. He who by heresy separates himself from this one true Church cannot be saved. That there is indeed but one church, Cyprian goes on to prove from the fact that there is but one God, one Christ, one faith; because our Saviour himself declared that there should be one fold under one shepherd; adding various other proofs and illustrations. "If," says he, "it be objected that the Lord has promised that whosoever two or three are gathered together in his name, there He will be in the midst of them; let it be remembered that this promise relates only to the church and its members, joined by the bonds of unity and love, and not to those sects which have separated from it. Such a separation is a great sin, and amounts to an apostasy from Christianity itself." It is obvious that, although most of the positions contained in this treatise are, in some sense, true; yet by means of the ambiguity of the terms, "one church, one faith," &c., and by arbitrary assumptions and interpretations, the foundation of serious error is here laid,—a foundation which, by an extensive application of the same mode of arguing, was afterwards deepened and enlarged, to the great detriment of Christian truth and charity.

The book *On the Lapsed* (*De Lapsis*), was composed with reference to the case of those persons who sought readmission into the church, after having been induced to offer sacrifice to idols in order to avoid persecution. The object is to show that such persons ought not to be readmitted hastily or easily;—that the sin of apostasy was great and inexcusable;—that the lapsed ought not to flatter themselves that the merits of martyrs could avail to their immediate absolution and acceptance;—and, on the whole, that they ought not to be received again into the church until after a long course of penitence and discipline, and proofs of real reformation.

The treatise *On the Lord's Prayer* (*De Oratione Dominica*), is chiefly of a practical tendency. In this work, the author describes the disposition of mind appropriate to prayer, and the external marks of reverence and devotion with which it should be attended; exhorts to the practice of common and public prayer: comments upon the several clauses of the Lord's Prayer:



refers to the customs of the church in illustration of this position, that this prayer ought to proceed from the heart, as well as from the lips; insists upon the necessity of combining alms with our petitions; and recommends the practice of setting apart certain hours of the day and night for the exercise of prayer.

The treatise *On Mortality* (De Mortalitate), is a practical and serious exhortation to Christian courage and patience, during the prevalence of the pestilence which raged extensively about the year 252. The arguments employed are, for the most part, scriptural and sound; such, in fact, as a pious minister of the present day would urge upon the attention of his flock under similar circumstances. Cyprian maintained however, by an easy mistake, that the prevailing pestilence was a token of the end of the world then rapidly approaching.

The *Exhortation to the Suffering of Martyrdom* (De Exhortatione Martyrii), which was composed at about the same time as the former treatise, consists of the usual arguments to constancy and patience under persecution, for Christ's sake, with a collection of texts of Scripture, bearing upon the same subject.

The *Address to Demetrian* (Liber ad Demetrianum), was composed upon the occasion of assertions made by the heathen generally, and especially by Demetrian, a magistrate at Carthage, to the effect that the great pestilence, under which all parties were suffering, was occasioned by the impieties and crimes of the Christians. Cyprian here retorts this charge upon the heathen themselves; upbraids their idols with the weakness of not being able to defend their own cause against the Christians, without the intervention of human power and cruelty; affirms that Christians do not seek to avenge themselves upon their persecutors, because they are able patiently to commit their cause into the hands of the true God; and that they can well endure the loss of earthly things, because they have a better and more enduring treasure, which temporal calamities cannot reach. He exhorts the heathen to repent and embrace the Gospel; assuring them that it was not too late for them to become partakers of all the grace and blessings which had been purchased, and were continually dispensed, by the Saviour of the world.

The book *On Good Works and Almsdeeds* (De Opere et

Eleemosynis), was written with a view to promote contributions in aid of the Christians who had been captured during an irruption of the barbarians into Numidia. In this treatise Cyprian represents, as motives to almsgiving, the blessings bestowed by God upon ourselves; the duty and benefit of being rich towards God; the groundlessness of unbelieving fear on the part of Christians, lest themselves or their families should ever be reduced to want by Christian liberality; and the certainty of a recompense at the hands of God: appealing, in support or illustration of his positions, to the histories of Tabitha, Elijah and the widow, Job, Tobias, and of the church in the days of the apostles. His language is often too strong; and he exceeds his commission especially by declaring, pointedly and unreservedly, that almsdeeds avail to the obtaining of forgiveness.

The treatise *On the Benefits of Patience* (*De Bono Patientiæ*), is a practical, judicious, and pious disputation upon the Christian virtue of which it professes to treat. The author shows that patience is a necessary part of true wisdom; recommends it by the example of God, of Christ, and of holy men, whose lives are recorded in Scripture; points out the numerous occasions for this virtue, which arise in the Christian life; refers to its benefits, and especially its good effect upon faith and hope; describes the mischiefs of the opposite temper; points out the extent of Christian patience, and its influence upon character; and reminds his readers that it is the will of God that we should not attempt to avenge ourselves, but refer our cause to Him to whom alone vengeance belongeth, and who has hitherto chosen to defer His judgments.

In the treatise *Concerning Envy and Ill Will* (*De Zelo et Livore*), Cyprian points out, in a scriptural and practical manner, the evil, the origin, the sinfulness, the misery, and the dangerous and destructive tendencies, of the unholy disposition against which he writes; and shows its inconsistency with the demands and the spirit of the Gospel.

*The Epistles* of Cyprian are highly important and valuable, both as displaying to us the character of this holy man, and as involving much information concerning the history and complexion of his times, more especially concerning the affairs of

Christianity and the church in general, and of its ministry, government, and discipline in particular.—In these writings of Cyprian, as well as in his other works, we are especially delighted with the sincere and primitive piety of the author; while the chief subject of our regret and disapprobation, are his mistaken views concerning the constitution of the church, and, especially, his assertion of undue power and prerogative on behalf of Christian ministers;—of such influence and authority as the apostles never sanctioned, and such as no pastors, who have thoroughly imbibed the apostolic spirit, would wish to exercise or to possess.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, SURNAMED THE GREAT.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Alexandria, was a teacher of the church, eminent at once for learning and eloquence, and for the more estimable qualities of constancy and courage in the profession of his faith, and a well-directed zeal in the cause of truth, combined with a remarkable degree of prudence, moderation, and love of peace. It is probable that he was born in Egypt, of heathen parents; and that in early life he filled some respectable station, probably that of a teacher of rhetoric at Alexandria. By means of a perusal of the Holy Scriptures, in the course of his diligent researches into the learning of the age, he was led to an acquaintance with Christian truth; and was thus induced to place himself under the tuition of the celebrated Origen. When Heraclas, who had succeeded Origen as the head of the catechetical school, was raised to the bishopric of Alexandria, upon the death of Demetrius, in the year 232, Dionysius was appointed as his successor. He was then ordained presbyter; and afterwards, in the year 247 or 248, he succeeded Heraclas as bishop of Alexandria; and was himself succeeded in the catechetical school, probably, by Pierius. Soon after the elevation of Dionysius to the bishopric, and during the reign of Philip, a persecution of the Christians broke out at Alexandria, which was shortly afterwards succeeded by the general and more cruel persecution

under Decius, who issued his famous edict, (which enacted that all Christians should be compelled to sacrifice to the gods,) at the end of the year 249, or at the beginning of 250. At the commencement of this persecution, Dionysius was obliged to seek safety by flight. He was once taken prisoner; but having recovered his liberty, he retired to a desert part of Libya, where he remained in concealment until the middle of the year 251, or perhaps until the death of Decius, at the close of that year. From his place of refuge he wrote various epistles to the presbyters and other Christians of Alexandria, giving them directions for their conduct, and administering topics of consolation, under their trying circumstances. After the return of Dionysius to Alexandria, he was most usefully and honourably employed in endeavouring to settle disputes connected with the Novatian controversy;—in administering support and consolation to his church during the fatal pestilence, which broke out in the year 252, and raged with more or less violence throughout the Roman empire during the space of fifteen years;—in refuting the arguments upon which was founded an expectation of a millennium, or personal reign of Christ upon earth for a thousand years, especially as taught in the writings of Cerinthus, and a bishop named Nepos;—and in acting as peace-maker during the violent disputes which took place, concerning the rebaptization of reputed heretics who wished to come over to the church.

In refuting the errors of Sabellius, Dionysius used some expressions concerning the nature of the Son of God, which caused his own orthodoxy to be called in question, as if he were leaning to errors of the opposite extreme; but his own explanations on this subject have been considered satisfactory, and it has been well remarked, that the circumstance of his supposed opinions having been warmly denounced is one proof, among many others, of the prevailing belief of the early church concerning the true and proper deity of our Saviour. The bishop of Rome (Dionysius), having received a report of the suspicions which attached to the doctrines held by his brother of Alexandria, and having convened a council to take the matter into consideration, remonstrated with him upon the subject by letter. In reply to the charges thus brought against him, Dionysius drew

up a treatise in four books, entitled, *A Refutation and Defence*, which he transmitted to the bishop of Rome. "Some few fragments of this work have been preserved to us, from which it appears that the charges against Dionysius were entirely groundless. In the following century, his authority was claimed by the Arians, as being on their side; but we may be satisfied of the falsehood of this claim, when we find a defence of him written by Athanasius, his successor in the see of Alexandria, and the great opponent of the Arians. It must be remembered that, at the time when Dionysius wrote, the Arian controversy had not yet been heard of; and he may have used some expressions which a writer of the fourth century would have avoided, as being then capable of two meanings. In exposing the errors of Sabellius, and in proving that the Son of God was not actually the same with God the Father, he had dwelt very strongly upon those passages of Scripture which show the human nature of Christ. In arguing that the Father and the Son are not one and the same Being, he had observed, incautiously perhaps and irrelevantly, that a tree is not the same with the person who plants it, nor a ship with the person who builds it. From these and other expressions it was inferred, that he meant to speak of the Son as made or created by the Father. But he said in reply, that whenever he spoke of the Son being *made*, he spoke with reference to his human nature. And he referred to other illustrations which he had used, such as a stem growing from a root, and a river flowing from its spring; where the stem and the river are of the same nature with the root and the spring, though they are not actually the same. With respect to the Son being of one substance with the Father, he acknowledged that he had not happened to use the word *consubstantial*, which, as he says, does not occur in the Scriptures; but he contended, that all the notions which are attached to the term, are implied in many passages of his letters, as in the two instances already adduced of the stem and its root, the river and its spring, and in the analogy to which he had referred, of the human son being necessarily of the same substance or nature with his father. . . . The charge brought against him, of not considering the Son to be of one substance with

the Father, is a convincing proof that the belief of the church in that day, on this subject, was in accordance with Scripture; and that unless a man was prepared to acknowledge the true doctrine, he was liable to be denounced as maintaining heretical tenets. Whatever Dionysius may have written in his first publications upon the Sabellian controversy, it is demonstrable, from his *Refutation and Defence*, that he held the divinity of the Son, and his consubstantiality with the Father, in the fullest and highest sense of which those words are capable. If he is to be suspected of error at all, he perhaps came nearer to what was afterwards known by the name of the Nestorian heresy, which made a complete separation between the divine and human nature of Christ<sup>1</sup>."

During the persecution under Valerian, which began in the year 257, Dionysius was summoned before Æmilian, governor of Egypt, and required to renounce the Christian religion. Upon his refusal, he was banished to a place named Cephron, in a remote part of Libya. Here the bishop and his friends were at first rudely treated by the heathen; but, in a short time, they not only succeeded in allaying the violence of their enemies, but even induced many of them to embrace the Christian faith, and unite with themselves in religious worship. In consequence of this, Dionysius, and some of his fellow Christians, were removed to a place named Colluthon, in a still more inhospitable region; but where the bishop enjoyed greater facilities of intercourse with the members of his church at Alexandria. Dionysius had afterwards occasion to defend his conduct in consenting to retire into banishment, against the aspersions of an Egyptian bishop, named Germanus. About the year 260, he returned to Alexandria; soon after which time, himself and his church were called to struggle with the difficulties and misery attendant upon civil commotion and anarchy. Towards the close of his life, Dionysius wrote against the errors of Paul of Samosata<sup>2</sup>, in a letter

<sup>1</sup> BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*, Lect. 27. A similar view of the conduct and opinions of Dionysius is

taken by Mr. Newman, in his work on *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, chap. i. sect. 5.

<sup>2</sup> "The fundamental error of Paul

addressed to the council of Antioch, which met in the year 265, for the condemnation and removal of those errors. He would probably have attended the council itself, had he not been prevented by declining health, and indeed, by the near approach of his death,—an event which took place in the course of the same year, and not long after he had despatched his letter.

Only a very small portion of the works of Dionysius have come down to us; and this chiefly in the shape of fragments. For the earliest information concerning his life and writings, together with specimens of his works, see EUSEBIUS *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 29, 35, 40—42, 44—46; lib. vii. c. 1, 4—11, 20, 28; *Prepar. Evangel.* lib. xiv. c. 23—27; HIERON. *Cata. Script. Eccl. seu De Viris Illust.* c. 69.—*Conf.* MOSHEIM *De Rebus Christ. Ante Const. M. Sec. Tert.* § 19, 33, 35, 38.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### GREGORY OF NEOCÆSAREA, SURNAMED THAUMATURGUS.

THIS celebrated man was born at Neocæsarea in Pontus, of heathen parents, at the beginning of the third century of the Christian era. His original name was Theodorus. He had devoted himself to the study of the law; but having met with Origen at Cæsarea, in Palestine, in the year 231, he was persuaded by him to addict himself to the higher study of philosophy, and to receive him as his guide and teacher. Having conducted his pupil through a course of study in dialectics, natural and moral philosophy, and the ancient classics, Origen directed his attention to the holy Scriptures, as the fountain of moral and religious truth. After mature consideration, Theodorus declared himself convinced of the truth of revealed religion, and was not only baptized into the faith of Christ, but gave evidence of having deeply imbibed the spirit of the gospel. When Origen was obliged to retire to Cappadocia, during the persecution under

was to deny that Christ had any distinct personal existence, before the time when Jesus was born of Mary; but he by no means believed Jesus Christ to be a mere human being, in the modern sense of that expression." BURTON'S *Lectures*, Lect. 27.

Maximinus, Theodorus went to Alexandria; but soon after the return of the former to Cæsarea, in Palestine, he was joined by his former pupil. Soon afterwards (about A.D. 240), Gregory received ordination, and was appointed bishop of Neocæsarea. The number of Christians at Neocæsarea is said to have been exceedingly small at the time of Gregory's appointment to the superintendence of their body; but soon after he had entered upon his labours, the increase of converts was so great, that Gregory resolved upon erecting a church for their accommodation; which is remarkable as being the first building of this kind mentioned in ecclesiastical history. During the persecution under Decius, which began in the year 250, Gregory was obliged to save himself by flight. After his return, upon the cessation of the persecution, he established the custom of commemorating the days upon which any martyrs or confessors had died, with public festivities. And herein, says Gregory of Nyssa, he acted wisely; for many persons, in his time, continued in their attachment to heathenism, for the sake of the festivals connected with its superstitions; and he hoped to gain over such persons to the true religion, by holding out similar inducements in connexion with its ceremonial. We may, perhaps, be unwilling to subscribe to this testimony respecting the propriety of this proceeding; but, while we deplore this partial accommodation of Christianity to a depraved taste, and regard such an imitation of heathenism as equally unnecessary and injudicious, it is gratifying, at least, to observe that the page of history is not disfigured by traces of any superstitions or immoral practices, in connexion with the early commemorations of martyrs.

Gregory combated the prevailing errors of his times, especially Sabellianism, and the doctrines of Paul of Samosata. He has been charged, however, with having himself approximated to the mistaken tenets of Sabellius; because, in an exposition of faith which he delivered in answer to the calumnies of a heathen, named Ælianus, who had represented the Christians as believing in a plurality of Gods, he declared that the Father and the Son are two in representation, or in our mode of conception (*ἐπινοία*), but only one in person (*ἰποστάσει*). But Basil answers the charge thus brought against Gregory, by saying that he used



these expressions not in the more strict and accurate way of teaching doctrine (*δογματικῶς*), but in a manner suited to a controversy with an unbeliever (*ἀγωνιστικῶς*); and he adds that those who took the notes of his observations in answer to Ælianus, made some mistakes in recording his expressions. Gregory, says this writer, in disputing with a heathen, did not think it necessary to be very precise in the use of his terms; and, indeed, he felt it right to concede some things to this man, who was favourably inclined towards the Christian religion, lest he should be led to reject even the leading doctrines of the gospel. And, hence, he made use of several expressions concerning the Son of God, such as “creature,” “made,” and the like, of which false teachers might willingly avail themselves.—These observations of Basil are remarkable, as containing one of the oldest examples of a distinction which afterwards extensively prevailed between accurate or precise instruction in the Christian faith (*δόγμα*), and a more lax and accommodating representation of the doctrines of our holy religion (*συγκατάβασις, οἰκονομία*). This practice, especially when systematized and perverted, was doubtless injurious to the cause of truth; nor can it be justified either by reason or by precedent. It may be right, sometimes, to make only a partial promulgation of truth, of which mode of procedure we find instances in the teaching of our blessed Lord himself, of St. Paul at Athens, and of Origen in his gradual training of Gregory and other pupils, and which is expressly commended in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, and other fathers; but it must always be wrong to make a partial concession to error, or rather to feign a partial admission of false doctrine. To apply to the eternal Son of God expressions which are true only of a creature, is to do something more than to make a necessary or judicious concealment of the full truth<sup>1</sup>.

The history of Gregory after the date of his conversion to Christianity, as recorded in the works of ancient authors, is full of legends concerning visions, revelations, and wonders which were attributed to him, and obtained for him the appellation of *Thaumaturgus*, or the Worker of miracles. Many of these are

<sup>1</sup> For a more favourable view of this matter, see Mr. NEWMAN'S *Arians of the Fourth Century*, chap. i. sect. 3.

highly absurd and inconsistent, and all more or less incredible; but the narratives concerning them tend to support the theory, that the cessation of miracles in the early church was gradual, and was not completely accomplished until some time after the death of the apostles and their fellow-labourers.

Among the most authentic sources of Gregory's history must be reckoned his own panegyric upon Origen. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 30; lib. vii. c. 14, 28), and Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 65; *Ep. ad Magnum*), furnish but scanty notices of his life; although Ruffin, in his translation of Eusebius, has enlarged the narrative by inserting passages from other writers (lib. vii. c. 25, according to his division), and these additions have been sometimes cited under the name of Eusebius himself. About a century after the time in which Gregory flourished, more copious narratives of his life, or rather elaborate panegyrics in his favour, were composed by the two celebrated brothers, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nyssa; in which they made use of materials communicated by their grandmother, who had lived in Cæsarea, of which place Gregory was bishop. The account of Basil may be found in his *Book on the Holy Spirit* (c. 29), and in several of his epistles (*Ep.* 28, al. 62; ep. 110, al. 64; ep. 204, al. 75; ep. 207, al. 63). Gregory of Nyssa compiled a regular narrative of his life, copious in its detail, but of little historical value (*GREG. NYSS. Vita Greg. Thaum.*). Theodoret (*Hæret. fab.* lib. ii. c. 28), and Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 27), are writers of a still later date who record portions of Gregory's history; but it is evident that no dependence can be placed on incidents in his life recorded by these writers alone.—Gregory died, probably, in the year 270.

Very small portions of the works of this celebrated bishop have come down to us. His *Panegyric on Origen* is extant. We possess, also, a *Paraphrase or Exposition of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*, by this writer; and a letter which he wrote to a certain bishop, concerning the rules of discipline to be observed with regard to some offending members of the church, entitled his *Canonical Epistle*, which was reckoned by the council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, among the canons of the church. In it, we find an early reference to the several degrees or classes of

penitents, which will be described in the course of the following work. Several other compositions now extant, which have been attributed to Gregory, are either of doubtful authority, or manifestly spurious.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### ARNOBIUS.

ARNOBIUS was a native of Sicca in Africa, where he taught rhetoric with great reputation and success. He wrote *A Disputation against the Heathen, in Seven Books* (Disputationum adversus Gentes Libri 7). In *the first and second books* of this treatise, the author states and answers the common objections of the heathen against Christianity;—in *the third, fourth, and fifth*, he attacks the principles of idolatrous worship, and exposes the absurdities of heathen mythology;—in *the sixth book*, he declaims against the temples and images of the pagan deities;—and in *the seventh*, he apologizes for the Christians in declining the use of sacrifices; the futility of which, as offered by the heathen, he explains at large. It has been supposed that this treatise was written by Arnobius before he was admitted to Christian baptism; but this point cannot be determined. The book certainly does not display any accurate or intimate acquaintance with Christian doctrine; but the author may have considered it useless to enter into particulars in a treatise, the object of which was to destroy the credit of the opposing system, and to recommend Christianity only incidentally, and in a general point of view. It has been also remarked as singular, that Arnobius does not make any reference to the sacred writings of either the Old or the New Testament; but this he may have studiously avoided, not without reason, in disputing with men who were not disposed to acknowledge the divine authority of holy Scripture. This treatise was probably composed about the beginning of the fourth century. The death of Arnobius may perhaps be correctly placed at about the year 325. (HIERONYM. *de Vir. Illustr.* c. 79; *Chron. ad an. XX. Constantini.*)

## CHAPTER XX.

## LACTANTIUS.

LUCIUS CÆLIUS (OR CÆCILIUS) LACTANTIUS FIRMIANUS. Neither the time nor place of his birth are known; but, from the circumstance of his having attended the lectures on rhetoric delivered by Arnobius, at Sicca, it has been concluded that he was a native of Africa. About the end of the third century, he began to teach rhetoric at Nicomedia, where he remained many years. He was entrusted by the Emperor Constantine with the education of his son Crispus; and it is probable that he did not long survive that unfortunate prince. He died probably about the year 325.

In opposition to the literary attacks made upon Christianity during his residence at Nicomedia, Lactantius composed a treatise, entitled *An Introduction to True Religion, or Christian Institutions, in Seven Books* (*Institutionum Divinarum Libri 7*), which he designed as a more complete and accurate defence of the Christian religion than those already put forth by Tertullian and Cyprian. This work was completed about the year 320.

In *the first and second books* of this treatise, Lactantius demonstrates the falsehood of the heathen system of religion; using many sound arguments against a plurality of gods, and the folly of image-worship; but adding an unauthorized account of the history and influence of demons or evil spirits, and the origin of evil.—*The third book* is employed in showing the vanity and unprofitableness of the heathen philosophy, and in exposing the faults of philosophers; a comparison being afterwards made in favour of the power of divine wisdom, or religion.—In *the fourth book*, the author undertakes to explain the principles of true religion and wisdom. This book is sadly disfigured by free and unhallowed speculations concerning the nature and eternal generation of the Son of God; but it contains, also, some more correct remarks concerning the real divinity of our Lord, and the union of the divine and human nature in his person. The author attempts to describe the great work of redemption accomplished

by the sufferings of Christ; but this description is most painfully defective, for it represents the work of the cross as designed chiefly by way of example or encouragement to believers. At the close of the book, the author describes the origin of heresies, and points out the difference between the true orthodox church and all erroneous sects.—*The fifth book* contains a description of the nature of true righteousness, which, says the author, consists in piety and justice. Much also is said concerning the unreasonableness and wickedness of persecuting the Christians on account of their religion.—*The sixth book* gives instructions concerning the true worship of God, and the nature of good works. We find here many excellent remarks relating to the spiritual service of God and true holiness of life; but there is a great deficiency of doctrine on many important points, and the author strongly maintains the unscriptural tenet that works of benevolence take away sin. At the close of the book, Lactantius insists upon the fact that, if any man has fallen into sin, he may be restored to divine favour upon his repentance and reformation, (*μετάνοια*, which, says he, may be well expressed by the Latin word *resipiscencia*.)—*The seventh book* treats of the future rewards of righteousness, the immortality of the soul, and the end of the world. The end of the present order of things is here fixed at the expiration of six thousand years from the creation; and the troubles of the latter days, together with the final triumph of Messiah over Antichrist, are described in accordance with the writer's views of the prophecies of Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Apocalypse; but without mentioning either of those books, and with great latitude of interpretation. The author then, in the next place, gives a description, for the most part fanciful and unwarranted, of the proceedings of the day of judgment, and of the mode in which separation will be made between the righteous and wicked professors of religion. He afterwards descants upon the millennium, or thousand years' reign of Christ upon earth (evidently founding his views upon a literal interpretation of certain portions of the Apocalypse);—the subsequent rebellion and destruction of Satan and his hosts, followed by a peace so profound, that no tree will be cut down for the space of seven years, because the weapons of warfare, no longer needed, will

serve for firewood;—the final glorification of the righteous;—the second resurrection of the wicked, and their doom to everlasting torments. Tertullian confidently fixes the commencement of the millennium at the date of two hundred years from the time of his writing (which would have been the six-thousandth year of the world, according to the system of chronology then current).—Such, says Lactantius in conclusion, is the doctrine of the holy prophets which we Christians receive; he then eulogizes the Emperor Constantine, to whom he had dedicated his work; and earnestly calls upon the heathen to embrace Christianity.

We must excuse Lactantius, and other early writers, for their well-meant, but mistaken, statements on sacred subjects; but we cannot help feeling that their language sometimes interferes with that deep solemnity and reverence which ought to pervade the mind, while it contemplates, at humble distance, those awful realities which the Almighty has not thought fit to disclose to us, or of which he has given only such intimations as are adapted to influence our practice, without satisfying an idle curiosity, or a vain thirst after unprofitable knowledge.

The Latin style of Lactantius is distinguished from that of other early ecclesiastical writers, by its superior clearness and elegance; and it has obtained for him the honourable appellation of the Christian Cicero. As to the contents of his great work, it may be remarked, that they embrace much that is valuable and instructive, both in an historical and religious point of view; but it is obvious that the author was far less successful in describing the foundations and principles of the Christian religion, than in exposing the errors and absurdities of the heathen systems. He was seduced by a desire of being, or appearing to be, wise above what is written; a failing which he possessed in common with many other pious fathers of the church before and after his time.

The treatise *On the Wrath of God* (*De Ira Dei, Liber unus*), consists of a series of arguments against the assumption that the Divine Being is incapable of wrath or indignation. It is directed especially against the tenets of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. Lactantius maintains that a love of good, which is allowed to belong to the Almighty, necessarily implies a hatred

of the opposite; he answers objections,—such as that if God can be angry, he must necessarily be subject also to fear and desire; that his happiness consists in repose; and that he could punish sin without being angry. The author is content to maintain a true position, and to refute a false one, rhetorically, instead of carefully explaining in what sense we are to understand the language which he defends, and how far the arguments of his opponents are correct or false. But the latter is surely the course which ought to be pursued with regard to a question on which much that is true may be said on apparently opposite sides.

In the treatise *On the Workmanship of God, or the Formation of Man* (De Opificio Dei, vel Formatione Hominis), the author adduces the wonderful construction of the human frame as a proof of the divine wisdom and providence. In conclusion, he discusses some questions concerning the soul, its nature, and its production.

The book *On the Deaths of Persecutors* (De Mortibus Persecutorum), is designed to show that those emperors who had engaged in the persecution of the Christians had become peculiar objects of divine vengeance in their misfortunes, and especially in their deaths; and that a testimony in favour of the Christian religion occurred from the fact thus stated. This treatise contains some valuable historical notices; but it is disfigured by bitterness of style. Its genuineness has been questioned by some critics; but strongly maintained by Baluze.

Some Latin poems are attributed to Laetantius. Two of these, entitled *Symposium*, and *Carmen de Phœnice*, are admitted to be genuine; but two others, *De Pascha* and *De Passione Domini*, are assigned with great probability to a later date.

Contemporary with Laetantius was the Christian Latin poet Juvencus (Caius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus, a Spaniard), who detailed the history of the Gospels in four books of Latin hexameter verses (*Historiæ Evangelicæ Libri 4*). This poem consists chiefly of a simple versification of the narratives recorded by the evangelists.

## CHAPTER XXI.

## EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA.

EUSEBIUS, bishop of Cæsarea, was born in Palestine, about the year 270. He was ordained presbyter at Cæsarea, where he contracted an intimate friendship with the celebrated martyr Pamphilus,—a connexion which he valued so highly that he was fond of being called, by way of distinction, “the friend of Pamphilus” (Eusebius Pamphili). He was constant in his attention to this valued friend during his imprisonment, which was of long duration; and assisted him in the composition of his *Defence of Origen*,—a work on which he was earnestly engaged, and of which some fragments have come down to the present time. After the martyrdom of Pamphilus, Eusebius himself was cast into prison in Egypt; but he was afterwards liberated without further loss or suffering,—a circumstance which gave rise to a charge, apparently unfounded, of his having purchased his liberty by offering sacrifice to idols (EPIPHAN. *Hær.* 68).

About the year 315, Eusebius was elected bishop of Cæsarea; soon after which date we find that he was present with other bishops at Tyre, on occasion of the consecration of a magnificent church by Paulinus, bishop of that city; before whom he pronounced an oration, in which he congratulated the church on the cessation of persecution, and its prosperity under the sunshine of imperial favour,—dwelt on the love of Christ, and the blessings of the Gospel,—spoke of the erection of the spiritual Temple to God’s honour in the soul of man,—but disfigured his speech by extolling, in the most unmeasured, offensive, and dangerous manner, the person and office of Paulinus.

In the year 319, or somewhat later, Eusebius was chosen bishop of Antioch; but although the office to which he was invited was most honourable and important, and the number of bishops by whom he was elected was very large, he firmly declined the honour, and chose to remain in his own more humble situation, in compliance with the usual practice and regulations of the church, which did not admit of a bishop’s translation



from one see to another. He continued bishop of Cæsarea until his death, in the year 340, employing his time in the zealous discharge of his episcopal duties, and in aiding the general cause of religion by his valuable writings. He was highly esteemed and favoured by the emperor Constantine; and it is not surprising that his gratitude to so distinguished a patron betrayed him into an undue admiration of his person, and even taught him to adopt strains of flattery and panegyric which are inconsistent with the sober dignity of truth, and are peculiarly unsuited to that simplicity, uprightness, and candour, which ought to distinguish a Christian minister in all ages of the church.

The name of Eusebius was afterwards conspicuous in the history of the church. He acted an important part in the Arian controversy, which began about the year 320, and raged with disastrous fury until the end of his life; but in this business he was so distinguished by his moderation and love of peace, that the more violent of the orthodox party did not hesitate to reproach him with being himself an Arian at heart<sup>1</sup>. The fact appears to have been that, although sound in his own views of religious doctrine, and therefore incapable of subscribing to the tenets of Arius, he was yet highly dissatisfied with the intemperate zeal and intolerance of the orthodox body, and unable to do or say in their favour all that they desired. He was one of those upright and temperate men who, in the contest of parties, must always be either unknown, despised, or hated.

Of the literary labours of Eusebius, one of the first was a great work on history and chronology, entitled *Chronicon* (*Παροδοπαῖ ἱστορία*); in which he undertook to describe the origin and progress of all nations from the beginning of the world to the time of Constantine. This valuable compilation has, however, perished; but some fragments of a translation by Jerome have been preserved, and have been published, together with some other fragments of the original work from the Byzantine historians, and certain other additions.

The chief works of Eusebius now extant are the following:—

<sup>1</sup> Contemporary with Eusebius of Cæsarea was another Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who was an Arian.

*An Evangelical Preparation, or Preparation for the Demonstration of the Truth of the Gospel* (Προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελικὴ, or εὐαγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως προπαρασκευή). This work is comprised in fifteen books; in the first six of which the author undertakes to show the folly of the heathen theology and worship; and in the others, to establish the superior claims of Christianity.

In the first book, Eusebius answers the objections commonly urged by the heathen and Jews against Christianity; he then mentions some of the blessings which this religion had conferred upon mankind; and proceeds to justify the Christians in their renunciation of heathenism, by detailing particularly the nature of the several systems of false theology. He begins by stating the opinions of the Greeks, concerning the origin of the world; describes the worship of the heavenly bodies as the earliest kind of idolatry; and explains especially the old Phœnician theology. It is in this part of the work that we find a celebrated fragment from the writings of Sanchoniathon, the Phœnician philosopher, in the Greek translation of Philo Byblius.—From the Phœnician theology, the author passes, in the second book, to the Egyptian, which he describes partly in the words of Manetho; and then to the Grecian, which he portrays from the writings of Diodorus Siculus, Eucemerus, and Clement of Alexandria. He displays particularly the defects of Plato's system of theology, and shows cause for rejecting the allegorical interpretation of the Grecian mythology.—The folly of these allegorical explanations is more particularly shown in the third book; in which, and in the fourth and fifth books, the author exposes the vanity of the heathen oracles and arts of divination, and maintains that the pagan worship was really addressed to demons or evil spirits, from whose tyranny Christ came to deliver us.—The sixth book contains a refutation of the heathen doctrines concerning fate, and the influence of the heavenly bodies upon the destiny of man and of human affairs in general; and here, also, the author asserts and expounds the doctrine of the liberty of the human will. Having thus assigned reasons for rejecting the various systems of heathen theology, Eusebius proceeds to show why the Jewish system deserved the preference which it had received from Christians.—

In *the seventh book*, he describes the Jewish religion as most excellent and useful, inasmuch as it gives the best account of the nature of God, of angels, evil spirits, and men, and of the creation of the world.—In *the eighth book*, we have an account of the sources of the Jewish religion;—of the Septuagint translation of the old Testament (after Aristeas);—and of the nature of the Mosaic theology and religion. The author here asserts the secret or double sense of Scripture. He extols the piety of the Essenes, and the wisdom of Philo.—In *the ninth book*, Eusebius shows that the best of the Greek writers had frequently referred to the history and religion, the laws and customs, of the Jews, and had even mentioned by name some of their celebrated men. He then goes on to prove at large, in *the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth books*, that the Greeks had borrowed all that was really good in their philosophy from the Jews, who were a much more ancient people than themselves; (presenting here an expansion and excessive refinement of the argument already brought forward by Clement of Alexandria and other writers.)—In *the fourteenth and fifteenth books*, the inconsistencies and disagreements of the heathen philosophers, their futilities, errors, and wranglings, are alleged as reasons for abandoning all their systems, and giving a preference to the doctrine of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures.

The whole work displays the fruits of extensive and careful reading, and is highly valuable, both as contributing to our knowledge of heathen superstition and philosophy, and because it preserves many fragments of ancient writers which would otherwise have been lost.

*A Demonstration of the truth of the Gospel* (Εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις). This treatise is the sequel of the former. It consisted of twenty books, of which only ten remain. The contents of this work are designed chiefly for the conviction of the Jews; and accordingly the argument turns very much upon the writings of the Old Testament, and upon the fulfilment of the Jewish prophecies relating to the person and history of the Messiah.

In *the first book*, Eusebius points out the difference between the Jewish, heathen, and Christian religions; and labours more particularly to show that, while the Jewish system was adapted

to only one people, Christianity on the other hand was designed for all nations, and that the religion of Christians is in substance the ancient religion of the Jewish patriarchs, the law of Moses having intervened as a remedy for the idolatrous propensities which the Jews had contracted in Egypt. The author then institutes a comparison between the doctrines of Moses and Christ, and shows why our Lord submitted to the ceremonial law. This is followed by some observations relating to abstinence from marriage.—The *second book* is employed in proving that the divine promises of a Redeemer conveyed by the Jewish prophets were designed to extend to all mankind;—that the knowledge and worship of Christ were to be adopted by all nations; and that the prophets had foretold the rejection of the Jews on account of their unbelief, together with the calling of the Gentiles.—After this introduction, the author approaches his main subject in *the third book*. He shows, first, that Jesus Christ is the true Saviour of the world; and that he was the subject of many of the Jewish prophecies;—he traces points of resemblance between Moses and Christ; maintains that our Lord was no impostor, and especially defends his miracles from the unfair imputations of unbelievers.—In *the fourth book*, Eusebius expounds the doctrine of our Saviour's deity and incarnation, and his work of redemption; detailing incidentally some information concerning the ministry of angels in the government of the world, much more copious and circumstantial than any which can be found in Scripture.—The following books are occupied in proving that all the particulars recorded in the Gospels concerning our blessed Lord were severally predicted by the Jewish prophets.—In *the fifth book*, Eusebius compares the Jewish prophecies with the heathen oracles, to the disparagement of the latter, which he maintains to have been under the control of evil spirits, and to have been silenced at the coming of Christ. He then proves the divinity of Christ from the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, and Col. i. 15, 16; and supposes that he finds the same doctrine intimated in about thirty passages of the Old Testament. (Of these, some of the most remarkable are Gen. xix. 24; Exod. xxiii. 20; Ps. xxxiii. 6; xlv. 7; ex.; Prov. viii. 22; Isa. xlv. 14, 15; xlviii. 12, *seq.*; Zech. ii. 8 *seq.*)—The *sixth book* tends

to establish the fact that the appearance of the Messiah among men was an ancient subject of prophecy; and in *the seventh and eighth books*, the author shows that even the manner, time, and place of his birth, and the family from which he was to come according to the flesh, were also minutely foretold.—And lastly, in *the ninth and tenth books*, the author collects passages from the prophets, in which particular events in the life of Christ upon earth were announced; such as the appearance of the star in the east (Numb. xxiv.);—the flight of Christ into Egypt (Isa. xix.);—his temptation (Ps. xci.);—his first miracle in Galilee (Isa. ix.);—his walking upon the sea (Job ix. 8);—the treachery of Judas (Ps. xli. 10; lv. 14; cix. 1, *seq.*; Zech. xi. 13);—the darkening of the sun at the time of the crucifixion (Amos viii. 9; Zech. xiv. 6, 7);—his struggle with despair; and many other circumstances and consequences of his sufferings and death (Ps. xxii.) This part of the work, and indeed many others, would have been far more correct and valuable, if the author had not adopted and acted upon the opinion of Origen and others, relating to the supposed double sense of Scripture.

Another treatise of Eusebius in defence of Christianity is that *against Hierocles*. Hierocles was a governor of Bithynia, who employed his pen, and other more severe means of persecution, against the Christians. The treatise of our author in reply to his book is chiefly occupied in exposing the fallacy of the comparison which Hierocles had instituted between the miracles of our Saviour, and the wonderful works falsely ascribed to Apollonius of Tyana.

The *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books (*Ἱστορίας ἐκκλησιαστικῆς λόγοι δέκα*), is the most important and valuable portion of the writings of this learned and indefatigable author. His design in undertaking this history was to exhibit the divine origin of Christianity, its growth amidst persecution, the piety and virtue of its teachers, and the steadfastness of its martyrs and confessors under sufferings, and in the face of death. He details accordingly the history of the Christian church from its foundation to the death of Licinius, A.D. 324, when outward persecutions ceased. By the favour of Constantine, Eusebius had access to many original records and documents, which

furnished much valuable information respecting the acts and sufferings of Christians in past ages; and although, as may be expected, he has not entirely avoided error, nor can be thoroughly acquitted of credulity, yet, on the whole, the history is compiled with such a degree of care, impartiality, and laborious research, that it constitutes an unique and invaluable treasure of its kind.

Eusebius presents us with the first formal list of the books of the New Testament. Until his time, no such catalogue or canon had been generally received, although the different churches agreed in esteeming certain books as undoubtedly genuine, while some regarded a few as doubtful. We should arrive at the same result as Eusebius, concerning books universally received or partially rejected, by collecting the testimonies of preceding writers; but the chapter in which the author makes his statement on this subject is peculiarly valuable and important<sup>2</sup>.

*A History of the Martyrs in Palestine*, during the persecution under Diocletian (*Περὶ τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μαρτυρησάντων*), is usually printed as an appendix to the eighth book of the Ecclesiastical History.

An important supplement to this history is found also in the *History of the Life of Constantine*, in four books; a work, however, which is not exactly what its title would lead us to expect, but rather a continued panegyric on the emperor for the various benefits which he had conferred upon the church, and his conduct in support of the Christian religion. In this work, although not strictly historical, as well as in the professed *Panegyric* on the emperor, composed on occasion of his having completed the thirtieth year of his reign, we find many valuable notices of facts which would otherwise have remained unknown to us.

Eusebius also composed a kind of harmony of the four gospels. This consists of ten lists (*κανόνες*); of which the first contains such narratives as are found in all four of the evangelists; the three following, such as occur in three only; the five next, such as are found in no more than two; and the last, such as are preserved in only a single Gospel.

We possess also, in a tolerable degree of preservation, his Scriptural topography, a treatise *On the names of places in Holy*

<sup>2</sup> EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 25.

*Scripture* (*Περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ*, *Onomasticum urbium et locorum S. Scripturæ*, ed. Io. Cleric). Some portions of his *Expositions of Scripture* have come down to us. They partake too much of the faults of the school of Origen; but are not without their value in a critical point of view. Fourteen minor treatises, or rather sermons, which exist in a Latin translation, have also been ascribed to Eusebius. Some treatises written in the course of the controversies with Arius and Marcellus of Ancyra complete the number of the works of this author now extant; many other productions of his labours and pen have perished amidst the wrecks of time.

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

### APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS.

Two collections of ecclesiastical rules and formularies, entitled *APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS* (*Διαταγαί*, or *διατάξεις*, *τῶν ἀποστόλων*; *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*), and *APOSTOLICAL CANONS* (*Κανόνες ἀποστολοκοί*; *Canones Apostolorum*), were attributed, in early ages of the church, to Clement of Rome, who was supposed to have committed them to writing from the mouths of the apostles, whose words they pretend to record. The authority thus claimed for these writings has, however, been entirely disproved; and it is generally supposed by critics that they were chiefly compiled during the second and third centuries; or that at least the greater part must be assigned to a period before the first Nicene council. We find references to them in the writings of Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Athanasius, writers of the third and fourth centuries. A modern critic supposes them not to have attained their present form until the fifth century<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The following remarks of Rosenmüller, quoted by Augusti, represent the general opinion of modern critics respecting the date of the Constitutions:—*Certum est Constitutiones in hoc opere contentas nec ab apostolis esse profectas, nec etiam a Clemente*

*Romano collectas et editas. Quis autem fuerit auctor, et quo tempore scripserit, id nemo facile definire ausit. Mihi eorum probabilis est sententia, qui credibile esse existimant, has Constitutiones non ab uno homine, nec uno tempore, sed a diversis hominibus*

The *Constitutions* are comprised in eight books. In these the apostles are frequently introduced as speakers. They contain rules and regulations concerning the duties of Christians in general, the constitution of the church, the offices and duties of ministers, and the celebration of divine worship. The tone of morality which runs through them is severe and ascetic. They forbid the use of all personal decoration and attention to appearances, and prohibit the reading of the works of heathen authors. They enjoin Christians to assemble twice every day in the church for prayers and psalmody, to observe various fasts and festivals, and to keep the sabbath (*i. e.* the seventh day of the week), as well as the Lord's day. They require extraordinary marks of respect and reverence towards the ministers of religion; commanding Christians to honour a bishop as a king or a prince, and even as a kind of God upon earth,—to render to him absolute obedience,—to pay him tribute,—and to approach him through the deacons or servants of the church, as we come to God only through Christ! This latter kind of (profane) comparison is carried to a still greater extent; for the deaconesses are declared to resemble the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as they are not able to do anything without the deacons. Presbyters are said to represent the apostles; and the rank of Christian teachers is declared to be higher than that of magistrates and princes.—We find here also a complete liturgy or form of worship for Christian churches; containing not only a description of ecclesiastical ceremonies, but the prayers to be used at their celebration.

This general description of the contents of the Book of Constitutions is alone enough to prove that they are no produc-

et variis temporibus conflatas, et primis decursu temporis additas esse novas, quemadmodum et novæ leges ac constitutiones in regimine ecclesiæ, novis occasionibus enatis, factæ sunt. . . . Nam inter mores et instituta, quæ in hoc opere recensentur, alia satis esse antiqua et jam sec. ii. imprimis in ecclesia Græca recepta, alia autem non ante secul. iii. et iv. in usu fuisse, harum rerum periti recte putant, et res ipsa docet. Exstîtisse

hanc collectionem jam ante sec. iv., et, quod consequens est, ante Concilium Nicænum, vel ex Eusebii testimonio patet. Sic autem loqui solet non de scriptis sua demum ætate confectis: sed de antiquioribus, qualia sunt Hermæ Pastor, Epistola Barnabæ, etc., ad quorum classem istæ *δαδαί* ab eo referuntur. JO. GE. ROSENMULLER. *Historia Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum in Eccles. Christ.* p. i.



tions of the apostolic age. Mention also occurs of several subordinate ecclesiastical officers, such as readers and exorcists, who were not introduced into the church until the third century. And there are manifest contradictions between several parts of the work. The general style in which the Constitutions are written is such as had become prevalent during the third century.

It is useless to inquire who was the real author of this work; but the date, and probable design of the forgery, are of more importance, and may be more easily ascertained. Epiphanius, towards the end of the fourth century, appears to be the first author who speaks of these books under their present title, Apostolical Constitutions (*Hæres.* 70, n. 10). But he refers to the work only as one containing much edifying matter, without including it among the writings of the apostles; and indeed he expressly says that many persons had doubted of its genuineness. One passage, however, to which Epiphanius refers, speaks language directly the reverse of what we find in the corresponding passage of the work now extant; so that it appears probable that the Apostolical Constitutions which that author used have been corrupted and interpolated since his time.

On the whole, it appears probable, from internal evidence, that the Apostolical Constitutions were compiled during the reigns of the heathen emperors towards the end of the third century, or at the beginning of the fourth; and that the compilation was the work of some one writer (probably a bishop), of the eastern church. The advancement of episcopal dignity and power appears to have been the chief design of the forgery.

If we regard the Constitutions as a production of the third century (containing remnants of earlier compositions), the work possesses a certain kind of value. It contributes to give us an insight into the state of Christian faith, the condition of the clergy and inferior ecclesiastical officers, the worship and discipline of the church, and other particulars, at the period to which the composition is referred. The growth of the episcopal power and influence, and the pains and artifices employed in order to derive it from the apostles, are here partially developed. Many of the regulations prescribed, and many of the moral and religious remarks, are good and edifying; and the prayers

especially breathe, for the most part, a spirit of simple and primitive Christianity. But the work is by no means free from traces of superstition; and it is occasionally disfigured by mystical interpretations and applications of holy Scripture, and by needless refinements in matters of ceremony. We find several allusions to the events of apostolical times; but occurrences related exclusively in such a work are altogether devoid of credibility, especially as they are connected with the design of the compiler to pass off his book as a work of the apostles.

The *Canons* relate chiefly to various particulars of ecclesiastical polity and Christian worship; the regulations which they contain being for the most part sanctioned with the threatening of deposition and excommunication against offenders. The first allusion to this work by name is found in the acts of the Council which assembled at Constantinople in the year 394, under the presidency of Nectarius, bishop of that see. But there are expressions in earlier councils and writers of the same century which appear to refer to the canons, although not named. In the beginning of the sixth century, fifty of these canons were translated from Greek into Latin by the Roman abbot Dionysius the younger; and about the same time thirty-five others were appended to them in a collection made by John, patriarch of Constantinople. Since that time the whole number (eighty-five) have been regarded as genuine in the east; while only the first fifty have been treated with equal respect in the west. It appears highly probable that the original collection was made about the middle of the third century, or somewhat later, in one of the Asiatic churches. The author may have had the same design as that which appears to have influenced the compiler of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. The eighty-fifth canon speaks of the Constitutions as sacred books; and from a comparison of the two works, it is plain that they are either the production of one and the same writer, or that, at least, the two authors were contemporary, and had a good understanding with each other. The rules and regulations contained in the *Canons* are such as were gradually introduced and established during the second and third centuries. In the canon or list of sacred books of the New Testament given in this work, the Revelation of St. John is omitted, but the two epistles of Clement and the *Apostolical Constitutions* are inserted.

BOOK II.  
OF THE CHURCH, OR GENERAL BODY OF  
CHRISTIANS.

---

CHAPTER I.

ACCOUNTS OF JEWISH AND PROFANE AUTHORS.

JEWISH and profane writers afford but scanty information concerning the constitution and practices of the early church.

The disputed passage in Josephus, in which allusion is made to the divine author of our religion, does not descend to any mention of his followers; nor do the remarks of this writer and Philo, even if we suppose that they refer to the Christians under the name of Essenes, offer much assistance in our inquiry.

Greek and Roman authors, especially the latter, took but slight notice of the Christian society for some time after the period of its foundation; regarding it, probably, as a mere offshoot of Judaism, or as an insignificant Jewish sect. And, hence, the passages in which Suetonius (*vit. Ner. c. xvi.*; *vit. Claud. c. 25.*), Tacitus (*Annal. xv. 44*), Arrian, Antoninus, Dio Cassius, and other writers, make mention of the Christians, throw little or no light on their manners and customs.

The most important notices of this kind occur in the letters of Pliny the younger, who was Governor of Pontus and Bithynia in the years 110, 111, and in the writings of Lucian of Samosata, an opponent of Christianity, who flourished in the latter part of the same century.

Pliny, finding occasion to consult the Emperor Trajan respecting the measures to be adopted with regard to the Christians in his province, many of whom he had punished, merely, as he states, on account of their obstinacy, or unflinching profession of their faith, gives some insight into their practices, in the following passage. "They declared," says he, "that their fault consisted only in this, that it was their practice to meet together on a

stated day before it was light, and to sing a hymn by turns (or to join in a set form of words), addressed to Christ as God; binding themselves, also, by a solemn compact, not indeed to commit any crime, but, on the contrary, not to steal, commit adultery, break their word, or refuse to restore anything which may have been entrusted to them. This done, they used to separate, until they met again to partake of a common (or ordinary) meal, of a perfectly harmless character." Here we find an allusion to the observance of the Lord's day; assemblies for worship early in the morning (*conventus antelucani*, Tertull.); common prayer, or psalmody, or both, with the use of responses; probably, the reading and exposition of the Scriptures; and, evidently, the *agapæ*, or love feasts, and the celebration of the Lord's supper, in an evening or night assembly. This letter also contains a striking proof of the extensive propagation of Christianity at the time in which it was written. It is highly important in many respects; and as it will be a subject of frequent reference in the following pages, I transcribe the entire original, with the emperor's reply, in a note<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> PLINIUS TRAJANO (*Epist. x. 97*). Solenne est mihi, Domine, omnia, de quibus dubito, ad Te referre. Quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere, vel ignorantiam instruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam: ideo nescio, quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri. Nec mediocriter hæsitavi, sitne aliquod discrimen ætatum, an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant; deturne prænitentiæ venia, an ei, qui omnino Christianus fuit, desisse non prosit: nomen ipsum etiamsi flagitiis careat, an flagitia coherentia nomini puniantur. Interim in iis, qui ad me tanquam Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos, an essent Christiani. Confitentibus iterum et tertio interrogavi, supplicium minatus: perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecumque esset quod faterentur, perviciaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri. Fuerunt alii similis amentia:

quos, quia cives Romani erant, annotavi in urbem remittendos. Mox ipso tractatu, ut fieri solet, diffundente se crimine, plures species inciderunt. Propositus est libellus sine autore, multorum nomina continens, qui negarent, se esse Christianos aut fuisse. Cum præeunte me Deos appellarent, et imagini Tuæ, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum afferri, thure ac vino supplicarent, præterea maledicerent Christo, quorum nihil cogi posse dicuntur, qui sunt revera Christiani; ergo dimittendos putavi. Alii ab indice nominati, esse se Christianos dixerunt, et mox negaverunt: fuisse quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante triennium, quidem ante plures annos, nonnemo etiam ante viginti quoque. Omnes et imaginem Tuam, Deorumque simulacra venerati sunt, et Christo maledixerunt. Affirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque

Lucian of Samosata, an opponent of the Christian faith, had many opportunities of becoming acquainted with its large and increasing body of professors in Syria, Asia Minor, Gaul, Italy, and other countries. His writings (*De Morte Peregrini*, *Philopseudes*, *Pseudomantis*), contain many allusions to the rites and practices of the early church. He represents the Christians as worshippers of "a man who had been crucified in Palestine," whom they regarded as their lawgiver. He makes mention of their public worship, and their observance of peculiar religious ceremonies; their fraternal union among themselves; their renunciation of idolatry, and contempt of false gods; their readiness to assist and support the sick and poor, and their institutions for these purposes; their agapæ, or love-feasts; their possession and use of sacred books; and their rigorous discipline, as shown in the practice of excommunicating offenders.

The testimony of Celsus, preserved by Origen, is important for its information respecting the doctrine of the Christians in his day, but it affords little or no insight into their customs and observances.

Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem; seque sacramento, non in seclus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne lætrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent; quibusperactis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse rursusque cocundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium: quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua heterias esse vetueram. Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis, quæ ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quærere. Sed nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam. Ideo dilata cognitione ad consulendum Te decurri. Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periculantium numerum. Multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur: neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est.

Quæ videtur sisti, et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat, prope jam desolata templa cœpisse celebrari, et sacra solennia diu intermissa repeti, passimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc rarissimus emtor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile est opinari, quæ turba hominum emendari possit, si sit pœnitentiæ locus.

TRAJANUS PLINIO (*Epist. x. 93*). Actum, quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in excutiendis causis eorum, qui Christiani ad te delati fuerant, secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid, quod quasi certam formam habeat, constitui potest. Conquærendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt; ita tamen, ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse, idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, *i. e.*, supplicando Diis nostris, quamvis suspectus in præteritum fuerit, veniam ex pœnitentia impetret. Sine autore vero propositi libelli, nullo crimine locum habere debent: nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri sæculi est.

Julian the apostate (*Epistola ad Arsacium, pontificem Galatiae*), refers to the charitable institutions of the Christians, their ecclesiastical discipline, and their education of the young.

---

The epistles of Pliny and Trajan, which have been quoted in a note to this chapter, are on many accounts so important in ecclesiastical history and antiquities, that I deem it right to subjoin Melmoth's translation, for the sake of those among my readers who may not be conversant with the original Latin. "The letter of Pliny," says Melmoth in a note, "is esteemed as almost the only genuine monument of ecclesiastical antiquity relating to the times immediately succeeding the apostles, it having been written at most not above forty years after the death of St. Paul. It was preserved by the Christians themselves, as a clear and unsuspecting evidence of the purity of their doctrines, and is frequently appealed to by the early writers of the church against the calumnies of their adversaries."

#### PLINY TO THE EMPEROR TRAJAN.

"IT is a rule, Sir, which I inviolably observe, to refer myself to you in all my doubts; for who is more capable of removing my scruples, or informing my ignorance? Having never been present at any trials concerning those who profess Christianity, I am unacquainted not only with the nature of their crimes, or the measure of their punishment, but how far it is proper to enter into an examination concerning them. Whether, therefore, any difference is usually made with respect to the ages of the guilty, or no distinction is to be observed between the young and the adult; whether repentance entitles them to a pardon; or, if a man has been once a Christian, it avails nothing to desist from his error; whether the very profession of Christianity, unattended with any criminal act, or only the crimes themselves inherent in the profession, are punishable; in all these points I am greatly doubtful. In the mean while, the method I have observed towards those who have been brought before me as Christians, is this:—I interrogated them whether they were Christians; if they confessed, I repeated the question twice again, adding

threats at the same time; when, if they still persevered, I ordered them to be immediately punished; for I was persuaded, whatever the nature of their opinions might be, that a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved correction. There were others also brought before me, possessed with the same infatuation, but being<sup>2</sup> citizens of Rome I directed them to be carried thither. But this crime spreading, (as is usually the case,) while it was actually under prosecution, several instances of the same nature occurred. An information was presented to me without any name prescribed, containing a charge against several persons, who upon examination denied they were Christians, or had ever been so. They repeated after me an invocation to the gods, and offered religious rites with wine and frankincense before your statue, (which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought, together with those of the gods,) and even reviled the name of Christ: whereas there is no forcing, it is said, those who are really Christians into a compliance with any of these articles. I thought proper, therefore, to discharge them. Some of those who were accused by a witness in person, at first confessed themselves Christians, but immediately after denied it; while the rest owned indeed that they had been of that number formerly, but had now (some above three, others more, and a few above twenty years ago) forsaken that error. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the gods, throwing out imprecations also at the same time against the name of Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their guilt or error was, that they met on a certain stated day before it was light, and addressed themselves in a form of prayer to Christ, as to some god, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery: never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then re-assemble, to eat in common a harmless meal. From this custom, however, they desisted after the publication of my

<sup>2</sup> It was one of the privileges of a Roman citizen, secured by the Sempronian law, that he could not be capitally convicted but by the suffrage of the people; which seems to have been still so far in force, as to make it necessary to send the persons here mentioned to Rome.—MELMOTH.

edict, by which, according to your orders, I forbade the meeting of any assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it so much the more necessary to endeavour to extort the real truth, by putting two female slaves to the torture, who were said to administer in their religious functions<sup>3</sup>: but I could discover nothing more than an absurd and excessive superstition. I thought proper, therefore, to adjourn all further proceedings in this affair, in order to consult with you. For it appears to be a matter highly deserving your consideration, more especially as great numbers must be involved in the danger of these persecutions, this inquiry having already extended, and being still likely to extend, to persons of all ranks and ages, and even of both sexes. For this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread its infection among the country villages. Nevertheless it still seems possible to remedy this evil, and restrain its progress. The temples, at least, which were almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission, are again revived; while there is a general demand for the victims, which for some time past have met with but few purchasers. From hence it is easy to imagine, what numbers might be reclaimed from this error if a pardon were granted to those who shall repent."

TRAJAN TO PLINY.

"THE method you have pursued, my dear Pliny, in the proceedings against those Christians which were brought before you, is extremely proper; as it is not possible to lay down any fixed plan, by which to act in all cases of this nature. But I would not have you officiously enter into any inquiries concerning them. If indeed they should be brought before you, and the crime is proved, they must be punished; with this restriction, however, that when the party denies himself to be a Christian, and shall make it evident that he is not, by invoking our gods, let him (notwithstanding any former suspicion) be pardoned upon his repentance. Informations without the accuser's name subscribed ought not to be received in prosecutions of any sort; as it is introducing a very dangerous precedent, and by no means agreeable to the equity of my government."

<sup>3</sup> Deaconesses.



## CHAPTER II.

## § 1. NAMES ASSUMED BY CHRISTIANS.

THE common appellations of the professors of the Christian religion which occur in the New Testament, and were current among themselves at the date of the Apostolical Epistles, are the following:—*Saints*, or *the holy people* (ἅγιοι); *believers*, or *the faithful* (πιστεύσαντες, πιστοὶ); *the chosen*, or *elect* (ἐκλεκτοὶ); *the disciples* (μαθηταὶ); *the brethren* (ἀδελφοὶ); *the people of God* (λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ); and the like. These names were derived from the Jewish nomenclature; and were expressive of certain dispositions and privileges which belonged to the sincere professors of the gospel.

Epiphanus and Eusebius mention the name *Jessians*, as one of the first distinctive appellations with which the church was acquainted; but it does not exactly appear by whom, or in what sense, this title was applied<sup>1</sup>.

No choice of either of these names, as a distinguishing and permanent title of the body, appears to have been made, at first, by Christians themselves. They did not, perhaps, contemplate

<sup>1</sup> “Epiphanus (*Hær.* xxix. n. 4) says they were also called Ἰεσσαῖοι, Jessians; either from Jesse, the father of David, or, which is more probable, from the name of the Lord Jesus. He adds that Philo speaks of them under this appellation in his book περὶ Ἰεσσαίων, which he affirms to be no other but Christians, who went by that name in Egypt, whilst St. Mark preached the gospel at Alexandria. This book of Philo is now extant under another title, Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, *Of the contemplative life*; and so it is cited by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 17), who is also of opinion that it is nothing but a description of the Christians in Egypt, whom he calls *Therapeutæ*, which signifies either ‘worshippers of the true God,’ or ‘spiritual physicians,’ who

undertook to cure men’s minds of all vicious and corrupt affections. But whether this name was invented by Philo, as most proper to express their way of living, or was then the common name of believers in Egypt, before the name Christian was spread all over the world, Eusebius does not undertake to determine. However, he tells us it was a name given to the Christians; and St. Jerome is so positive in it, that for this reason he gives Philo a place in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, telling us that he wrote a book concerning the first church of St. Mark at Alexandria.” BINGHAM *Antiq.* book i. ch. i. § 1.—But Eusebius was wrong in supposing that the Therapeutæ of Philo were Christians.—See BURTON, *Lectures*, Lect. x.

any future condition of the church, in which the various appellations that have been mentioned would not be applicable, in the strictness of their meaning, to all who should embrace the faith of the gospel. And it is likely that they were averse from adopting any name of a sectarian cast, or any denomination whatever which should not appear to flow immediately from their own principles, character, or prospects. But it is a fact, however deeply to be deplored, that the names which were thus current at first, do not apply in the strictness of their meaning, or indeed in any good sense whatever, to a large number of persons who have since that time professed the faith of the gospel.

Another general name, descriptive of men's professed relation to the head of the spiritual body, which was introduced at a very early period, soon gained a preference over all others, and was universally adopted. The disciples were called by that title which has prevailed ever since,—CHRISTIANS.

There can be no doubt that this name was at first applied to the disciples by way of contempt, or as a term of reproach. The form of the word (*Χριστιανός*) bespeaks its Roman origin. And in the passages of the New Testament in which it occurs, there is no intimation that it had originated among Christians themselves; while the context, in one place, expressly refers to the contempt and persecution which were incurred by those who bore the name. "The disciples *were called* Christians first in Antioch," Acts xi. 26. "Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," Acts xxvi. 28.—"If any man *suffer* as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed," 1 Peter iv. 16; to which there appears to be an allusion also in v. 14, "If ye be reproached for the name of Christ (*ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*), happy are ye." The Jews appear to have distinguished the Christians by the contemptuous appellation of *Galileans* (Acts ii. 7), or the *sect of the Nazarenes* (Acts xxiv. 5).

But, whatever may have been the origin of this name, it was soon cheerfully adopted by Christians themselves. They willingly assumed the name of the Lord and Master whom they served, and in whose service they gloried and rejoiced; complying perhaps designedly, in this particular instance, with the rule of

the apostle; "on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. - If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf," 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16. The early Christian writers relate several instances of martyrs who, when put to the torture, persisted in returning to the questions of their persecutors this single answer—"I am a Christian!" (EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 1; CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* XLVI. t. i. p. 532, *ed. Franc.*)

The ancients speak with approbation of this name, inasmuch as it contains no indication of adherence to any particular sect or party in the church, but expresses only an attachment to the common religion. "I honour Peter," says Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 31), "but I am not called a Petrian; I honour Paul, but I am not called a Paulian. I am named after no man, for I belong to God." Epiphanius (*Hæres.* 42) observes, "No sect or Church is called by the name of an apostle. We hear nothing of Petrians, Paulians, Bartholomæans, or Thaddæans; for all the apostles from the beginning had but one doctrine, preaching not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Hence, they gave to all the churches but one name; not their own, but the name of Christ, from the time that they were first called Christians in Antioch."

By mistake, the professors of the gospel were sometimes called *Chrestiani*, instead of *Christiani*. The allusion contained in the Greek word *Christus* (a translation of the Hebrew Messiah, *i. e.*, the anointed), was not understood by the opponents of the new religion, to whom the word *Chrestus*, *i. e.*, good, was more familiar. And as the members of the persecuted sect exhibited extraordinary piety and virtue, it was natural for the heathen to suppose that they had adopted a distinctive appellation from this honourable circumstance. Passages from ancient writers relating to the name *Christianus* or *Chrestianus*, are inserted in a note<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Nero quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos, per flagitia inuisos, vulgus *Christianos* appellabat. *Auctor nominis ejus Christus*, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. TACIT. *Annal.* lib. xv. c. 44.—Judeos, *impulsore Chresto*, as-

sidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. SÆTON. *Vit. Claudii*, c. 25. — *Christianus*, quantum interpretatio est, de *unctione* deducitur. Sed et cum *pereram Chrestianus* pronuntiat a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos), de *suavitate* vel *benignitate*

The name *Catholici*, or Catholics, denoting an adherence to the *universal* faith, was introduced after the rise and spread of sects which maintained peculiar opinions, and separated themselves from the general body. It is obvious that this name would be claimed by all persons who supposed that their faith was that of the earliest ages of the church, and such as ought to be, at all times, universal.

*Ecclesiastici*, or members of the church, another name adopted upon the same ground, is of frequent occurrence in the writings of Eusebius, Origen, Epiphanius, and Cyril of Jerusalem. This name was at first applied to Christians in general, though afterwards restricted to the clerical body<sup>3</sup>.

*Doctmatici*, or (οἱ τοῦ δόγματος), *i. e.*, the professors of the true Christian doctrine. This also was a term of general application, not confined to Christian teachers.

In opposition to the Gnostics, commonly so called, the early Christians sometimes styled themselves *the true Gnostics*, as being in possession of real knowledge, derived from the pure source, and not corrupted by human additions.

The terms *Theophori*, *Christophori* (Θεοφόροι, Χριστοφόροι), were used chiefly as epithets, or significant names, denoting the character of Christians as persons devoted to the worship or service of God and Christ.

The Greek word *Ichthys* (ἰχθῦς), composed of the initials of the Greek words for Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸς Σωτῆρ), and signifying in that language, *a fish*, was a symbolical term, in conventional use chiefly during the periods of persecution<sup>4</sup>.

compositum est. Oditur ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum. TERTULL. *Apolog.* c. 3.—Χριστιανὸὶ γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα τὸ δὲ Χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον. JUSTIN. MART. *Apolog.* i. § 4.—Exponenda hujus nominis (Christi) ratio est propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera *Chrestum* solent dicere. LACTANTI. *Institut. Div.* lib. iv. c. 7.—*Conf.* EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Tribus modis dicitur Ecclesiasticus.

Interdum enim accipitur pro Christiano, et opponitur Gentili. . . . Interdum vero designat Catholicum, et opponitur Haeretico. . . . Denique interdum denotat eum qui in clero est constitutus, et opponitur sæculari seu Laico.—VALES. *Not. in EUSEB. Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθῦν nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur; nec aliter quam in aqua permanente salvi sumus. TERTULL. *de*

Hence, and with allusion to the water of baptism, the early Christians sometimes called themselves *Pisciculi*, or *Fishes*.—(TERTULL. *De Bapt.* c. 1.)

## § 2. NAMES APPLIED TO CHRISTIANS BY WAY OF REPROACH.

The Jews and heathen, in their dislike of Christianity, took every opportunity of representing its professors as deserving of hatred or contempt. And hence, various terms of reproach and ridicule were commonly applied to Christians in the earliest period of the church.

1. The Romans, at first, regarded the followers of Christ as merely a Jewish sect, like the Pharisees, Sadducees, or Essenes; and hence, they contented themselves with calling them by the common appellation of *Jews*. This was of itself a term of contempt, as appears from several Roman proverbs, and from the well-known charges of superstition and misanthropy, which the Romans were accustomed to bring against the Israelitish nation. If they made any distinction between the Christians and Jews, it appears to have been only such as is implied in the words of Suetonius (*Vit. Ner.* c. 16), *Genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ, a sect distinguished by a new and mischievous superstition.*

2. Christians were also entitled *Nazarenes* by the Jews, and from them by the Gentiles also, (see Luke iv. 34; Acts xxv. 5; EPIPHAN. *Hæres.* xxix. c. 9; Hieron. *Com. in Es.* 49; PRUDENT. *Peristeph. Carm.* v. 25, 26; *Hymn.* 10, *De Rom. Mart.* v. 41, *seq.*) There seems to have been a sect entitled Nazarenes (*Ναζαραῖοι*), who observed circumcision and other Mosaic rites, while they professed the Christian religion; and Epiphanius supposes that these men were especially referred to in an impre-

*Baptismo*, c. 1.—Hic est piscis qui in baptisate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut quæ aqua fuerat, a pisee etiam piscina vocitetur. Cujus piscis nomen, secundum appellationem Græcam, in uno nomine per singulas literas turban sanctorum nominum continet, Ἰησοῦς, quod est Latine, Jesus

Christus, Dei Filius, Salvator. ΟΡΤΑΓ. *contra Parmenon.* lib. iii. p. 62.—See also some verses of *A Greek Hymn* at the end of the third book of the *Pædagogus* of Clement of Alexandria; —CARM. SIBYLL. lib. viii. v. 217—50; —TERTULL. *de Resurr.* c. 52; —AUG. *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xviii. c. 23.

eciation which the Jews repeated in their synagogues, three times a day, "Send thy curse, O God, upon the Nazarenes." But Jerome affirms that this imprecation was directed against Christians in general.

3. Another name of reproach was *Galilæans*. This may have originated from the use of the word in Acts ii. 7; but ecclesiastical writers derive the common application of the term from the practice, or the express command, of Julian the Apostate. Theodoret says that Julian's last words were *Νενίκησας Γαλιλαίη, Thou hast conquered, O Galilæan*. (See GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* iii.; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 12; THEODORET *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 21.)

4. The Romans sometimes scoffed at the Christians under the title of *Grecian Impostors*;—a term derived from the practice of some Christians, who used to wear the Grecian pallium, instead of the Roman toga<sup>5</sup>.

5. The followers of Jesus were derided as *Magicians* or *Sorcerers*, in accordance with the impious charge, brought by Celsus and others against our blessed Lord, that he practised magic, which they supposed him to have studied in Egypt. Augustine says that it was generally believed among the heathen, that our Saviour wrote some books about magical arts, which he delivered to St. Peter and St. Paul for the use of the disciples. (See AUG. *De Consens. Evang.* i. c. 9; ORIGEN. *Contr. Cels.* lib. i.; ARNOB. *Disputat.* i.; KORTHOLT. *De Magia Christo Hujusque Cultoribus Exprobrata.*)

6. Some other reproachful appellations were peculiar to

<sup>5</sup> Ubique viderint Christianum, statim illud de trivio, ὀργυϊκὸς ἐπιθέτης. ΠΙΕΡΟΝ. *Ep. x. ad Fur.*—Si tunica non canduerit, statim illud e trivio, IMPOSTOR ET GRECUS EST. *Id. Ep. xix. ad Marcell.*—Quia proinde Græcorum pallio etiam vestiebantur Christiani (quanquam non omnium omnino, qui Christo nomen dederant, sed τῶν ἀσκητῶν tantum, gestamen id fuisse, ut nec omnium Græcorum, sed solum philosophorum, ostendit Salmasius ad librum Tertulliani de Pallio), hinc

communi scommate audiebant Greci, et ab injectione pallii quod tunicæ superimponebant, etiam ἐπιθέται, hoc est (ut ita dixerim), impostores. Id simpliciter accipiebat indoctum vulgus ob pallii superimpositionem; ceterum literati figuratum morsum intelligebant in vocabulo ἐπιθέτης, quo fieret ad impostoris nomen apud Latinos tacita allusio, hoc est, deceptoris et hominis sanctitatem mentientis.—KORTHOLT. *Pagan. Obtrectat.* pp. 467—468.

individual writers, or were applied only in particular countries, or on particular occasions. Such are the following:—

(a.) *Sibyllists*; a favourite expression of Celsus, who accused the Christians of having falsified the Sibylline books.

(b.) *Sarmentitii* and *Semarii*; because the martyrs, when burnt alive, were sometimes fastened to a stake (*semavis*), surrounded by piles of faggots (*sarmenta, sarmina*).—See TERTULL. *Apologet.* c. 50.

(c.) *Parabolani* or *Parabolarii*, and *Desperati*, were terms applied to Christian martyrs who were exposed to wild beasts; being the common appellation of those reckless adventurers who fought with beasts in the Amphitheatre for hire.—LACTANT. *Instit.* v. 9.

(d.) *Biathanati* (*Βιαθάνατοι*), i. e., *suicides* or *self-murderers*, from their contempt of death, and cheerful endurance of extreme sufferings for the sake of Christ; or *Biothanati*, men who expect to live after death.—See BINGHAM, book i., chap. ii., § 8.

(e.) *Plautine prosapie homines et Pistores* (MINUC. FEL. *Octav.* c. 14), i. e., *men of the race of Plautus, and Bakers*, probably on account of their poverty and low station in life; with allusion to a story relating to the poet Plautus, that he was once obliged to procure a subsistence by hiring himself to a baker, who employed him in grinding his mill.

(f.) In like manner, Christians were sometimes unjustly entitled *stulti, stupidi, fatni, imperiti, hebetes, idiotæ*, i. e., *fools, infatuated*; *creduli, simplices, credulous, simpletons*; *rudes, rustici, vulgar, clowns*; *abjecti, outcasts*; *lucifuge, lucifuga natio, skulking, afraid of the light*.

7. Other terms of reproach were of a more general signification, and related more particularly to the nature of the Christian religion and worship. Thus the professors of the Gospel are sometimes entitled:—

(a.) "*Ἄθεοι*, i. e., *Atheists*; their renunciation of the errors of polytheism being construed into an entire denial of the existence and providence of God. Hence the Roman proconsul, who called upon Polycarp to renounce his Christianity, addressed him in the following terms. "Repent. Say, away with the Atheists."—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 15.

(b.) Novelli, novissimi, nuperrimi, *Νεώτεροι*, i. e., *innovators*. Both Jews and Gentiles were accustomed to upbraid Christianity with the novelty of its doctrines, and to describe it as a “new, foreign, barbarous superstition.”—See ARNOB. *Disp. adv. Gent.* i. 71, seq.; PRUDENT. *Hymn.* 10, 14, 404, seq.; TERTULL. *ad Nat.* i. 8.

(c.) *Σταυρολάτραι*, *worshippers of the cross*. This appellation seems to refer chiefly to the respect paid to the sign of the cross, and the practice of making that sign on the body, which prevailed in the early church. Christian writers indignantly repel the charge of offering any worship to the sign, and retort the accusation of image-worship upon their accusers.—See TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 16; *Ad Nat.* i. 7, 12; ATHANAS. *Parab. Script.* quæst. 83; AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 44<sup>e</sup>.

(d.) *Ὄνοχοηταί*, *Asinariî*, i. e., *worshippers of an ass*. This name seems to have been derived from an old prejudice against the Jews, of uncertain origin, mentioned by Tacitus.—See PLUTARCH. *Sympos.* lib. iv. quæst. 5; JOSEPH. *contr. Apion.* ii. 10.

(e.) Some have supposed that the Christians were also called *Ὀυρανολάτραι*, *cœlicolæ*, *worshippers of the heavens*, and *Ἡλιολάτραι*, *heliolatræ*, *worshippers of the sun*; but there is not sufficient evidence on the subject.

## CHAPTER III.

### DIVISIONS OR CLASSES OF CHRISTIANS.

IN the New Testament, Christians are divided simply into *hearers* or *learners*, and *teachers* or *governors*. Those of the

<sup>6</sup> Cruces etiam nec colimus, nec optamus [al. oramus]. Vos plane, qui ligneos deos consecratis, cruces ligneas, ut deorum vestrorum partes forsitan adoratis. Nam et signa ipsa, et cantabra, et vexilla castrorum, quid aliud, quam inauratæ cruces sunt et ornatæ? Tropæa vestra victricia non tantum simplicis crucis faciem, verum et affixi hominis imitantur. MINUC. *Fel. Octav.* p. 33, ed. Ouzel. Lugd. B. 1652, 4.—

Habeat Helena, quæ legat: unde crucem Domini recognoscat. Invenit ergo titulum, regem adoravit: non lignum utique, quia hic gentilis est error et vanitas impiorum. Adoravit illum qui pependit in ligno, scriptus in titulo.—AMBROS. *Orat. de Obitu Theodos. Imp. Conf.* TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 16; *ad Nation.* lib. i. c. 7, 12; ATHANAS. *Parab. Script.* quæst. 83; AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 44.



former class are denominated *ὁ λαὸς*, the people; *τὸ ποιμνίον*, the flock; *τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πιστῶν* (*πιστευσάντων*), the body of believers; *ἡ ἐκκλησία*, the church, assembly, congregation; *ιδιώται*, private persons; *βιωτικοὶ*, seculars, &c. Those of the latter class are called *διδάσκαλοι*, teachers; *ἡγούμενοι*, leaders; *ποιμένες*, shepherds; *ἐπίσκοποι*, overseers, superintendents, bishops; *πρεσβύτεροι*, elders; *προεστῶτες*, presidents; and others who were immediately connected with them, and subject to them, as assistants in their ministrations, are the *διάκονοι*, ministers, deacons; *χῆραι* or *διακονίσσαι*, widows or deaconesses; *ὑπηρέται*, assistants, servants; *νεώτεροι*, the younger, &c.

It is admitted on all hands that the original constitution of the Christian church was framed after a Jewish pattern; but it has been debated whether it was constructed in accordance with the Temple service, or with the worship of the Synagogue. Early ecclesiastical writers differ in their opinions on this subject. Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerome, find the prototype of the Christian church in the Mosaic institution; while Chrysostom, Basil, and Augustine, refer to the services of the synagogue, as the pattern which was followed in Christian worship. Modern writers, especially among Protestants, incline, for the most part, to the latter opinion. And they advance the following reasons for refusing to refer the origin of Christian ecclesiastical institutions to the services of the Temple. First, say they, although in the New Testament, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, our Saviour is compared to the high priest of the old dispensation, yet no comparison whatever is instituted between the rulers or teachers of the Christian church and the Jewish priests; but the resemblance is traced rather between those priests and believers in general, as in 1 Peter ii. 9; Rev. i. 6. Secondly, there is a greater similarity between the services of the synagogue and the offices of the Christian church, than between the ministers of the temple (high priest, priests, and Levites) and the three orders of Christian clergy. Thirdly, the testimonies of the Fathers, which are urged on the other side of the question, do no more than show that the real origin of ecclesiastical offices was forgotten or overlooked at an early period of the church; which may be partly accounted for, by remembering that, after the

destruction of the Jewish polity, the institutions of the synagogue were but little known. The memory of the temple service was, at the same time, perpetuated in the sacred records of the Old Testament; and it may have been thought more to the credit of the Christian worship to trace it to a divine institution than to any other.

Eusebius classes the whole body of Christians under two general divisions, *the governors* and *the governed*; and subdivides the latter class into *the unbaptized* and *the baptized* or *the faithful*. Jerome mentions a fivefold division, which, however, may be reduced to the more simple classification of Eusebius. He speaks of five orders in the church; namely, bishops, presbyters, deacons, the faithful, and the catechumeni, *i. e.*, the unbaptized. It is obvious that the first three of this order are included in the first class of Eusebius; and that the last two are the same as his twofold division of the second class<sup>1</sup>.

In the New Testament, and the writings of the Fathers, the word "Church" usually denotes the body of believers, either in general, or as met together in a particular place, including governors and teachers, the governed and the hearers. Sometimes, however, "the Church" is spoken of in early writers in contradistinction to "the ministers of the Church," denoting merely the people, or those who were not employed in any ecclesiastical office.

But the word commonly employed in this latter sense, was that which we have retained in our terms *lay*, *laity*. The Greek term *λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος*, derived from *λαὸς*, *populus*, and signifying "one of the people," was retained in the Latin form, *laicus*, being sometimes, but rarely, translated into *popularis*. The word is thus employed by early Christian writers; but some

<sup>1</sup> Τρία καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν τάγματα, ἓν μὲν τῶν ἡγουμένων, δύο δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑποβεβηκότων, τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς δύο τάγματα διηρημένου, εἰς τε τὸ μὲν πιστῶν, καὶ τῶν μὲν μηδέ πω τῆς διὰ λούτρου παλιγγενεσίας ἡξιωμένων. EUSEB. *Demonst. Evang.* lib. vii. c. 2.—Quinque ecclesie ordines, episcopus, presbyteros, diaconos, fideles, catechumens. HIERON.

*Comm. in Jes.* 19.—Majorem penam habet, qui ecclesie presidet, et delinquit. Annon magis misericordiam promeretur ad comparationem fidelis, catechumens? Non magis venia dignus est laicus, si ad diaconum confertur? Et rursus comparatione presbyteri diaconum veniam plus meretur. ORIGEN, *Hom.* 5, in Ezek.

scholars have supposed that the distinction between laicus and clericus (laity and clergy) was not introduced until the third century. Although both Jews and Christians in general were entitled God's κληρος, *his inheritance, portion, or clergy*, as distinguished from the heathen (see Deut. iv. 20; ix. 29; 1 Peter v. 3), yet ministers were likewise distinguished by this title from the other members of the church. (See CLEM. ROMAN. (?) *Ep. ad Corinth.* i. c. 40; CLEM. ALEXAND. *ap. Euseb.* lib. iii. c. 23; TERTULL. *de Præscript.* c. 41.) Nor were the laity permitted to exercise any clerical office; except that they were suffered to baptize, in case of necessity, when no ecclesiastical minister could be had. (HIERON. *Dial. c. Lucifer.*; TERTULL. *Exhort. ad Castit.* c. 7.) "As soon as the Church began to spread itself over the world, and sufficient numbers were converted to form themselves into a regular society, then rulers and other ecclesiastical officers were appointed among them, and a distinction made that no one,—no, not of the clergy themselves,—might presume to meddle with any office not committed to him, and to which he knew himself not ordained. So that, for ought that appears to the contrary, we may conclude that the names and offices of laymen and clergy were always distinct from one another, from the first foundation of Christian churches." *Bingham*.—There can be, at all events, no doubt that the distinction, and the terms by which it was expressed, existed in the early part of the third century.

Laymen were called also βιωτικοὶ, *seculars*, and ἰδιῶται, *private men*. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 3, in Laz.; *Hom.* 23, in Rom.; *Hom.* 35, in 1 Cor. xiv.; THEODORET *Com.* in 1 Cor. xiv. 16.)

Among the laity in the primitive church there was a wide and important distinction between the unbaptized and the baptized. The former were entitled κατηχούμενοι, *catechumens*, i. e., *persons receiving a course of instruction, or learners*; and the latter πιστοὶ, i. e., *believers, the faithful*.

## CHAPTER IV.

## OF CATECHUMENS.

ALL persons who had not completed that course of religious instruction which was deemed necessary in order to admission to the church, were called in Greek *κατηχούμενοι*, *catechumens*, —a word which occurs more than once in the New Testament (Rom. ii. 18; Gal. vi. 6; compare Acts xviii. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 9). They were also called *candidates for baptism*; a name which especially applied to them in its original Roman signification (*clothed in white*), from the circumstance of their being obliged to appear in white vestments when they were received into the church. Hence the name of the first Sunday after Easter, *Dominica in albis* (in white).

The instruction given to these persons was called in Greek *κατήχησις*, *catechesis*; *λόγος κατηχητικός*, *catechetical lessons*; or *κατηχισμός*, *catechism*. The teacher was called *κατηχητής*, or *κατηχιστής*, *catechist*. The place in which this instruction was given, and the candidates were prepared for baptism, was entitled *κατηχουμενέιον*, or usually, in the plural, *τὰ κατηχουμενεῖα*, *κατηχουμένια*, and sometimes *τὰ κατηχούμενα*, *the schools of the catechumens*. These Greek appellations were commonly retained by the Latin writers; but sometimes they employed the corresponding Latin terms *novitii* and *novitioli*, *novices*; *tirones*, or *tirones Dei*, *tiros*; *audientes*, *auditores*, *pupils*; *rudes*, *incipientes*, *beginners*.

There does not appear to have been any fixed age at which persons were eligible as Catechumens; nor was there any uniform rule respecting the duration of their term of instruction. The term of probation appears to have extended sometimes to two or three years; but in many cases it was reduced to a much shorter compass. And it seems to have been understood that the children of Christian parents required less preparatory instruction than Jewish converts, and the Jewish converts in like manner less than the heathen<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione etiam ætate cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos. . . . Veniant

The Catechumens were divided, at a very early period of the church, into certain classes or orders; but the learned are not agreed respecting the names and number of these classes.

The Greek canonists speak of only two classes, namely, the Ἀτελέστεροι, *imperfect*, and the Τελειώτεροι, *more perfect*. Hence Cave (*Primitive Christianity*, book i. chap. 8), says, “Of the Catechumens there were two sorts, the Τελειώτεροι, or *more perfect*, such as had been catechumens of some considerable standing, and were even ripe for baptism; the others were the Ἀτελέστεροι, *the more rude and imperfect*; these were as yet accounted heathens, who applied themselves to the Christian faith, and were catechised and instructed in the more plain grounds and rudiments of the Christian religion. These principles were gradually delivered to them, according as they became capable to receive them, first the more plain, and then the more difficult.”

Other writers, (including Beveridge, Basnage, and Suicer,) divide the Catechumens into two classes, but under different names; while others again contend for a larger number of classes, but without agreeing concerning their distinctive appellations<sup>2</sup>.

ergo dum adoleseunt, veniant dum discunt, dum, quo veniant, docentur, fiant Christiani, dum Christum nosse potuerint. TERTULL. *de Baptismo*, c. 18.—Audieram ego adhuc puer de vita æterna nobis promissa per humilitatem Domini Dei nostri, descendentis ad superbiam nostram; et signabar jam signo crucis ejus, et condiebar ejus sale, jam inde ab utero matris meæ, quæ multum speravit in T. . . . Dilata est itaque mundatio mea, quasi necesse esset, ut adhuc sordidarer, si viverem; quia videlicet post lavaerum illud major et periculosior in sordibus delictorum reatus foret. AUGUSTIN. *Confess.* lib. i. c. 11.—Ὁ μέλλον κατηχέσθαι, τρία ἔτη κατηχέσθω· εἰ δὲ σπουδαῖός τις ᾗ, καὶ εὐνοίαν ἔχει περὶ τὸ πρῶγμα, προσδέχέσθω· ὅτι οὐχ ὁ χρόνος, ἀλλ' ὁ τρόπος κρίνεται. *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 32.—Eos, qui ad fidem primam credulitatis

accedunt, si bonæ fuerint conversationis, intra biennium placuit ad baptismi gratiam admitti. *Conc. Illiberit.* c. 42.—Judæi, quorum perfidia fræquenter ad vomitum redit, si ad legem catholicam venire voluerint, octo mensibus inter catechumenos ecclesiæ limen introeant; et si pura fide venire noscuntur, tum demum baptismatis gratiam mereantur. *Conc. Agath.* c. 34.—*Conf. CYRIL. IIEROSOL. Catech.* i. n. 5; *IIERON. Ep.* 61, *ad Pammach.* c. 4; *SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 30; *BASIL M. Ep.* 186; *EPIPHAN. Hæres.* 28, n. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Catechumenes in varias olim classes distinctos reperio. . . . In Latina Ecclesiæ omnes classes in quatuor redactæ sunt, quæ in sermonibus et tractatibus Latinorum patrum passim occurrunt. Quidam enim ab infidelitate ad fidem converti desiderantes audiebant in ecclesia verbum Dei, et

It would seem that there was no general rule in the early church, respecting the classification of the Catechumens, or the claims which were made upon them. These matters appear to have varied according to circumstances, regard being had especially to the age, education, and sex of the candidates.

Persons received as Catechumens, or candidates for baptism, were signed with the sign of the cross, with prayer, and the imposition of hands. (*Concil. Arelat.* i. c. 6; *Illiber.* c. 39; *EUSEB. Vit. Constant. M.* c. 61; *SULP. SEVER. vit. Mart. Turon. Dial.* ii. c. 5; *AUGUSTIN. Confess.* b. i. c. 11; *De Peccator. Merit.* lib. ii. c. 26.)

The exercises and occupations of Catechumens are considered particularly in the chapter which treats of the preparations for baptism.

## CHAPTER V.

### OF THE BAPTIZED, FAITHFUL, OR COMPLETE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.

THE other class of the laity consisted of baptized persons, or the full members of the church. And these were distinguished by peculiar names and privileges.

1. *Their names or titles*, an acquaintance with which tends to throw much light on the phraseology and formularies of the ancient church, were the following:—

*Πιστοὶ*, that is, *the faithful*. By this name those who had been instructed in the truths of Christianity, and were living as private members in full communion with the church, were distinguished especially from the clergy, the catechumens, penitents, the possessed, and ascetics. This title, as well as the more common *οἱ πιστεύοντες*, or *πιστεύσαντες*, *believers*, occurs in the New Testament.—*Acts* xvi. 1; *2 Cor.* vi. 15; *1 Tim.* iv. 12; v. 16.

<p>ii dicebantur <i>Audientes</i>. Alii audito sermone procumbebant in genua et orationum ecclesie aliquo modo participes erant, et vocabantur <i>Substrati</i> sive <i>Genyflecentes</i>. Alii in fide recte</p>	<p>instituti baptismum petebant, et dicti sunt <i>Competentes</i>. Qui vero ex istis in albo baptizandorum descripti erant, <i>Electi</i> nuncupari solebant.—<i>BONA, Re-rum Liturg.</i> lib. i. c. 16, n. 4.</p>
---	--

2. Φωτιζόμενοι, *the enlightened*, with reference to baptism, which was called φωτισμός, or φώτισμα, *illumination*. This name does not occur in the New Testament, but it is perfectly analogous to expressions which are found in Eph. iii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 4—6; and other places.

3. Μεμνημένοι, *the initiated*. This name prevailed especially during the fourth and fifth centuries, having originated in the supposed analogy between baptism and the rites of initiation into the sacred mysteries of the heathen. The phrase ἴσασιν οἱ μεμνημένοι, *the initiated know*, occurs about fifty times in the works of Augustin and Chrysostom. In like manner, the words μυσταὶ, μυσταγωγῆτοι, *mystagogues*, and other terms borrowed from the heathen mysteries, are applied to the Christian rites. All these expressions mark the prevalence of that system of secret instruction or doctrine which will be noticed in its place. (See book iv. chap. i. sect. 10.)—They came into general use during the fourth century.

The corresponding titles of catechumens were ἀμήτοι, ἄμυστοι, ἀμυσταγώρητοι, *uninitiated*.

4. Τέλειοι, and τελειούμενοι, *the perfect*. This name, as well as the former, was derived from the system of secret instruction, or sacred mysteries, which appears to have been gradually established in the church during the second, third, and fourth centuries. The term was applied only to those who were admitted to a participation of the Lord's supper, which ordinance was mystically denominated τελετὴ τελετῶν, *perfection of perfections*. The word Τέλειοι and its cognates are applied to the persons and the spiritual condition of Christians in the New Testament, but in a less restricted sense; *e. g.* Matt. v. 48; Heb. vi. 1.

5. Lastly, to this class of Christians were attached the common titles of affection and respect, ἀδελφοὶ, *brethren*; ἄγιοι, *saints*; ἐκλεκτοὶ, *the elect*; ἀγαπητοὶ, *beloved*; υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, *sons of God*; carissimi in Jesu Christo filii, *dearly beloved in Christ*, and the like.

II. The following were *the rights and privileges* peculiar to this class of Christians.

1. They were permitted to attend all religious assemblies without exception. Whereas the catechumens, and all others

who were not in full communion with the church, were entitled to attend only certain services, and were commanded to retire from the assembly, when the more sacred services and rites were about to be performed.

2. It was regarded as a special privilege of the faithful, that they might hear and repeat the Lord's prayer aloud; which prayer was hence called *εὐχὴ τῶν πιστῶν*. The catechumens in their assemblies were not permitted to recite this prayer aloud, but to use it *διὰ σιωπῆς*, in silence. In the services of the faithful it was said or sung, and repeated by all present.

3. The faithful were further entitled to receive an explanation of all the mysteries of their religion. Not that the ancient teachers of the church represented all the doctrines of Christianity as fully intelligible by the mind of man, or by any finite understanding. But by this privilege we are to understand a right of acquaintance with all those sacred ordinances of the church, which were especially termed mysteries, and with the peculiar doctrines and truths of Christianity, especially those relating to the Holy Trinity, and the nature of the sacraments. The catechumens were instructed only in the more simple outlines of the Christian belief, and in matters relating to morals and practice<sup>1</sup>.—(See book iv. chap. i. sect. 10.)

4. As the most important privilege of church-membership, the faithful were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's supper, which was regarded as the highest and most complete of all

<sup>1</sup> De moralibus quotidianum sermonem habuimus, cum vel Patriarcharum gesta, vel proverbiorum legerentur præcepta: ut his informati atque instituti assuesceretis majorum ingredi vias eorumque iter carpere, ac divinis obedire mandatis, quo renovati per baptismum ejus vite usum teneretis, quæ ablutos deceret. Nunc de mysteriis dicere admonet atque ipsam sacramentorum rationem edere: quam ante baptismum si putassemus insinnandum nondum initiatis, prodidisse potius, quam edidisse, æstimaremur. ΑΜΒΡΟΣ., *De his qui mysteriis initiuntur*, c. 1.—Dimissis jam catechumenis, vos tantum ad audiendum retinimus:

quia, præter illa, quæ omnes Christianos convenit in commune servare, specialiter de cælestibus mysteriis locuturi sumus, quæ audire non possunt, nisi qui ea donante jam Domino perceperunt. Tanto igitur majore reverentia debetis audire quæ dicimus, quanto majora ista sunt, quæ solis baptizatis et fidelibus auditoribus committuntur, quam illa, quæ etiam catechumeni audire consueverunt. AUGUST. *Serm. 1. ad Neoph.*—Ἀσήμεως διὰ τοὺς ἀμνήτους περὶ τῶν θείων διαλεγόμεθα μυστηρίων τούτων δὲ χωριζόμενον, σαφῶς τοὺς μεμνημένους διδάσκομεν. THEODORET. *Quæst. 15 in Num.*



sacred rites, and was distinguished by the term *κοινωνία*, *communio*.

5. Closely connected with this privilege of communion, was the important right of taking part in all the public transactions of the church, especially in the election of ministers, and the exercise of discipline.

From the earliest times, the assembly of the faithful, or members in full communion, took part in the choice of the spiritual officers of the body. This appears both from the New Testament, and from the first ecclesiastical writers after the completion of the sacred canon. This practice, having led to various abuses, was afterwards modified or discontinued.

The exercise of discipline by the church was chiefly confined to the act of excommunication, and the readmission of penitents;—acts which, although administered by the bishops in the ancient churches, always required the concurrence of the people.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### OF PENITENTS.

THE *penitents* in the ancient church were such of the faithful, or lay members who had been admitted to full communion, as had been excluded from the church on account of some open offence or scandalous misconduct, and had afterwards voluntarily submitted to such punishment or discipline, as the church had thought proper to inflict, with a view to their readmission to the church, and a restoration to their former privileges.—(This subject is more particularly treated in book iv. chap. 4.)

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### OF ENERGUMENS.

FREQUENT mention is made in early ecclesiastical history of the *ἐνεργούμενοι*, or *δαιμονιζόμενοι*, i. e. *persons possessed with an evil*

*spirit, or disordered in mind:* and we find special regulations of the church with regard to these diseased members. They composed, in fact, a separate class of Christians; belonging sometimes to the catechumens and sometimes to the faithful; but so far distinguished from both, that they were placed under the special care and government of the exorcists; and, while they were permitted to unite with the other classes of Christians in some acts of worship, they were prohibited from joining in others.

Catechumens, who became disordered in mind during their term of probation, were not admitted to baptism until they had been cured, unless indeed at the approach of death. Those among the baptized who were afflicted in this way, were entirely excluded from the Christian assembly during the worst stages of their disease, being compelled to remain in the *exedra*, or even in the *area* of the church. (See book vi. chap. v. sect. 4.) From this last circumstance they were termed *χειμάζοντες*, or *χειμαζόμενοι*. When they had made some progress towards recovery, they were permitted to join in public worship; but they were not admitted to the sacrament of the Lord's supper until they were perfectly cured. An exception, however, was made in this case also at the approach of death.

The Energumens were usually reckoned in the same rank as penitents.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### OF ASCETICS.

THE name *Ἀσκηταὶ*, *Ascetics*, was often applied to some Christians by way of distinction from others. Such were all those who inured themselves to greater degrees of fasting and abstinence than other men; who spent a larger portion of time in the exercises of prayer and devotion; who gave up their whole estates for the service of God, or the use of the poor; who confined themselves to a single life; or who exercised themselves with extraordinary hardships and austerities, with a view to the supposed promotion of piety.

These persons and practices are not to be confounded with those of the monks and religious of later date. "Ascetics," says Bingham (*Antiquities*, book vii. chap. 1), "there were always in the church; but the monastic life was not known till toward the fourth century," when many persons chose to remain in solitude in Egypt, in which country they had found places of retreat from the Decian persecution. "The ancient ascetics," continues the same writer, "differed from the monks chiefly in these three things.

"1. The monks were men who retired from the business and conversation of the world; for they either lived in private cells singly by themselves; or, if in monasteries and societies, yet those were remote from cities in some far distant mountains, or a desert wilderness. But the first ascetics, as their name implies, were always men of active life, living in cities, as other men, and in nothing differing from them, save only in this, that they were more intent and zealous in attempting greater heights, and heroic acts, of Christian virtue.

"2. The monks, by their first institution, were to be no more than laymen; for, being confined to the wilderness, the clerical and monastic life were upon that account incompatible states; and for almost one whole age, they were scarce ever joined together. But the ancient ascetics were indifferently persons of any order of men, clergy as well as laity, because the clerical and ascetic life were then consistent with each other; the business of each being to converse with men, and exercise themselves in acts of piety and charity among them.

"3. The monks, at least such as lived in monasteries and societies, were always brought under certain private rules and laws of discipline. But the ancient ascetics had no laws, but those of the gospel and the church where they lived, to be governed by; their exercises were freely chosen, and as freely pursued, in what manner and to what degree they pleased, without any binding laws or rules of compulsion."

It is evident, however, that there are several particulars in which the habits and exercises of the ascetics may be regarded as an introduction of monasticism.

The name *ἀσκητής* is borrowed from profane writers; by

whom it was originally applied to the athletes, or men trained to the profession of gladiators. Eusebius and Epiphanius call the ascetics *σπουδαῖοι*, meaning *persons eminent for their sanctity*; and Clement of Alexandria entitles them *ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι*, i. e., *the elect of the elect*.

In later times we read of *ἀναχωρηταὶ*, anchorites, i. e., *solitaries*; *ἐρημίται*, hermits, i. e., *dwellers in deserts*; *κοenobitæ*, i. e., *persons who live in common*, in one place, or with a community of goods, and under a common discipline; and other titles, implying peculiar exercises, or acts of mortification, were given or assumed.

---

## BOOK III.

### OF THE MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### NAMES GIVEN TO THE MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH, BOTH ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY.

BEFORE we proceed to consider the several orders and offices of the ministers of the church, it may be useful to review the appellations by which this whole body of men were distinguished from the laity, or ordinary Christians.

1. The title *Clerus*, *Clerici* (whence our term *clergy*), was given to this body at a very early period. It is derived from a Greek word *κληρος*, signifying *a lot*. Some suppose that the ministers of the gospel were so called, because they were sometimes elected to their office by lot. But it is generally agreed that the term is derived from the more common application of the same word to all Christians, after the manner of the Jews, as being the lot or inheritance of the Lord. "God always had a peculiar people, whom he selected for himself out of the rest of mankind. Such were the patriarchs and the holy seed of old; such the Jews, chosen by him above all other nations in the world. This was his *κληρος*, his particular lot and portion, comprehending the body of the people in general. But afterwards this title was confined to narrower bounds, and became appropriate to that tribe which God had made choice of to stand before him, to wait at his altar, and to minister in the services of his worship. And after the expiration of their economy, it was accordingly used to denote the ministry of the gospel, the persons peculiarly consecrated and devoted to the service of God in the Christian Church."—(CAVE, *Primitive Christianity*, part i. chap. 8.)

The learned are for the most part agreed in this derivation of the word *clerus*, or *clergy*; although some eminent writers,

including Bingham and Dodwell (*Dissert. Cyprian.* i. c. 15), contend for the former. It is remarkable that this doubt concerning the origin of the title existed in early times, as appears from the writings of Jerome and Augustin<sup>1</sup>.

It has been maintained that this title was not appropriated to the ministers of the church until the beginning of the third century; but this is a question which, in the absence of sufficient information, cannot be accurately determined. Tertullian is indeed the first writer who points out a definite distinction between the clergy and laity, and mentions a strict division and gradation of ecclesiastical offices. A distinction, substantially the same, but less systematically defined, appears in a disputed passage of Clemens Romanus<sup>2</sup>; not to mention a passage in the writings of Ignatius, the genuineness of which has been reasonably doubted. Perhaps the term was appropriated during the second century.

2. Spiritual persons were also called *Κανονικοί*, *canonici*, or *οἱ τοῦ κανόνος*, *οἱ ἐν τῷ κανόνι*, *men of the canon*, because their names were entered in an official list or register of the church, called *κανὼν*, *ἄγιος κανὼν*, *register*, *sacred register*, or *κατάλογος ἱερατικὸς*, *list of the priesthood*; in Latin, *album*, *matricula*, *tabula clericorum*.

In later times this name was applied to those who were bound only by the general laws and statutes of the church, in opposition to monks, who were moreover bound by the particular rules of their order.

3. The terms *Ἐκκλησιαστικοί*, *Ecclesiastici*; *Οἱ τοῦ δόγματος*, *Dogmatici*, *Gnostici*, and the like, were applied at first to Christians in general, but were afterwards given more especially to the ministers of the church. During the middle ages the term *ecclesiastici* was almost restricted to the inferior orders of clergy.

4. *Οἱ τοῦ βήματος*, or *τάξις τοῦ βήματος*, was applied

<sup>1</sup> *Ministri Dei propterea vocantur Clerici, vel quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia ipse Dominus sors, id est, pars clericorum est, ΗΙΕΡΟΝ. Ep. ii. ad Nepot.—Quia Matthæus sorte electus est, quem primum per apostolos legimus*

*ordinatum. AUGUST. in Ps. 67.—Quo divino cultu ministeria religionis impendunt, clerici vocantur. COB. THEODOS. De Episc. 1, 2.*

<sup>2</sup> CLEM. ROM. *Ep. ad Corinth. c. 40, 41, 44.*

especially to the higher orders of clergy, who were entitled to sit in the part of the church called βῆμα or ἱερατεῖον, near the high altar and the bishop's seat (Θρόνος, *throne*).

5. The words τάξις ἱερατικῆ, Lat. *ordo*, Angl. *order*, occur in the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, and afterwards were in general use. Jerome, in several passages, refers to this word as synonymous with gradus (degree), officium (office), potestas (power), dignitas (dignity), and the like. In the Greek writers, besides the common word, τάξις, we find also βαθμὸς, χώρα, ἀξία, ἀξίωμα, in the same sense.

It cannot be exactly determined at what time a distinction was made between the ordines majores and minores, *higher and lower orders*; but it appears, from the Apostolical Constitutions, and the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, that a distinction of various ecclesiastical offices and functions was in existence as early as the end of the second, or the beginning of the third century (see EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43). "The whole κατάλογος ἱερατικὸς (as it is often called in the Apostolical Canons), i. e. *the roll of the clergy* of the ancient church (taking within it the compass of its first four hundred years), consisted of two sorts of persons;—the ἱερουμένοι, who were consecrated to the more proper and immediate acts of the worship of God, and the ὑπηρέται, such as were set apart only for the more mean and common services of the church."—CAVE, *Primitive Christianity*, part i. ch. 8.

It has been usual to distinguish the governors and teachers of the church into two classes, *ordinary and extraordinary*. This distinction appears to be well founded, by a reference to Eph. iv. 11, 12, compared with 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 7, 8; 1 Tim. iii. 5.

The ποιμένες and διδάσκαλοι, *pastors and teachers*, of whom we read there were certain ordinary ministers of particular congregations, as sufficiently appears from the expression, εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, *for the work of the ministry*; and hence it is the most probable, as well as the oldest, interpretation, that these terms indicate the same officers who are elsewhere called ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι, *bishops and presbyters* (e. g. in Acts xx. 28;

1 Pet. v. 2). At all events it is evident that the apostles make a distinction between the several governors and teachers of the Christian church; and that some of the offices to which they refer did not exist in the subsequent ages of the church.

The persons and offices of ordinary ministers of the church will be specially considered hereafter. It may be useful to make some remarks in this place respecting the offices which were peculiar to the apostolic age, namely, those of apostles, evangelists, and prophets.

1. Ἀπόστολοι, *Apostles*. The word ἀπόστολος signifies properly an ambassador or messenger; and the name was applied primarily to the twelve disciples whom our Lord selected as the first preachers of his gospel (Matt. x. 1—5; Luke vi. 13, 14); afterwards to Matthias, who was chosen in the place of Judas Iscariot (Acts i. 15, &c.); and subsequently to St. Paul, but with especial reference to his mission to the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13). The apostles of the circumcision were called *the Twelve*, their number containing a reference to that of the tribes of Israel; while St. Paul was peculiarly designated as *the apostle of the Gentiles*.

But this name was given also to other preachers of the gospel, who assisted the apostles properly so called, in establishing or confirming churches. Barnabas, the assistant of St. Paul, is so entitled, in Acts xiv. 4, 14. In 2 Cor. viii. 23, we read of ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, *apostles of the churches*. And Epaphroditus is termed ἑμῶν ἀπόστολος in Philipp. ii. 25. In Rom. xvi. 7, it is said that Andronicus and Junia (or probably Junias) were “of note among the apostles;” by which it does not seem necessary or even right to understand St. Paul as ranking them in the number of apostles, but merely as affirming that they were well known to the apostles as Christians of long standing, and highly esteemed on account of their personal character. The definite article in the original appears to point to this interpretation; the words are ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. But some interpreters suppose that Andronicus and Junia are here called apostles in the same sense as Barnabas, Acts xiv. 4, 14. In the Apostolical Constitutions, book vi. c. 7, Philip, who is



mentioned Acts viii. 26, is entitled *συναπόστολος*, a *fellow apostle*; because he co-operated with the apostles in the execution of their office.

It was the office of the apostles to plant churches by preaching the gospel from place to place, and afterwards to visit and superintend the churches which they had founded. We are "not to consider each or any of them as locally attached to some particular town. It is true that all of them planted several churches, and these churches continually looked upon some particular apostle as their first founder. There are cases in which the apostles are spoken of as the first bishops of these churches; but there is no evidence that they bore this title in their own life-time, nor could the founder of several churches be called, with propriety, the bishop of all of them, or of any one in particular.

"Their first care seems to have been to establish an elder, or elders, who were resident in the place; but they themselves travelled about from city to city, and from village to village; first, within the confines of Judea, and at no great distance from Jerusalem; but afterwards, in more extensive circuits, from one end of the empire to the other."—BURTON'S *History of the Christian Church*, chap. iii.

2. *Εὐαγγελιστής*, *Evangelist*, is a term employed in the New Testament in a much wider sense than that in which we now use it, signifying merely a writer of the history of the life and transactions of our Lord. See Eph. iv. 11; Acts xxi. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5. In the New Testament, the word is employed partly in the general sense of a teacher of Christianity, or a preacher of the Gospel, and partly in the more limited signification of a fellow-labourer with the apostles.

In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* b. iii. c. 37, we find an important passage respecting the office of Evangelists. "They extended the preaching of the Gospel, and spread the seed of the kingdom of heaven far and wide. The greater number of disciples at that time, whose souls were inflamed through the divine word with a zealous love of wisdom, in the first place fulfilled the commandment of the Saviour (see Matt. xix. 21), and distributed their goods among the poor. Then they travelled into distant parts,

and discharged the office of evangelists among those who had not yet heard anything of the word of faith. They were busily employed in preaching Christ, and in distributing the books of the holy Gospels. When they had laid the foundation of faith in unenlightened places, they appointed others as pastors (*ποιμένας*), to whom they intrusted the care of the new plantation (*γεωργίαν*); but they themselves went forward to other countries and people, being led by the grace and co-operation of God. The Holy Ghost wrought many miracles by their hands, by means of which they succeeded in bringing over large multitudes, at the first hearing, to the worship of the universal Creator.”

It appears, therefore, that the office of the evangelists was substantially the same as that of the apostles, whose companions and assistants they were. “There appear also,” says Dr. Burton, in a continuation of the passage quoted above, “in addition to the presbyters and deacons, who may be called resident ministers, to have been preachers of the Gospel, who were not attached to any particular church, but who travelled about from place to place, discharging their spiritual duties. These men were called, in a special manner, evangelists. One of them was Philip, who had first been a deacon of the church at Jerusalem; but, after his flight from that city, he seems to have resided principally in Cæsarea, and to have preached the Gospel wherever he found occasion, without discharging his former office of deacon in any particular church. Such labours must have been peculiarly useful in the infancy of the church; and we have the authority of Scripture for saying that a special distribution of spiritual gifts was made to the evangelists, which qualified them for their important work. Mark and Luke are perhaps to be considered evangelists in this sense, as well as in the more common one of having published written gospels. Both of them were preachers of the Gospel for many years before they committed the substance of their preaching to writing; and we may suppose that such men were of great assistance to the apostles, by accompanying them on their journeys, or by following up and continuing the work which had been so successfully begun.”

3. The term *Προφήτης*, *Prophet*, is frequently applied in the New Testament to certain extraordinary and inspired teachers of

the church. See Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xxi. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 29, 32, 37; Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5.

These persons are to be regarded in a twofold capacity.

First, As inspired men, endowed with the gift of prophecy, who foretold future events. See Luke i. 67, 69; ii. 25—27, 36, 37; Acts xxi. 9, 10, 11; xx. 4; xi. 28.

Secondly, as expounders of the holy Scriptures, and interpreters of the divine will. The words *προφητεία*, *prophecy*,—*προφητεύειν*, *to prophesy*,—and *προφήτης*, *a prophet*, appear to have been technically applied to the act and office of interpreting Scripture. The Greek words *ἐρμηνεύς* and *ἐρμηνευτής* do not occur at all in the New Testament; and *ἐρμηνεία*, *interpretation*,—*ἐρμηνεύειν*, *to interpret*, very seldom. And it is remarkable that, in the ecclesiastical phraseology, *hermeneutes* signifies not an *expounder*, but a *translator* of the Scriptures.

Some suppose that the name of prophets was given especially to those teachers who expounded the Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah; and they refer, in support of their opinion, to 1 Cor. xiii. 1; xiv. 29; 1 Thes. v. 20, 21; Acts ii. 16.

The gift of speaking with tongues was perhaps peculiar to the prophets, although we find the interpretation of tongues distinguished from the gift of prophecy.

The New Testament contains frequent warnings respecting *false prophets*. See Matt. vii. 7, 15; xxiv. 4, 5, 11, 24; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Acts xx. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 1 John iv. 1—3. Our Lord declares concerning them, that they would give themselves out falsely for the Messiah, and would deceive many by means of great signs and wonders. (Matt. xxiv. 5, 24.) And the apostle St. John gives the following criterion by which they might be distinguished, “Every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.” (1 John iv. 3.)

“There is reason to think that the gift of prophecy was by no means uncommon among the early Christians. It is well known to readers of the New Testament, that this gift of prophecy is often spoken of without reference to a knowledge of future events; and that it means the power which was possessed by many believers, of understanding and interpreting the Scriptures. This power, though it may be acquired to a considerable

extent by ordinary means, was imparted in a preternatural way to many of the first believers, who were known by the name of prophets; and since no gift could be of more essential service to the early church, when so many new converts were to be instructed in the faith, it is probable that the prophets, in this sense of the term, were much more numerous than those who were gifted to foretell future events. It is, however, certain that prophecy, in this latter sense, or prediction, was exercised occasionally by the Christians of the apostolic age. Agabus possessed such a power, and foretold the famine which was to happen in the reign of Claudius."—BURTON, *History of the Christian Church to the Conversion of Constantine*, chap. iii.

"The great scheme of Christianity had been successively unfolded in the New Testament; but the revelation was often couched in dark and enigmatical expressions. There were many of these sayings which even the apostles did not understand, till their minds were specially enlightened; and they were now able not only to see through these mysteries themselves, but by laying their hands on their converts, they could impart to them also the possession of this preternatural knowledge. This gift was called *prophecy*, the right interpretation of the ancient prophecies being the principal part of it; and the same Spirit who had wrapped the divine revelations in their designed obscurity, now furnished the means of removing the mysterious veil. See MOSHELM'S Dissertation, *De illis qui Prophetæ vocantur in Novo Fœdere*, Syn-tagm. Diss. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentium."—BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the First Three Centuries*, lect. 6.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### DIFFERENT ORDERS OR CLASSES OF THE CLERGY, OR ORDINARY MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH.

THE ποιμένες, *pastors*, and διδάσκαλοι, *doctors*, mentioned in Eph. iv. 11, and 1 Cor. xii. 28—30, are usually reckoned among the permanent and ordinary governors and teachers of Christian churches, although it cannot be denied that the term may have

been originally applied to the temporary and extraordinary ministers, regarded as preachers of the Gospel or as superintendents of the churches which they had planted. An apostle or evangelist might have been justly termed *ποιμὴν καὶ διδάσκαλος*; but after the extraordinary ministry had ceased, these terms, which were derived from the Old Testament, and rendered venerable by long use, were especially retained in use and applied to the permanent spiritual officers of the church. And these titles, *pastor* and *doctor*, have continued in use in all ages of the church.

The title *ποιμὴν*, pastor, was particularly recommended by the circumstance that our blessed Lord had compared himself to a shepherd, and his church to a flock; and that the apostle St. Peter had designated him as the chief shepherd.

The word *διδάσκαλος*, *doctor*, was applied by the Jews to their teachers as a title of respect. It is the word which is given in John i. 39 as the interpretation of Rabbi.

The proper or distinctive names of these spiritual pastors and teachers which occur in the New Testament are three in number, namely, *ἐπίσκοπος*, overseer, superintendent, bishop; *πρεσβύτερος*, *presbyter*, elder; *διάκονος*, deacon. The several offices which these different ministers filled will be particularly described hereafter. In this place it is sufficient to remark that these three classes made up the entire *ordo ecclesiasticus*, *ecclesiastical order*; whether we consider the use of the word *ordo* in this sense to be derived from the Roman jurisprudence, or borrowed from the phraseology of the Jewish temple or synagogue.

The synagogue appears to present the nearest resemblance, and to furnish the most suitable points of comparison. Accordingly—

1. The *ἐπίσκοποι* have been compared to the *rulers or presidents of the synagogue*, mentioned Matt. ix. 18; Mark v. 22, 35, 36, 38; Luke viii. 41, 49; xiii. 14; Acts xiii. 15; xviii. 8, 17. The rulers of the synagogue had the oversight at once of doctrine and of discipline. See CAMP. VITRINGA, *de Synagoga*. Vet. lib. ii. c. 11; RELAND *Antiq. Ebr.* i. 10.

2. The *πρεσβύτεροι* have been supposed to correspond to the Jewish *elders*, who were so called, with reference not so much to

their age, as to their dignity and authority. While the second temple stood, the members of the Sanhedrim were especially called *πρεσβύτεροι*; and hence, in the New Testament, we often find, in connexion, ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, *rulers and elders*, (Acts iv. 5, 8;) or ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι, *chief priests and elders*, (Matt. xxi. 23; xxvi. 47, 59; Acts iv. 23; xxiii. 14;) or ἀρχιερεῖς, καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, *chief priests, and scribes, and elders*, (Matt. xxvi. 41, 57; xxi. 23, &c.)

The following passages of the New Testament relate to the Christian presbyters and their connexion with the ἐπίσκοποι:—Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; xvi. 4; xx. 17; xxi. 18; 1 Tim. v. 17, 19; Tit. i. 5; James v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1.

But in all these places the *πρεσβύτεροι* of the Christian church do not answer so much to the elders of the Jews as to the *officers of the synagogue called* רבנים, a word which signifies *pastors or governors*.

3. The *διάκονος*, *deacon*, has been compared to the *chasan* of the synagogue. But this comparison relates rather to the functions of the deacon in the second, third, and fourth centuries, than to those which are attributed to him in the New Testament, where he is described as occupied chiefly in the care of the sick, and the distribution of alms. (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12; Rom. xvi. 1.) It was the business of the *chasan* in the synagogue to preserve order and decorum, to assist in the reading of the law, and to lead the singing.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### OF BISHOPS.

#### § 1.—THEIR NAMES AND TITLES.

THE Greek word ἐπίσκοπος, episcopus, has been always retained in the church, to denote the chief minister in sacred things. It was sometimes, but rarely, translated by Latin writers into inspector, superinspector, superintendens, or superattendens, *i. e.*

*overseer*, or *superintendent*. It is found in the English *bishop*, German *bischof*, French *évêque*. Augustin (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xix. c. 19, lib. i. c. 9) explains the word as equivalent to speculator, *overseer*, and *præpositus*, *president*, *superintendent*; and Jerome (*Epist. 8 ad Euzar.*) says, ἐπισκοποῦντες, *i. e.* *superintendentes*, unde et nomen episcopi tractum est; *superintendents*, whence the name *bishop*. Both Augustin and Jerome, however, always employ the original word.

In the New Testament, the terms ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι are used synonymously. In 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, we read of πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκοποῦντες, *i. e.* presbyters exercising the episcopal functions, where the former word appears to be a title of honour, and the latter a designation of their office. But of this more hereafter.

The following names and titles were also employed by the ancients with reference to the office of these spiritual presidents or bishops.

1. The scriptural appellations προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v. 12) and προεστῶτες (1 Tim. v. 17) were translated into Latin by Præpositi (whence our word *provost*), and were retained by the Greek fathers, with the addition of πνευματικοὶ, or πνευματικῶν χοροῦ, *spiritual*, by way of distinction from temporal titles. (See JUSTIN. MART. *Apologia*, 2; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. c. 3, 8; vii. c. 13; BASIL. M. *Hom. in Ps.* xxviii.; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 3, 9.)

In the same signification we find also Antistites sacrorum, or simply Antistites, and Præsules.

2. In nearly the same way the term πρόεδροι was employed (EUSEB. *Vit. Const. M.* lib. ii. c. 2; *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 2); which was translated by the Latin writers præsides and præsidentes, *presidents*. (TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 39; *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 72.) This name refers to the right of occupying the first seats in religious assemblies (προεδρία).

3. Ἐφοροὶ, inspectores, *inspectors*. This term was not often used, probably to avoid confusion with the names of civil officers so called.

4. According to Theodoret, *Comment.* in Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 1, bishops in the early church were often styled ἀπόστολοι, *apostles*, in order to distinguish them from presbyters, who were also called ἐπίσκοποι.

They were very commonly called *διάδοχοι τῶν ἀποστόλων*, *successors of the apostles*. (CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 55, 69, 42; AUGUSTIN in *Psalm XLV.* 16.)

5. According to Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23, and Jerome, in 1 Tim. iii., the bishops were often called *Angeli ecclesiæ*, *angels of the churches*, an appellation obviously founded upon the use of the term in the first three chapters of the Revelation.

Some commentators have supposed that the word *angels* in 1 Cor. xi. 10, signifies the bishops or presidents of the churches; but other interpretations of the word in that place have been given with, at least, equal probability. (See TERTULL. *De Virgin. Vel.* c. vii.; *De habitu Mul.* c. ii.)

6. The titles *Summi Sacerdotes*, and *Pontifices Maximi* were given when it had become the fashion to deduce the institution of the ecclesiastical hierarchy from the priests and services of the Jewish temple.

7. Bishops were called *patres*, *patres ecclesiæ*, *patres clericorum*, and *patres patrum*, *fathers*, *fathers of the church*, *fathers of the clergy*, and *fathers of the fathers*, according to the Oriental idiom by which every teacher or governor is respectfully entitled **אב**, *abba*, *father*.

Presbyters were called *patres laicorum*, and simply *patres*, *fathers of the laity*, *fathers*; whence the term *patres patrum*, as applied to their superiors.

Hence the name *Papa*, *pope*, which is a term of reverence and affection, corresponding to *ἀββᾶ*, *πάππας*, *ἀπφὺς*, *dear and honoured father*. It appears most probable that this title was first given to the Bishop of Alexandria, and that the first Bishop of Rome who assumed it in any public document was Siricius (A.D. 384). It was not, however, employed officially until the time of Leo the Great; and it was afterwards applied exclusively to the Bishop of Rome, according to an order of Gregory the Great. (BARON. *Annal.* a. 1076, n. 31.)

This ancient title was attributed to all bishops alike, until about the sixth century. Jerome, for example, in writing to Augustin, salutes him as *Domine vere sanete et beatissime papa* (*Ep.* 94); and he gives the same title to other bishops. The bishop of Constantinople was anciently called *urbis papa*; and the bishop



of Rome, in like manner, *urbis papa*, or *Romanæ urbis papa*, and simply *papa*. The title continued in general use through the fifth and sixth centuries, (see, for example, SIDONIUS, lib. vi. ep. 1—12; vii. ep. 1—11.) Soon afterwards, however, some writers began to appropriate the title, as has been said, to the Bishop of Rome.

8. In early times bishops were called Patriarchs, as being the superiors of the presbyters, who were called simply *patres*. Afterwards this title became equivalent to that of archbishop or metropolitan; and at length (between the fourth and sixth centuries) it was appropriated to the superior of metropolitans.

9. After a certain time, bishops were regarded as appointed by Christ himself, and as governing the church in his name; and hence it is not surprising that they were entitled, at a very early period, *representatives or vicars of Christ or of God*.

Cyprian says (*Ep.* 63, 55, 59), that everything which is done in the church, for its good, is done *vice Christi*, by bishops appointed by Christ. In the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, we often find the expression τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθε, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ, *submit yourselves to the bishop, as to the Lord*. But these writings, parts of which, at least, are supposed to be spurious, are of no authority. Basil the Great, however, says (*Constit. Mon.* c. 22), *He who presides is nothing less than one who sustains the person of the Saviour (one who occupies his place, ὁ τοῦ σωτῆρος ὑπέχων πρόσωπον)*. And this is in accordance with many expressions of Ambrose, Augustin, and other writers about that date.

This title, and some others, evince that the church, at a comparatively early period, forgot to act in the spirit of the Saviour's injunction *Call no man your father upon earth*, and of the admonition of an apostle, *Feed the flock of God, which is among you—neither as being lords over God's heritage*, 1 Pet. v. 2, 3.

It is but fair to remember that the Bishop of Rome is not chargeable with a modern innovation in the *assumption* of the favourite title *Vicar of Christ*, but in the exclusive *appropriation* of a title which was very anciently given to many or all bishops in common with himself.

10. Ἀρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν, *governors or rulers of the churches*, and simply *principes*, *princes*, are episcopal titles of frequent

occurrence in the writings of Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Paulinus, Jerome, and others. These terms are probably employed with reference to the Greek and Latin versions of Isa. lx. 17, δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, Dabo principes tuos in pace, et episcopus tuos in justitia. But these titles were employed strictly in a religious or ecclesiastical sense, and not at all with reference to civil dignity.

11. Princeps sacerdotum, and episcopus episcoporum, in the same sense as archiepiscopus, patriarcha, pontifex maximus, *i. e. high priest*, are found in the writings of Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustin, and others, and without any special reference to a particular see or bishop.

12. The usual surnames or epithets of the bishops were, μακάριοι or μακαριώτατοι, beati, beatissimi, *blessed, most blessed*; ἅγιοι or ἁγιώτατοι, sancti, sanctissimi, *holy, most holy*; Θεοφιλέστατοι, Deo carissimi, *dearly beloved by God*.

## § 2.—OFFICE AND DUTIES OF BISHOPS.

THE duties attached to the office of a bishop may be described, in general terms, as two-fold.

1. The celebration or conduct of divine worship in all its parts, by the bishop in his own person, or by others acting by virtue of a commission from him.

2. Church government and discipline; or the oversight of the whole church in his diocese, both laity and clergy, together with the management of the affairs of all congregations committed to his care.

### I. *Celebration of Divine Worship.*

IN the very infancy of the church, before any distinction between bishop and presbyter existed, we find that many offices in divine worship were discharged by deacons and ministers. According to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii.), the consecration of the eucharist was performed by the president (τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν), who is evidently the same as the ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop; while the distribution of the elements was made by the hands of deacons. (See also *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 12, 13.)

Other ministerial acts are likewise attributed to deacons and inferior officers. But it is carefully to be borne in mind, that in thus taking part in the celebration of public worship, these persons always acted under the immediate superintendance of the bishop or presbyter, or as commissioned by him; the bishop or presbyter being continually regarded as the representative of the whole.

This was particularly the case with regard to catechising and preaching. These duties were originally assigned especially to the bishop. It was a maxim of the early church, *Episcopi proprium munus docere populum*, *the peculiar office of the bishop is to teach the people* (AMMIOS. *De Offic. Sacr.* lib. i. c. 1); a duty which was recognised and discharged, for example, by Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyprian, Augustin, Leo the Great, and Gregory the Great.

These acts and offices, however, were not exclusively episcopal. But such, after a certain time, were the following:—

1. *The confirmation of baptized persons* (*confirmatio neophytorum*, or *catechumenorum*); by which the baptized were admitted as full members of the church. This obsignatio, signaculum, or sigillum fœderis baptismalis, *sealing of the baptismal covenant*, was always regarded as a privilege peculiar to the bishop.

2. *The ordination of ministers and ecclesiastical officers.*

3. *The restoration of penitents*, or the public and solemn reception into the church of excommunicated persons, after the completion of penance previously enjoined. This office was very rarely entrusted to a presbyter in the ancient church.

4. *Various acts of consecration and benediction.*

## II. *Church Government and Discipline.*

This included (after the formation of the hierarchy)—

1. *The oversight and arrangement of all matters pertaining to divine worship* (which, it is almost needless to say, is something different from the actual celebration of divine worship, before mentioned). The bishop appointed the liturgy, or the form or order of worship, either in accordance with general or special regulations of the church,—in compliance with precedent,—or at

his own discretion. And he took care that all things were done according to the established order. His authority in these matters was exerted especially on extraordinary occasions, such as processions, pilgrimages, fasts, &c., after such ceremonies and customs had been established.

2. *The oversight of all the members of the church throughout a diocese in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters;* especially with reference to ecclesiastical censures, excommunication, penances, marriage, and the like.

3. Especially, *all spiritual persons and ecclesiastical officers were subject to the superintendence and jurisdiction of the bishop,* both as to the discharge of their offices, and as to the conduct of their lives. It was an old maxim of the church, that the clergy stood in the same relation to their bishops as soldiers to their general; and history abounds with examples of strict discipline in this particular, and of heavy punishments inflicted by bishops upon disobedient or contumacious clergy. The clergy were punished, according to their offences, in various ways;—sometimes by suspension from their revenues; sometimes by suspension from their office (either in whole or in part); and sometimes by a total deposition or degradation, whereby they were reduced to the state of simple laymen. Crimes punishable with excommunication in a layman, were usually visited with suspension or degradation in a clergyman; but for gross offences, the clergy were sometimes excommunicated.

4. *The visitation of the clergy, churches, schools, and religious societies,* was especially included in this charge of superintendence. Several laws were passed by the ancient church binding the bishops to perform this duty of visitation in person; nor were they permitted, until after much resistance and delay, to employ rural bishops (chorepiscopi), exarchs, and periodontæ (visiting presbyters), in this service.

The council of Laodicea, in the middle of the fourth century, ordained that bishops should not be appointed in villages and rural districts, but periodontæ (*i. e.* visitors), who, however, should be bound to do nothing without the will and consent of the bishop. Also, that presbyters in like manner should do nothing without the will and consent of the bishop (c. 57).

5. *Presidency in all diocesan synods*, and the management of the business transacted in those synods. The custom of holding ecclesiastical councils or synods, appears to have originated, in the Greek church, at the latter end of the second century. After the middle of the third century, the number and importance of these conventions received a considerable increase. They tended greatly to augment the authority and influence of the bishops.

6. *The management and distribution of the property of the church*.—At first the deacons were the assistants of the bishop in conducting these temporal affairs, and in keeping accounts. But when business of this kind had greatly increased, and accounts had become extensive and complicated, this charge was committed to special œconomi, or *managers*, under the direction of the archdeacons, all acting in subordination to the bishop, and by his sanction.

It may be here remarked, that chapters of clergy, and collegiate foundations, were entirely unknown in the early ages of the church. They originated in the interval between the ninth and twelfth centuries.

### § 3.—INSIGNIA OR EMBLEMS OF THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE.

THE insignia, or emblems of office, peculiar to bishops, were the following:—

1. *A ring* (annulus), whereby was signified the intimate union, and, as it were, the marriage, of the bishop with his church; called accordingly annulus sponsalitiuus, or annulus pronubus; but sometimes also annulus palatii.

2. *The pastoral staff* (δικανίκιον, pedum). This varied a little in form; but it was usually bent, or crooked, at the top.

3. *The mitra, or infula*; which was sometimes called στέφανος, corona, *crown*, κίδαρις, diadema, and τιάρα, tiara.

4. *Gloves*, which the bishops always wore when they performed any sacred office.

5. *Sandals*.—No priest could celebrate the eucharist without these; but, after the seventh and eighth centuries we find them expressly mentioned as an episcopal badge, distinct from that of the priests.

6. *Caligæ*, or military boots, usually of a red or a violet colour.—(See DURANDI *Ration. Divin. Off.* lib. iii. c. 8.)

7. *Pallium*, the *Pall* (ὠμοφόριον, ἱερά στολή), or superhumerales, pectorales, *ephod*). This badge was so peculiar and distinctive, that its name was often used to denote the person or office of a bishop, especially in the disputes of the middle ages. It was worn at first by all bishops (see ISIDOR. HISPAL. *de Offic. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 4); but afterwards only by archbishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs.

According to GREGORY of Nazianzum, *Orat.* 47, this ἱερά στολή (THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 17), was the badge of the Roman emperor, as Pontifex Maximus; and Constantine the Great was the first who invested the bishop of Jerusalem with it. Tradition says that it was worn by St. Mark as bishop of Alexandria, and that it descended from him to his successors; and it has been supposed that Linus, bishop of Rome, was the first who assumed this mark of distinction. Some say that Constantine the Great gave it, in the first instance, to the Roman bishop Sylvester.

The form and substance of the pallium in the earliest times are not known. We learn from JOANNIS Diaconi (*Vit. Gregor. M.* lib. iv. c. 8), that in his time it was a cloth of white linen (byssus candente), without seam (nullis acubus perforata), hanging down over the shoulders. Afterwards it was made of wool. There is evidence that it was marked with crosses, of a purple colour, before the eighth century.

It is not quite certain in what respects the rationale (τὸ λόγιον) differed from the pallium. This ornament appears to have been only a peculiar form of the pallium, appropriated by the bishops of Rome to themselves from the time in which they began to assume the title of pontifices maximi, and the dignity of the high priests of the Old Testament. It was sometimes sent by the Roman pontiffs to other bishops, as a mark of distinction and favour.

8. *The cross*.—This was of two kinds; namely,—

i. A cross of wood or gold, worn on the breast, and hanging from the neck, called by the Greeks τὸ περίαιμμα, or τὸ ἐγκόλπτιον, by the Latins *crux collaria*. But some suppose that this

cross was worn by private Christians, princes, and others; and so was no peculiar badge of the bishop.

ii. Another carried by bishops in their hand during processions or other solemnities; hence called *crux gestatoria*. For a considerable time the Roman bishops claimed, as their exclusive privilege, the “*jus cruce ante se gestandi*,”—*right of carrying a cross before them*. In the twelfth century this right was conceded to all metropolitans and patriarchs; and from the time of Gregory IX. it has been granted to all archbishops.

The patriarchs of the Eastern church rarely employed this badge of distinction. They preferred the use of the *λαμπαδοῦ-χον*, a lighted candelabrum, which was carried before them.

#### § 4.—DIFFERENT ORDERS OR CLASSES OF BISHOPS.

THE whole number of bishops in the early churches may be divided into two classes or orders,—superior and inferior.

I. To the superior bishops may be referred,—

1. *Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, *archbishop*. This title was given in the fourth and fifth centuries to the bishops of the chief cities, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople; which bishops presided amongst the other metropolitans and bishops in the districts, or divisions of the empire, attached to those places. The title occurs, perhaps, for the first time in *ATHANAS. Apol. 2. c. Ar.*, where it is applied to the bishop of Alexandria. It was officially given by the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 430, and the Council of Chalcedon. It afterwards yielded to the more favourite title of patriarch.

2. *Πατριάρχης*, *patriarch*. The patriarchate of the ancient church has been the subject of much political and learned controversy. It may be sufficient in this place to make the following remarks concerning it:—

i. The official title *πατριάρχαι*, occurs for the first time in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 431, and in *SOCRATES, Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 8*, where it is used as synonymous with *ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας*. There is no doubt that this title was derived from the Jews, by whom it was commonly used for some time after the destruction of Jerusalem.

ii. The title was given especially to the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

iii. The common rights and privileges of these patriarchs, as stated by BINGHAM, book ii. chap. 17, were the following:—1. To ordain all the metropolitans of the diocese, and to receive their own ordination from a diocesan synod. 2. To convene diocesan synods, and to preside in them. 3. To receive appeals from metropolitan and provincial synods. 4. To act as censors over metropolitans, and also their suffragans, when metropolitans were remiss in the exercise of their authority. 5. To employ metropolitans as their commissioners or delegates. 6. To be consulted by their metropolitans in matters of any great moment. 7. To communicate to their metropolitans such imperial laws as concerned the church. 8. Great criminals were reserved for the patriarch's absolution. 9. They were absolute, or independent one of another.

3. *Μητροπολίτης*, *metropolitan*, or *Πρῶτος*, *primus*, *primate*. This bishop presided over others in a province or district, included in the larger district subject to the patriarch. “‘The settlement of metropolitans,’ says Dr. Cave, ‘commenced not long after the apostolic age, when sects and schisms began to break in apace; and, controversies multiplying between particular bishops, it was found necessary to pitch upon one in every province, to whom the umpirage of cases might be referred, and by whom all common and public affairs might be directed.’ Perhaps it took its rise from that common respect and deference which was usually paid by the rest of the bishops to the bishop of the civil metropolis in every province; which, advancing into a custom, was afterwards made into a canon by the Council of Nice.”—BINGHAM, book ii. chap. 16, § 2.

The authority of metropolitan or primate existed long before that council, by which it was confirmed; and there are traces of it as early as the second century.

In early times, the terms *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, *κεφαλὴ*, *head*, or *ἐξάρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας*, *exarch of the province*, were employed in an equivalent sense.

*Ἐξάρχοι*, in the Eastern church, were usually bishops of the same order as the primates or metropolitans.



4. Ἀκέφαλοι, or αὐτοκέφαλοι, *independent bishops*. This title was applied to all those bishops who were not subject to the authority of a superior; whether they were metropolitans independent of any patriarchal power, or bishops independent of metropolitans and patriarchs. Also, bishops who were subject, not to the metropolitan, but immediately to the patriarch, were distinguished by this appellation.

5. The titles of *cardinal*, and that of *pope* in its exclusive sense, are peculiar to the Church of Rome, and are comparatively of modern date. The institution of cardinals was a work of the eleventh century. An account of the appropriation of the title of pope has been given above.

II. Among the inferior bishops are reckoned:—

1. Ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες, or *quiescent*, i. e., bishops who were only *elect*, or who, after institution, resigned their office, or, from some cause or other, did not engage in the discharge of its duties.

2. *Titular bishops*, who were advanced to the episcopal rank, but without being appointed to any particular diocese.

3. *Suffragans*. These were originally such diocesan bishops as were appointed to act as assistants to their metropolitans, or as their substitutes. They were called suffragans, either because “*sine metropolitani suffragio consecrari non poterant*,” i. e., *they could not be consecrated without the suffrage of the metropolitan*; or, which seems more probable, because they possessed the *jus suffragii*, i. e., *the right of suffrage*, in the synods. Some say that suffraganeus is equivalent to adjutor, coadjutor, i. e., *assistant*.

It has been satisfactorily shown, that the suffragan bishops were not the same as the chorepiscopi; but it cannot be denied that the need of suffragans, and their numbers, greatly increased after the discontinuance of the chorepiscopi. We do not find that any other bishops than those who exercised metropolitan authority had their suffragans before the tenth century.

The suffragans were entitled also vice-episcopi, vices gerentes in pontificalibus, and vicarii generales; *vice-bishops*, *vicars general*.

4. In ancient ecclesiastical history frequent mention is made

of *Χωρεπίσκοποι*, chorepiscopi, episcopi rurales, or villani, i. e., *rural bishops*. Their office has been discontinued; but it is, to say the least, an interesting subject of antiquarian research.

Their origin may be traced to the earliest period of ecclesiastical history immediately succeeding the age of the apostles<sup>1</sup>. They were not merely superior to presbyters, but were really bishops, and entitled to discharge episcopal functions. They acted, however, in a subordinate capacity, and possessed limited powers; being subject to a city-bishop, and acting as his colleagues and vicars; holding a different rank, but possessing a similar office.

By the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, they were authorized:—

- i. To give letters of peace, and testimonials.
- ii. To superintend the affairs of the church in their district.
- iii. To appoint ecclesiastical officers, readers, subdeacons, and exorcists.
- iv. And to ordain presbyters and deacons, *but not without the permission and co-operation of the superior or city-bishop*.

The chorepiscopi possessed also the privilege of attending councils in their own right, and not merely as representatives or substitutes of the bishops (in which capacity deacons were for the most part employed). See ATHANAS. *Apolog.* 2. The canons of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, were subscribed by nine chorepiscopi, attached to dioceses of which the bishops also were present. The first mention made of them as representatives of bishops, is at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

We do not find any traces of these bishops in the Western church before the fifth century; although they had long existed in the East. They were common in Africa.

About the ninth century many complaints were made against these bishops in the Western churches, and especially in that of Gaul. It was said that they encroached too much upon the authority of the superior bishops, and introduced hereby many

<sup>1</sup> Κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρίσ-  
σοντες (ἀπόστολοι), καθίστανον τὰς  
ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύ-  
ματι, εἰς ἐπίσκοπος καὶ διακόνους τῶν  
μελλόντων πιστεύειν. CLEM. ROM.  
(?) Ep. ad Corinth. c. 42.—Ὅτι καὶ

τοὺς θωπέοντας αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπος τῶν  
ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων, καὶ πρεσ-  
βυτέρους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ὁμίλαις  
καθήσει διαλέγεσθαι. EUSEB. Hist.  
Eccl. lib. vii. c. 30.

disorders. The same complaint had been made as early as the middle of the fourth century in the East; and by a canon of the Council of Laodicea, quoted above, an attempt was made to do away with their office, by substituting visiting presbyters in their room. But this canon was very partially and imperfectly obeyed; and the office of chorepiscopus continued in the East until the tenth century. The first order for their abolition, in the West, was passed by the Council of Ratisbon, A.D. 800. But it appears that they exercised their functions in France as late as the twelfth century, and in Ireland even in the thirteenth. From that period, however, their name is lost in history; and their place was, to a certain extent, supplied by archdeacons, rural deans, and vicars-general.

5. We read of *Intercessores*, or *Interventores*, in the ancient African church. These were persons who discharged the episcopal functions of a diocese, during a vacancy of the see. The duration of their authority was limited to a year.

---

To this general description of the different orders or classes of bishops, I subjoin a more particular account of metropolitans and patriarchs, which is due to the pre-eminent dignity and importance of those offices. And here the subordinate rank may be more conveniently considered in the first place.

### I. *Of Metropolitans.*

1. *Of the Name or Title.*—Bishops or archbishops, who had their seat in the chief city (*μητρόπολις*) of a Roman province, were called, from that circumstance, *metropolitans*. This title does not occur in any writings of the second and third centuries; during which time such bishops were called by the Latins *episcopi sedis apostolicæ*, (if their churches had been, or were said to have been, founded by an apostle, as was the case, e. g., with the churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Corinth,) or *episcopi primæ sedis*, or *primæ cathedræ*,—and by the Greeks, *πρώτοι*, or *προκριταὶ τῶν λοιπῶν* sc. *ἐπισκόπων*. But, inasmuch as this title was publicly adopted at the Council

of Nice, in the year 325, it may be supposed to have come into use even before the end of the preceding century. The growing power of the episcopal order continued to add dignity to its titles. In the sixth canon of the Council of Sardica, which was held in the year 344, we find metropolitans distinguished by the title, *princeps provinciæ*, ἔξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας; and elsewhere they are entitled *monarchæ*. But as these titles pointed too plainly to the possession of temporal dignity and power, the use of them was forbidden by the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397.

In Africa, the leading archbishops were usually styled *primates*; but we meet with the term metropolitans in the acts of several councils held in that country. Here, also, the same bishops were frequently called *senes* (elders), because their dignity was attached rather to the priority of their standing, than to their residence in a chief city. The senior bishop of a province was, for the most part, the chief or metropolitan; indeed this rule obtained universally in Africa and Spain; except in the case of Carthage, the possession of which see conferred metropolitan rank upon its bishop, independently of any other consideration.—*Conc. Milv.* i. c. 13; *Bracar.* i. c. 24; *Tolet.* iv. c. 4.

Sometimes the term primate or metropolitan was applied merely as a title of respect. Thus, in Africa, it was given to several of the older bishops, besides the senior to whom it properly belonged. Also, whenever the emperor raised a provincial town to the rank of a metropolis, without bestowing upon it all the privileges of the chief city, the title of metropolitan was accorded to the bishop of the place. Thus the Emperor Marcian honoured Chalcedon with the title of metropolis, without infringing upon the privileges of Nicomedia, which retained its ancient rank as the chief city of the province. And in this way it happened that various provinces possessed several bishops who were metropolitans in title, but only one who possessed the corresponding authority. Thus, also, the bishops of other celebrated cities were honoured with this title; as in the case of the bishop of Jerusalem, while the metropolis of Palestine was Cæsarea.—*HIERON. Ep. ad Pammach.*; *VALES. not. in EUSER. Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23.

The term *apostolici* continued to be applied especially to

metropolitans, even down to the time of Alcuin; and their sees accordingly were entitled *sedes apostolicæ*.—ALCUIN. *De Divin. Officio*, c. 36.

2. *Origin of the Metropolitan Office*.—It is easy to account for the origin of the metropolitan rank among the bishops, when we consider that the larger sees possessed, for the most part, a priority of foundation, as well as a larger degree of influence. They were, in fact, not only the largest communities, but in many cases the parent churches of the whole Christian neighbourhood. It is needless, therefore, as well as fruitless, to attempt, with Baroni- us, Usher, and others, to refer the establishment of metropolitan precedence to the age and practice of the apostles. Some traces of it are found as early as the second century. During the third century, certain rights and privileges were gradually, and no doubt voluntarily, conceded to the bishops of the chief cities, their possession of which was recognised by the first Council of Nice; by which council, not only the title was established, but the duties and privileges of the office were defined.

3. *Metropolitans in the East and West*.—The office and title of metropolitans was established at an earlier period, and more completely, in the churches of the East than in those of the West. It appears from the provincial councils which were held at the close of the second century concerning the Paschal controversy, and from the synodal letters composed on those occasions, (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 23, 24.) that metropolitans existed (although not under that title) at Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea in Palestine, together with Jerusalem, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Corinth, and Carthage. And we may infer, from the decrees of councils held at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, that at that time almost every province had its metropolitan.—*Conc. Illiber.* A.D. 305, c. 28; *Conc. Nic.* A.D. 325, c. 4.

After the time of Constantine, the ecclesiastical districts of the East corresponded, for the most part, to the political divisions, or provinces, of the empire; and hence we may conclude, that there were then as many metropolitan sees as chief cities of the several provinces. But in this respect, as well as in others

Egypt forms a marked exception; for although that country was politically divided into three parts, namely, Egypt Proper, Libya, and Pentapolis, it formed no more than one ecclesiastical district, under the metropolitan of Alexandria. Other Egyptian metropolitans were such only in point of title.

In the western portions of the empire, where Christianity was of comparatively later introduction than in the East, the metropolitan system was also of later and more imperfect formation. It does not appear to have arisen at all in these parts (except in Spain and Africa) before the fourth century; a circumstance which may, perhaps, be referred to the preponderating influence of the Romish bishops, the more democratic spirit of the people, and the violence of political commotions. A slight comparison of the number of metropolitan sees with that of the provinces of the empire in this part of the world may suffice to illustrate this remark. For example;—when Sextus Rufus Festus wrote his *Breviarum*, which he dedicated to Valens (about A.D. 370), Gaul consisted of fourteen provinces; and not long afterwards, under Gratian, it reckoned seventeen: but yet the Council of Valentia, which was held in the year 375, and that of Tours, in 401, addressed their Synodal Epistles to the bishops of Gaul and the *five* provinces,—thereby designating the whole Gallican church at that period. The same was the case with Italy; where we find metropolitans only at Rome, Milan, Aquileia, and (subsequently) Ravenna.

4. *Privileges and Office of Metropolitans.*—The rights and privileges of metropolitans were not exactly the same in all places. But we may obtain a tolerably correct general view of them by considering, in order, the decrees and canons in which they are defined.

In the *Apostolical Canons* (c. 35), it is ordered that the bishops of every province should respect the first among them as their head, and undertake nothing of importance without his concurrence, except what may immediately belong to the special government of their own dioceses.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (4 and 8), precedence is accorded to the primate in the election of bishops.

The Council of Elvira, A.D. 305, c. 58, indicates the presence of a metropolitan, whose duty it was to examine the literæ formæ and their bearers.

The Council of Nicea, A.D. 325, c. 4, 6, confirms the existing rights of metropolitans, especially respecting the election of bishops.

The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, c. 9, confirms and explains former decrees on this subject.

The Council of Sardica, A.D. 344, c. 6, ordains that the bishops of the neighbouring province shall be summoned to the election of a metropolitan. The ninth canon commands all bishops who may be desirous of carrying any point at the imperial court, to transmit the substance of their requests to their metropolitan.

The Councils of Turin, A.D. 401,—of Ephesus, A.D. 431,—and of Chalcedon, A.D. 451,—speak of the ordination of bishops by metropolitans.

From all these sources we may form the following estimate of the rank, rights, and privileges of a metropolitan.

i. As bishop of the chief city, he had precedence of all other bishops of his province, a decisive voice in the matter of their election, and the power of confirming and ordaining them, which was the original foundation of episcopal subordination.

ii. He summoned provincial councils, presided in them, and drew up their decrees.

These were the earliest distinctive rights of metropolitans, from which others were derived in course of time.

iii. The metropolitan had the oversight of the provincial bishops; and the ecclesiastical superintendence of the whole province, saving only the diocesan rights of the respective bishops.

iv. He possessed also the privilege of determining all causes of especial importance (causæ majores) in a provincial council; but in concurrence with the other bishops of the province.

v. In extreme cases appeal was made to the metropolitan, who had the power of controlling a provincial bishop in such matters, without the assistance of other bishops.

vi. He had the right, in conjunction with the bishops, to grant a clergyman permission to undertake a journey to the

imperial court ; or, by his own authority, to commission a deacon to transact his business there.

vii. It was his privilege to give and receive letters of communion ; and to publish and carry into effect laws, enacted either by councils or the emperor, relating to the church.

viii. The metropolitan of Alexandria possessed the peculiar privilege of fixing the time for the celebration of Easter every year (LEO. *Ep.* 72, *ad Marc. Imperat.*) ; a privilege which was perhaps accorded to him on the supposition that the bishop of a city so celebrated for its cultivation of the science of astronomy possessed peculiar facilities for determining the season with exactness. But this privilege was afterwards granted to other metropolitans ; e. g., to Ambrose, bishop of Milan.

It may be thought, perhaps, that the establishment of the metropolitan rights and presidency must have tended to diminish the dignity and influence of the provincial bishops. But the effect was, in fact, directly the reverse. After the establishment of this order in the hierarchy, all causes relating to the bishops were withdrawn from the cognizance of the churches at large, and even from that of the clergy, and were referred, as *causæ majores*, to the higher tribunal of the metropolitan and the provincial synod. And thus the submission of bishops to their superiors involved their independence, and the increase of their power, with regard to the inferior clergy and the laity.

5. *Election and Ordination of Metropolitans.*—The bishops of a province elected and ordained their metropolitan, without the concurrence of the metropolitan of another province. We learn from Augustin (*Brevic. Collat. tert. die, c. 16*), that this custom prevailed in Italy as well as in Africa ; and in fact we find, in the early history of the church, no trace of any foreign ordination being required for a metropolitan, such as was afterwards prescribed under the papal system.

## II. *Of Patriarchs.*

1. *Of the Name or Title.*—The title of patriarch is undoubtedly borrowed from the Jews ; but it does not appear to have been in use among Christians in the earliest ages of the church. Salma-



sius indeed (*De Primatu*, c. 4) supposes, that the bishop of Alexandria was entitled patriarch as early as the reign of Hadrian; but, upon an attentive examination of the passages to which he refers in support of this opinion, we discover that they relate to the Jewish patriarch, who sometimes resided at Alexandria. After the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the office of the Jewish high priest ceased; and his place was partially supplied by superintendents or presidents at Babylon, Alexandria, and perhaps other considerable cities in the East, who bore the title of patriarchs, and exercised their functions under the sanction of imperial authority. But, during the first half of the fifth century, this office and title ceased to exist among the Jews, and was assumed by the Montanists, who transferred the title of patriarch to the chiefs of their clergy. (HIERON. *Ep.* 54.) Not long after, this title was adopted also by the orthodox. Gregory of Nazianzum applies it to the bishops who suffered persecution under Constantius; and in his funeral oration for his father, he calls him patriarch, although he was only the bishop of so inconsiderable a place as Nazianzum. (*Conf.* SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 8.) Subsequently, this title was officially applied and restricted to certain leading archbishops. The term was thus adopted first by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. We learn from Socrates, who wrote his *Church History* about the year 440, that this strict and limited sense of the title was established in the course of seventy years; namely, between the date of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, and that of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

2. *Origin of the Patriarchal Office.*—Baronius, and other writers of his church, have sought the institution of the patriarchal office in the age of the apostles. It is perhaps needless to say, that they founded their supposition upon unwarranted conjecture, or forged documents; and that their opinion is entirely unsupported by any historical proof. Among those writers who attend more closely to the facts of history, or the intimations of ancient records, some place the institution of patriarchs a little earlier than the date of the first Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325, and others immediately after that era. We cannot err widely from the truth, if we suppose that, in point of fact, the office of

patriarch was known before that date, but that it was not formally and legally established until some time between the assembling of that council and the date of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. Allusions to patriarchs and their office occur more frequently in the acts of councils held during that interval, than in those of any other period of the church.

The following considerations may assist us in accounting for the rise and establishment of the patriarchal dignity in the Christian church, independently of arguments which may be drawn from the general spirit of the times.

First. All those bishops who were eventually denominated patriarchs enjoyed from very early times considerable distinction among neighbouring metropolitans, arising partly from the celebrity and importance of their places of residence, and partly from the extent of the districts subject to their jurisdiction. Take, for example, the three bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. As early as at the end of the third century, the first of these was recognised as metropolitan by the bishops of the ten provinces, called *suburbicariæ*; the second, by the six provinces into which Egypt was divided; and the third, by the fifteen provinces which composed the Oriental diocese or district (*Oriens*). Accordingly, the Council of Nicæa regarded these as the greater metropolitans; and it appears from the celebrated sixth canon of that council, that these three bishops enjoyed a kind of precedence, or superior dignity. The Council of Arles (A. D. 314), had already distinguished them by the title of *maiores diœcesium episcopi*; and they had been entitled *Exarchi* and *Archiepiscopi*.

Secondly, The efforts of the church to conform its institutions to those of the civil government doubtless contributed to the formation of the patriarchate. Constantine the Great divided the whole Roman empire into four great districts, each subject to its own *pæfectus prætorio*, and including a certain number of smaller provinces. This arrangement naturally affected the position and influence of the bishops of those cities which were distinguished as the residence of these *pæfecti prætorio*. This circumstance however, singly considered, would not account for the origin of the patriarchal office. But.

Thirdly, the studious exaltation of the dignity of the bishop of Constantinople may have contributed, directly and materially, to this result. The Byzantine emperors, in endeavouring to raise their residence to the rank of the chief city of the world, naturally sought to obtain for the bishop of that city a presidence over all others. This remark applies particularly to the Emperor Justinian. (*Cod. JUST.* l. i. tit. 2, c. 24.) It was therefore natural that the other great metropolitans, who had hitherto occupied at least the same rank as the bishop of Constantinople, should seek for an extension of their own dignity and influence, no less than commensurate with that which the latter had begun to possess. The jealousy which afterwards prevailed between the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople is well known.

3. *Privileges and Office of Patriarchs.*—Patriarchs were the superiors of their metropolitans, as the latter were of their subordinate bishops. The rights and privileges of patriarchs varied a little, according to difference of time and place; but they may be described in general as consisting in the following particulars:—

i. Patriarchs ordained all metropolitans subject to their jurisdiction. They received their own ordination from a diocesan council. (*Conc. Chalced.* c. 28; *JUST. Novell.* 131, c. 3.)

ii. They had power to summon all their metropolitans and provincial bishops to a diocesan council. (*THEODORET, Ep.* 81.)

iii. They received appeals from the decisions of metropolitans and provincial councils, with power to reverse such decisions. (*Conc. Chalced.* c. 17; *Cod. JUST.* l. i. tit. 4, c. 29.)

iv. They could institute inquiry into the lives and administration of their metropolitans, with power to inflict punishment upon any who might be found guilty of heresy or malversation in their office. They could also exercise authority in like manner with regard to provincial bishops, in case of neglect on the part of the metropolitan. (*JUST. Novell.* 37, c. 5.) An instance of this exercise of patriarchal authority is recorded by Sozomen, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (lib. viii. c. 6).

v. Metropolitans were expected to consult their patriarchs on matters of peculiar importance or difficulty. (*Conc. Chalced.* c. 30.) Patriarchs could also employ their metropolitans in the

capacity of legates or commissioners. (SYNES. *Ep.* 67.) Such was the case at least in Egypt, if not elsewhere.

vi. Patriarchs promulgated laws, ecclesiastical and civil, so far as the latter concerned the clergy. (JUSTIN. *Norell.* 6. *Epilog.*)

4. *Division of the Patriarchate—Seats of Patriarchs.*—At an early period, rights, nearly corresponding to those of a patriarch, were exercised by the bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia over the bishops of Pontus and the neighbouring countries; by the bishop of Ephesus over the bishops of Asia Minor; by the bishop of Thessalonica in Greece; by the bishop of Lyons in Gaul; and by the bishop of Toledo in Spain. But these bishops were afterwards made to occupy an inferior position, in consequence of the growing claims and power of the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. Afterwards, four patriarchs, (and at length five,) gradually rose to eminence.—Among these, the first place was conceded to the bishop of Rome. Next to him may be reckoned the patriarch of Alexandria, to whom no less than ten metropolitans were subject in the fourth century. The third in order was the patriarch of Antioch, whose church was the first established in the Gentile world, and who presided in a city which was reckoned as the third in the Roman empire, being inferior only to Rome and Alexandria. The patriarch of Constantinople was at first the fourth in rank; but during the fifth century he was reckoned as second, next to the patriarch of Rome; and he possessed the most extensive jurisdiction in the Oriental church. The sixth canon of the Nicene Council reckons him among the metropolitans;—by the second and fourth general councils he was placed upon an equality with the bishop of Rome. He was distinguished by the title of Patriarcha Œcumenicus, or Caput totius ecclesie, (*Conf. Cod.* JUSTIN. l. i. tit. ii. c. 24;) a distinction, however, which was soon claimed by the bishop of Rome, and by other independent metropolitans of Oriental churches. The fifth place was assigned to the patriarch of Jerusalem. In his case the name of patriarch was at first no more than a title, the metropolitan of Cæsarea and the patriarch of Antioch possessing jurisdiction over the church of Jerusalem. The bishop of Jerusalem, however, became independent of his metropolitan, probably in the course of the fourth century.

Theodosius II. ordained that the bishop of the ancient capital of Judea should be supreme in the churches of Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia; thus severing no less than six provinces from the patriarchate of Antioch; and by the general Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 450, it was decreed that the bishop of Jerusalem should retain this independent authority over the three provinces of Palestine, but that the other provinces should be restored to the bishop of Antioch.

It should be remarked, that some metropolitans continued to be independent of patriarchs; as some bishops also were exempt from the jurisdiction of metropolitans. These were called *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, *independent*. Thus the independence of the bishop of Constantia in Cyprus was confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, in opposition to the claims of the patriarch of Antioch.

#### § 5.—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS.

GREAT controversy has arisen respecting the original equality or difference of bishops and presbyters in the Christian church, and various interpretations have been put upon the testimonies of antiquity which relate to this point. In a work like the present, it would be utterly impossible to state all the arguments that have been advanced in connexion with this much-agitated question, or even to quote all the passages of early ecclesiastical writers to which appeal has been made. It would also be a departure from the general tone and substance of this Manual, to treat the matter controversially. And I believe that I shall best discharge the duty which devolves upon me in this portion of the work, by exhibiting the general or leading questions which have been raised, and then representing the grounds of the different opinions on the subject, according to the sense of their respective advocates, and, when opportunity may occur, in their own words.

It does not really admit of a question whether or not the difference between the order of bishop and that of presbyter existed in the course of the second century. Many authorities quoted in the course of this chapter concur to establish the fact that such a distinction did exist before the close of that period; and the affirmative must here be taken for granted. But, this early

introduction of the episcopate as a distinct order from that of presbyter being admitted, some persons contend that the institution is the result of merely an ecclesiastical arrangement made after the death of the apostles, and without any higher sanction than a sense of the necessity or expediency of the measure; while others maintain that the introduction of episcopacy is coeval with the apostles themselves; that it was, in fact, of apostolic origin; and that it is to be regarded as a divine appointment, of perpetual obligation, for the preservation of a distinct authority, and the conveyance of a peculiar grace. In short, some maintain that the difference between the two orders of bishop and presbyter is of merely human origin, while others contend that it is the effect of divine, or apostolic, institution. Of those who maintain that the difference between bishop and presbyter was established by the apostles, some suppose that it was only a difference in point of authority, jurisdiction, or discipline; while others regard it as a distinction of order in the full sense of the expression. But the general question, to be here answered in two different ways, is the following:—Was the difference between bishops and presbyters, such as confessedly obtained in the church during the second and third centuries, the effect of mere ecclesiastical institution, or of divine (apostolic) appointment?

I. *Episcopacy supposed to be of merely human, or ecclesiastical, origin.*

Bishops and presbyters were not at first distinct orders, but the bishop was only the chief in a body of presbyters. And the same titles of distinction were applied to both; namely, *προεστῶτες, προστάται, προέδροι, præpositi, antistites*, i. e., in one word, *presidents*. When the first place was assigned to the bishops, they were only *primi inter pares*,—*chief among equals*.

It is, however, correct to say, that the order (i. e., degree, office) of bishop is different from that of presbyter; if we mean by this only that a bishop is a presbyter invested by the church with superior rank and authority, and intrusted with the discharge of duties appropriated, by the same authority, to the

episcopal office. The original commission divinely given to all presbyters, whether bishops or others, is alike; but from a very early period of the church, probably ever since the beginning of the second century, the church has judged it right and expedient to adopt a regular and permanent system of superintendency and subordination among her ministers, corresponding, in some respects, to the state of things in Crete when Titus resided in that island, possessed of a delegated authority over the other elders of the church, or in Ephesus when Timothy was charged with a similar (temporary) superintendence. There is not any reason to doubt that such a system of investing certain presbyters with authority over others, and even of appropriating to them certain ministerial acts, for the honour of their office, and for the good of the whole church, is strictly lawful;—that St. Paul, at least, recognised and sanctioned the principle of subordination on which the episcopal form of government is founded;—that it is according to the mind of the inspired apostle that such subordination should continue as long as it may be needful or expedient in any church, as appears from his instructing Titus not to leave Crete until Artemas or Tychicus should have arrived, (probably, to take his place;)—and that, accordingly, the Church of England is fully entitled to regard her bishops as holding their office by divine permission. Nor can it be disputed, as a matter of history, that such an office has existed in the church from the second (or, at latest, the third) century, down to our own days. At the same time, it does not appear that this office was positively instituted or established, as permanent or necessary, by our Saviour or his apostles, and that it is therefore held by *divine right*; or that the order of bishops is distinct from that of presbyters, as founded upon a different commission. All presbyters, as left in the churches by the apostles, were equal; but soon after the apostles' times, precedence and authority were granted to certain presbyters in the several churches, as an expedient for good order and the best management of ecclesiastical affairs, in imitation of at least a partial practice of the apostles themselves, and in order to supply their place.

Jerome, one of the most learned of the Latin fathers, who had before him all the testimonies and arguments of earlier

writers, has placed this matter in its true light with peculiar distinctness<sup>2</sup>. In his annotation on the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus, he gives the following account of the nature and origin of the episcopal office:—"A presbyter is the same as bishop. And until, by the instigation of the devil, there arose divisions in religion, and it was said among the people, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas,' churches were governed by a common council of the presbyters. But afterwards, when every one regarded those whom he baptized as belonging to himself rather than to Christ, it was everywhere decreed that one person, elected from the presbyters, should be placed over the others; to whom the care of the whole church might belong, and thus the seeds of division might be taken away. Should any one suppose that this opinion,—that a bishop and presbyter is the same, and that one is the denomination of age, and the other of office.—is not sanctioned by the Scriptures, but is only a private fancy of my own, let him read over again the apostle's words to the Philippians. 'Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ,

<sup>2</sup> The testimony of Jerome, in this particular, has been appealed to by Presbyterians in their attempts to prove that *episcopacy is unlawful*;—a position which (I believe) cannot be proved by any arguments whatever. On the other hand, the support of Jerome has been claimed by those who maintain the doctrine of *episcopacy by divine right*, and affirm that the power of ordination is inherent in the episcopal order alone, by the declared will of God, or according to apostolical appointment. Surely the language of Jerome does not favour either of these views. The writer speaks of the appointment of governing bishops without any disapprobation; but at the same time he positively affirms that the appointment was of human or ecclesiastical origin, and no more. The words "Quid enim facit," &c., in the epistle to Evagrius, when considered in connexion with other passages of the same writer, cannot imply any higher assertion respecting the

power of ordination, than that it had been confined to the episcopal order by ecclesiastical appointment and consent. If, from the very first, bishops *could*, and presbyters *could not*, ordain, then the assertion of Jerome, that bishops and presbyters were at first *the same*, cannot be, in any sense, true. According to that supposition, there was at least one point of original and inherent *distinction*;—quite sufficient to destroy that *identity* which Jerome unequivocally maintains.

For a different view of the matter, see CABASSUTHI *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, sec. ii. diss. 13. De discrimine inter episcopos et presbyteros jam inde ab ipsis ecclesiæ exordiis; and the arguments of *Hooker*, *Hall*, and *Jeremy Taylor*. For a good statement of the arguments now under review, I would refer especially to STILLINGFLEET'S *Irenicon*, part ii.: in which the testimony of Jerome is most accurately weighed, and the opinions of many of our own divines are collected.



to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons; grace be unto you and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ:’ &c. Philippi is a single city of Macedonia; and certainly, of those who are now styled bishops there could not have been several at one time in the same city. But, because at that time they called the same persons bishops whom they styled also presbyters, therefore the apostle spoke indifferently of bishops as of presbyters.” The writer then refers to the fact, that St. Paul, having sent for the *presbyters* (in the plural) of the *single city* of Ephesus only, afterwards called the same persons *bishops*. (Acts xx.) To this fact he calls particular attention; and then observes that, in the Epistle to the Hebrews also, we find the care of the church divided equally amongst many; “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief, for that is [un]profitable for you.”—“And Peter,” continues Jerome, “who received his name from the firmness of his faith, says, in his Epistle, ‘The presbyters who are among you I exhort, who am also a presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God which is among you, [he omits the words, taking the oversight thereof, ἐπισκοποῦντες, i. e., superintending it,] not by constraint, but willingly.’ These things we have brought forward to show that, *with the ancients, presbyters were the same as bishops*. But in order that the roots of dissension might be plucked up, *a usage gradually took place that the whole care should devolve upon one*. Therefore, as the presbyters know that *it is by the custom of the church that they are subject to him who is placed over them*, so let the bishops know that *they are above presbyters rather by custom than by the truth of our Lord’s appointment*, and that they ought to *rule the church in common*, herein imitating Moses,” &c.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Idem est presbyter, qui et episcopus; et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, *Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cepha*, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesie gubernabantur.

Postquam vero unusquisque eos, quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse, non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis ecclesie cura pertineret, et schisma-

The same views are maintained by this father in his Epistle to Evagrius, with the additional mention of the fact, that from the first foundation of the church of Alexandria down to the days of Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters of that church made (or, as we should say, consecrated) their bishops. The passage, which is quoted at some length in the note, is very important. Having referred to several passages of the Acts and Epistles in proof of an assertion which he had made, to the effect that bishop and presbyter were at first the same, he proceeds to say that “afterwards, when one was elected, and set over the others, this was designed as a remedy against schism. . . . For at Alexandria, from the evangelist Mark down to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always gave the name of

tum semina tollerentur. Putet aliquis non Scripturarum, sed nostram, esse sententiam, episcopum et presbyterum unum esse, et aliud actatis, aliud esse nomen officii: relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses verba dicentis, “Paulus et Timotheus servi Jesu Christi, omnibus sanctis in Christo Jesu qui sunt Philippis, cum episcopis et diaconis, gratia vobis et pax,”—et reliqua. Philippi una est urbs Macedoniae, et certe in una civitate plures, ut nuncupatur, episcopi esse non poterant. Sed quia eodem episcopos illo tempore quos et presbyteros appellabant, propterea indifferenter de episcopis quasi de presbyteris est locutus. Adhuc hoc alicui videatur ambiguum, nisi altero testimonio comprobetur. In Actibus Apostolorum scriptum est, quod cum venisset Apostolus Miletum, miserit Ephesum, et vocaverit presbyteros ecclesiae ejusdem, quibus postea inter caetera sit locutus, “Attendite vobis, et omni gregi in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit episcopos, pacere ecclesiam Domini, quam acquisivit per sanguinem suum.” Et hoc diligentius observate, quo modo unius civitatis Ephesi presbyteros vocans, postea eodem episcopos dixerit. Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam, quae sub nomine Pauli ad Hebraeos scripta est,

et ibi aequaliter inter plures ecclesiae cura dividitur. Siquidem ad plebem scribit, “Parete principibus vestris, et subjecti estote; ipsi enim sunt qui vigilant pro animabus vestris, quasi rationem reddentes, ne suspirantes hoc faciant: siquidem hoc utile (sic) vobis est.” Et Petrus, qui ex fidei firmitate nomen accepit, in epistola sua loquitur dicens, “Presbyteros ergo in vobis obsecro compresbyter, et testis Christi passionum, qui et ejus gloriae, quae in futuro revelandus est, socius sum, pascite eum qui in vobis est gregem Domini, non quasi cum necessitate, sed voluntarie.” Haec propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eodem fuisse presbyteros quos et episcopos; paulatim vero, ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei qui sibi praepositus fuerit esse subjectos, ita episcopi novimus se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicae veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen; qui cum haberet in potestate solus praeesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret.—HIERON. *Comment.* in Tit. i.

bishop to one whom they elected from themselves, and placed in a higher degree; in the same way as an army may create its general, or as deacons may elect one of their own body, whom they know to be assiduous in the discharge of duty, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop perform, except ordination, which a presbyter may not do," &c.<sup>4</sup> The fact which Jerome here states respecting the appointment and ordination of bishops in the church of Alexandria by presbyters alone for the space of more than two centuries, is attested also by Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria. And the opinion of Jerome respecting the original equality, or rather identity, of presbyter and bishop, is in perfect accordance with the language of a still earlier writer, Tertullian. It will be needless to multiply references to ancient authors, after having added to the passage already quoted from Jerome, one from the treatise of Tertullian, *De Baptismo* (c. 17). The two passages together form a text and commentary, sufficient to elucidate the whole matter. "The highest priest, who is *the bishop*," says Tertullian, "has the right of administering baptism. Then *the presbyters and deacons*, yet not without the authority of

<sup>4</sup> Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est: ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumpere. Nam et Alexandria a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in exceliori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant: quo modo si exercitus imperatorem faciat; aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrinum noverint, et archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat? Nec altera Romane urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Gallie, et Britannie, et Africa, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaræ nationes unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubiunque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Engubii, sive Con-

stantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriae, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem, episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt. . . . . Presbyter et episcopus aliud ætatis, aliud dignitatis, est nomen. Unde et ad Titum, et ad Timotheum de ordinatione episcopi et diaconi dicitur: de presbyteris omnino reticetur; quia in episcopo et presbyter continetur. . . . Et, ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumtas de veteri Testamento; quod Aaron et filii ejus (one order, namely, priests, corresponding to bishops or presbyters), atque Levitæ (another order, corresponding to deacons), in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi et presbyteri, et diaconi, vindicant in ecclesia.—HIERON. *Ep. ad Evagrium*, 35.

the bishop, *because of the honour of the church*, which being preserved, peace is preserved. Otherwise, the right belongs even to laymen. . . . Emulation is the mother of divisions. ‘All things are lawful to me,’ said the most holy Paul, ‘but all things are not expedient.’ Let it suffice that you use your liberty in cases of necessity, when the condition of the person, or the circumstances of time or place compel you to it<sup>5</sup>.”

Our own church wisely contents herself with asserting the antiquity of the three orders or offices, of bishop, presbyter, and deacon, without pretending to establish a distinction between bishop and presbyter by divine right. In the preface to the *Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, we read, “It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s church, bishops, priests, and deacons.” There can be no doubt that this language would be perfectly consistent with the doctrine of the divine right of episcopacy as distinct from the office of presbyters; but it is evident also, from the following testimonies, that it does not, of itself, assert or imply any such doctrine.—In answer to a question proposed to an assembly of divines in the reign of Edward VI., “Whether bishops or priests were first; and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop?” *Archbishop Cranmer* affirmed that “bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion.” See remarks on Cranmer’s opinion, below, pp. 243-4.—*Bishop Jewel*, in his *Defence of the Apology*, refers to the two passages above quoted from Jerome; and adds another testimony of like nature from Augustin (*Epp.* 19). “The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest [not by authority of the Scriptures, but (*Jewel*)], after the names of honour which the custom of the church hath

<sup>5</sup> Dandi (baptismum) habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri, et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesie honorem; quo salvo, pax salva est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est. . . . Æmulatio schismatum

mater est. Omnia licere dixit sanctissimus apostolus, sed non omnia expedire. Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus utaris, sicuti aut loci, aut temporis, aut persone conditio compellit. —TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 17.

now obtained<sup>6</sup>." And in a subsequent part of the *Defence*, he says, "What meant Mr. Harding here to come in with the difference between priests and bishops? Thinketh he, that priests and bishops hold only by tradition? Or is it so horrible an heresy as he maketh it, to say, that by the Scriptures of God a bishop and a priest are all one? Or knoweth he how far, and unto whom, he reacheth the name of an heretic? Verily Chrysostom saith, 'Between a bishop and a priest in a manner there is no difference.' St. Hierome saith, somewhat in rougher sort, 'I hear say there is one become so peevisish, that he setteth deacons before priests, that is to say, before bishops; whereas the apostle plainly teacheth us, *that priests and bishops be all one.*' Augustine saith, 'What is a bishop but the first priest, that is to say, the highest priest?' So saith St. Ambrose, 'There is but one consecration of priests and bishops; for both of them are priests, but the bishop is the first.' All these, and other holy fathers, together with St. Paul the apostle, for their saying, by Mr. Harding's advice, must be holden for heretics<sup>7</sup>."—"I believe," says *Bishop Stillingfleet*, "upon the strictest inquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Jerome, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, were all of Aërius's judgment, as to the identity of both name and order of bishops and presbyters in the primitive church; but here lay the difference, Aërius from thence proceeded to separation from the bishops and their churches because they were bishops." (*Trenicon*, part ii. chap. vi. § 13).—Aërius denied what the Church of England, with the general consent of antiquity, maintains,—that the government of the church by bishops is lawful and expedient.

<sup>6</sup> "Secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major est."

<sup>7</sup> The following are the originals prefixed by Bishop Jewel to the translations in his text.—Inter episcopum et presbyterum interest ferme nihil. CHRYSOST. in 1 Tim. Hom. 11.—Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut diaconos presbyteris, id est episcopis, anteferet: cum apostolus

perspicue doceat, eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos. Hieron. ad Evagrium.—Quid est episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos? AUGUST. in *Question. Novi et Vet. Testamenti*, quæst. 101.—Episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est: uterque enim sacerdos est. Sed episcopus primus est. AMBROS. in 1 Tim. cap. 3.

Upon the whole, then, it appears that the order (or office) of a bishop is above that of a priest, not by any authority of Scripture, but only by the custom of the church, or by virtue of an ecclesiastical arrangement. The facts relating to the distinction between bishops and presbyters, and to the origin of that distinction, may be stated in the following manner. At first, each church was instructed and governed by a presbyter, or, especially if the church was large, by a presbytery, or council of elders; the superintendency of the whole being vested in the apostles during their lives. In course of time, and after the removal of the apostles, it became expedient, from the increase of business or other circumstances, that some one member of the presbytery should have precedence of the others, and be invested with a certain degree of authority over them; or, at least, should be so far distinguished from his brethren that their acts could not be valid without his presence, approbation, or consent. Besides this, when churches began to multiply in a city or district, it was natural that the chief officer of the oldest church should be regarded as a leader or president of the whole. All these changes actually took place. A presbytery appointed one of its members foreman or chairman; it then acknowledged him as representative of the whole body; and afterwards, for the sake of good order, and in the natural course of human institutions, it consented to submit to him as governor, not without something very much like apostolic precedent in favour of the measure. Such was the origin of the useful and venerable office of a bishop in the Christian church. It is contrary to the sense of Scripture and the voice of antiquity to pronounce such an order of ministers unlawful; while it is equally unscriptural and opposed to the truth of history to describe it as absolutely necessary or essential to the being (or even, under some circumstances, to the well-being) of a Christian church. The bishop is a presbyter whom other presbyters may lawfully be required to obey for the good of the church; and it forms part of the duty and wisdom of the church to increase or diminish the power of this officer, as may best consist with the interests of the whole body. or of religion in general, and as circumstances may, from time to time, require. Experience has proved that the episcopal order, in the due

exercise of its functions, and under efficient control, is highly beneficial to the church; although doubtless, by the concession and usurpation of despotic authority or undue influence, it has sometimes been found equally oppressive and pernicious.

The first three centuries furnish many examples of an opposition made by presbyteries, *i. e.* bodies of presbyters, to their presiding bishop. Thus Novatus and Novatian, with their parties, opposed Cyprian and Cornelius at Carthage and Rome. And in some cases the resistance of the presbyters operated most favourably for the preservation of sound doctrine against attempts at innovation on the part of the bishop; as in the case of Beryllus, Paul of Samosata, and others down to the time of Arius. In many instances this opposition or resistance was perfectly constitutional; inasmuch as the presbyters were the colleagues or assessors of the bishop (according to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, book ii. chap. 28), and the regulations made by the bishop without the consent of his presbytery were null and void.—See CHRYSOST. *de Sacerdot.*, lib. iii. chap. 15; HIERON. *in Jes.* chap. 3; *Concil. Carthag.* iv. c. 23.

Such are the conclusions at which many critics have arrived, as the result of their investigations into the origin of the distinction which has so generally obtained between bishops and presbyters. Learned writers, of different communions, have supported this view of the question; but it has not found extensive acceptance with divines of the Church of England. It prevailed, at first, among our early reformers, but it was soon abandoned. Cranmer, for instance, at first plainly asserted this position; but he afterwards changed his opinion on the subject<sup>8</sup>. Stillingfleet, in like

<sup>8</sup> The following questions, among others, were proposed to an assembly of divines convened by order of King Edward VI. at Windsor Castle: “10. Whether bishops or priests were first; and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop? 11. Whether a bishop hath auctoritie to make a priest by the Scripture or no, and whether any order but only a bishop may make a priest? 12. Whether in the New Testament he required any

consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointeigne to the office be sufficient?” The answers returned by Archbishop Cranmer to these questions, in his own handwriting, were as follow:—“10. The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion. 11. A bishop may make a priest by the Scriptures, and so may princes and governors alsoe, and that by the auctority of

manner, who, as we have seen, advocated the opinion of the human (but lawful) institution of episcopacy in the early part of his life, took a different view of the question when he had advanced in years, and had been deservedly honoured with ecclesiastical preferment. Nor can I, perhaps, make a more convenient transition from one view of this subject to the other, than by extracting two [or three] passages from the earlier and later works of this learned author.

In the *Irenicon*<sup>9</sup>, which Stillingfleet wrote as a young man, while rector of Sutton, he delivers and maintains the following sentiments:—"When the apostles were taken out of the way, who kept the main power in their own hands of ruling the several presbyteries, or delegated some to do it (who had a main hand in the planting churches with the apostles, and thence are called

God committed them, and the people also by their election. For as we reade that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it. And the people, before Christian princes were, commonly did elect their bishops and priests. 12. In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture; for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." "Which I have exactly transcribed out of the original," continues Bishop Stillingfleet, from whom (*Irenicon*, part II. ch. vii. § 2) I quote. "I have observed generally the form of writing at that time used. In the same MS. it appears that the bishop of St. Asaph, Therleby, Redman, and Cox, were all of the same opinion with the archbishop, that at first bishops and presbyters were the same; and the two latter expressly cite the opinion of Jerome with approbation. Thus we see by the testimony, chiefly of him who was instrumental in our reformation, that he owned not episcopacy as a distinct order from presbytery of divine right, but only as a prudent constitution of the civil magistrate for the better governing in

the church." But Archbishop Cranmer advocates other views in his Sermon on the Power of the Keys.

<sup>9</sup> A treatise in which the author takes great pains to prove that no one form of church government is so necessary to the being of a church, but that a good and peaceable Christian may and ought to conform himself to the government of the place in which he lives. In it, he entirely agrees with those who make all difference between church officers to arise from consent of parties, and not from any divine law. In the preface he says, "My main design throughout this whole treatise is, to show that there can be no argument drawn from any pretence of a divine right, that may hinder men from consenting and yielding to such a form of government in the church as may bear the greatest correspondency to the primitive church, and be most advantageously conducive to the peace, unity, and settlement of our divided church. I plead not at all for any abuses or corruptions incident to the best form of government through the corruption of men and times."



in Scripture sometimes fellow-labourers in the Lord, and sometimes evangelists, and by Theodoret apostles, but of a second order) after, I say, these were deceased, and the main power left in the presbyteries, the several presbyters enjoying an equal power among themselves, especially being many in one city, thereby great occasion was given to many schisms, partly by the bandying of the presbyters one against another, partly by the siding of the people with some against the rest, partly by the too common use of the power of ordinations in presbyters, by which they were more able to increase their own party by ordaining those who would join with them, and by this means to perpetuate schisms in the church; upon this, when the wiser and graver sort considered the abuses following the promiscuous use of this power of ordination, and withal having in their minds the excellent frame of the government of the church under the apostles and their deputies, and for preventing future schisms and divisions among themselves, they unanimously agreed to choose one out of their number who was best qualified for the management of so great a trust, and to devolve the exercise of the power of ordination and jurisdiction to him; yet so as that he act nothing of importance without the consent and concurrence of the presbyters, who were still to be as the common council to the bishop. This I take to be the true and just account of the original of episcopacy in the primitive church, according to Jerome; which model of government, thus contrived and framed, sets forth to us a most lively character of that great wisdom and moderation which then ruled the heads and hearts of the primitive Christians; and which, when men have searched and studied all other ways (the abuses incident to this government through the corruption of men and times being retrenched), will be found the most agreeable to the primitive form, both as asserting the due interest of the presbyteries, and allowing the due honour of episcopacy, and by the joint harmony of both carrying on the affairs of the church, with the greatest unity, concord, and peace. Which form of government I cannot see how any possible reason can be produced by either party, why they may not with cheerfulness embrace it."—*Irenicon*, part II. ch. vi. § 13.

The same author, however, in his treatise *On the Unreason-*

*ableness of Separation*, written at a subsequent period of his life, when he was dean of St. Paul's, and chaplain in ordinary to King Charles II., takes a different view of the question concerning the origin of episcopacy<sup>10</sup>. The following passage from that work will prepare us for statements on this subject, different from those which we have been considering.—“That our church did believe our bishops to succeed the apostles in those parts of their office (namely, government, ordination, and censures), I shall make appear by these things: (1.) In the preface before the *Book of Ordination*, it is said that ‘it is evident unto all men, diligently reading the holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s church, bishops, priests, and deacons.’ What is the reason that they express it then ‘from the apostles’ time,’ rather than ‘in the apostles’ times,’ but that they believed, while the apostles lived, they managed the affairs of government themselves; but as they withdrew, they did in some churches sooner, and in some later, as their own continuance, the condition of the churches, and the qualification of persons were, commit the care and government of churches to such persons whom they appointed thereto? Of which we have an uncontrollable evidence in the instances of Timothy and Titus; for the care of government was a distinct thing from the office of an evangelist; and all their removes do not invalidate this; because, while the apostles lived, it is probable there were no fixed bishops, or but few. But as they went off, so they came to be settled in their several churches. And as this is most agreeable to the sense of our church, so *it is the fairest hypothesis for reconciling the different testimonies of antiquity*. For, hereby, the succession of bishops is secured from the apostles’ times, for which the testimonies of Irenæus, Tertullian, Saint Cyprian, and others, are so plain; hereby, room is left to make good all that Saint Jerome hath said; and what Epiphanius delivers concerning the differing settlements of churches at first. So that we may allow

<sup>10</sup> “Will you not allow one single person, who happened to write about these matters when he was very young, in twenty years time of the most busy

and thoughtful part of his life, to see reason to alter his judgment?”—*Preface to the Unreasonableness of Separation*.

for the community of names between bishop and presbyter for a while in the church, that is, while the apostles governed the churches themselves; but afterwards, that which was then part of the apostolical office became the episcopal, which hath continued from that time to this, by a constant succession in the church. (2.) Archbishop Whitgift several times declares, that these parts of the apostolical office still remained in the bishops of our church. ‘As for this part of the apostle’s function,’ saith he, ‘to visit such churches as were before planted, and to provide that such were placed in them as were virtuous and godly pastors, I know it remaineth still, and is one of the chief parts of the bishops’ function.’ And again, ‘There is now no planting of churches, no going through the whole world, there is no writing of new gospels, no prophesying of things to come, but there is governing of churches, visiting of them, reforming of pastors and directing of them, which is a portion of the apostolical function.’ Again, ‘although that this part of the apostolical office which did consist in planting and founding of churches through the whole world is ceased, yet the manner of government by placing bishops in every city, by moderating and governing them, by visiting the churches, by cutting off schisms and contentions, by ordering ministers, remaineth still, and shall continue, and is in this church in the archbishops and bishops, as most meet men to execute the same’ (*Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*). Bishop Bilson fully agrees as to these particulars. ‘(1.) That the apostles did not at first commit the churches to the government of bishops, but reserved the chief power of government in their own hands. (2.) That upon experience of the confusion and disorder which did arise through equality of pastors, they did appoint, at their departures, certain approved men to be bishops. (3.) That these bishops did succeed the apostles in the care and government of churches; as he proves at large, and therefore he calls their function apostolic,’ (*Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church*, chap. 12.) Instead of many others, which it were easy to produce, I shall only add the testimony of King Charles I., in his debates about episcopacy, who understood the constitution of our church as well as any bishop in it, and defended it with as clear and strong a reason.

In his third paper to Henderson, he hath these words:—‘Where you find a bishop and presbyter in Scripture to be one and the same (which I deny to be always so), it is in the apostles’ times; now I think to prove the order of bishops succeeded that of the apostles, and that the name was chiefly altered in reverence to those who were immediately chosen by our Saviour.’ In his first paper at the treaty of Newport, he thus states the case about episcopal government:—‘I conceive that episcopal government is most consonant to the word of God, and of an apostolical institution, as it appears by the Scriptures to have been practised by the apostles themselves, and by them committed and derived to particular persons, as their substitutes or successors therein, (as for ordaining presbyters and deacons, giving rules concerning Christian discipline, and exercising censures over presbyters and others,) and hath ever since, to these last times, been exercised by bishops in all churches of Christ; and, therefore, I cannot in conscience consent to abolish the said government.’ In his reply to the first answer of the divines, he saith, ‘that mere presbyters are *episcopi gregis* only, they have the oversight of the flock in the duties of preaching, administration of sacraments, public prayer, exhorting, rebuking, &c.; but bishops are *episcopi gregis et pastorum* too, having the oversight of the flock and pastors within their several precincts in the acts of external government. And that, although the apostles had no successors *in eundem gradum*, as to those things that were extraordinary in them, as, namely, the measure of their gifts, the extent of their charge, the infallibility of their doctrine, and the having seen Christ in the flesh; but in those things that were not extraordinary (and such those things are to be judged, which are necessary for the service of the church in all times, as the office of teaching and the power of governing are), they were to have, and had, successors; and, therefore, the learned and godly fathers and councils of old times, did usually style bishops the successors of the apostles, without ever scrupling thereat.’ Many other passages might be produced out of those excellent papers to the same purpose; but these are sufficient to discover that our bishops are looked on as successors to the apostles, and, therefore, Mr. Baxter hath no reason to call our episcopacy ‘a new devised

species of churches,' and 'such as destroys the being of parochial churches.'” *Unreasonableness of Separation*, part iii., sect. 13.—Thus far the learned author, when dean of St. Paul’s.—In his ordination sermon, the bishop maintains expressly, that “there is as great reason to believe the apostolical succession to be of divine institution, as the canon of Scripture, or the observation of the Lord’s day. . . . Now it cannot but seem unequal not to allow the same force where there is the same evidence; and therefore our church hath wisely and truly determined, that since the apostles’ time there have been three orders, of bishops, priests, and deacons, and that these in a regular well-constituted church are to continue to the world’s end.”

## II. *Episcopacy supposed to be founded upon Divine Institution or Apostolical Tradition.*

It has been the opinion of the leading divines of our own church, from a very early period, that any view of episcopacy as a human or ecclesiastical institution is below the truth, and essentially defective. They contend<sup>11</sup> that episcopacy is a divine, or at least apostolical, institution, and supported by apostolical tradition and catholic practice. Perhaps what is usually meant by the term “divine right of episcopacy” may be well explained in the following words of Bishop Hall:—“Whereas there are three degrees of truths and holy institutions, as they are commonly distinguished, human, apostolic, divine; the first, from mere men; the second, from men apostolical; the third, from God himself immediately:—the author desires to go a midway in this difference; holding it too low, to derive episcopacy from a merely human and ecclesiastical ordinance; holding it too high, to

<sup>11</sup> See especially, BISHOP BILSON, *Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church*; HAMMOND, *Defence of Episcopacy against Blondel*; ARCHBISHOP POTTER, *On Church Government*; BISHOP PARKER, *Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first Six Hundred Years*; BISHOP HALL, *Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted*; BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR, *Episcopacy Asserted, or, Of the Sacred*

*Order and Office of Episcopacy by Divine Institution, Apostolical Tradition, and Catholic Practice*; HICK’S *Two Treatises of the Christian Priesthood, and the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*.—See also BINGHAM’S *Antiquities*, book ii. chap. 3; and SCLATER’S *Original Draught of the Primitive Church, in answer to Lord Chancellor King’s Enquiry*.

deduce it from an immediate command of God: and therefore, pitching upon an apostolical institution, rests there. But, because those apostles were divinely inspired, and had the directions of God's Spirit for those things which they did for the common administration of the church, therefore, and in that only name, is episcopacy said to lay claim to a divine right: howsoever, also, it cannot be gainsaid, that the grounds were formerly laid by our Saviour, in a known imparity of his first agents." This passage occurs in Bishop Hall's Advertisement to his translation of a tract in favour of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, by "that eminent light of the Palatinate, Dr. Abraham Scultetus<sup>12</sup>." Having, in the foregoing pages, personated an advocate of the opposite or lower views of this subject, I do not know that I can more effectually, and at the same time concisely, represent the opinions of those who appeal to primitive antiquity in defence of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, than by inserting in this place the temperate and well-digested statement of Scultetus, and appending further explanations, or remarks of our own divines, in the form of notes.—The opinions of those who contend for the divine right, in the extreme sense of the expression, may afterwards be represented in a few words. The following is the tractate of Scultetus. I trust I may be permitted to introduce it with the words of its pious translator. "Peruse it. . . . And if you shall not meet with convincing reasons to bring you home to this opinion, yet, at least wise, find cause enough to retain a charitable and favourable conceit of those who are (as they think, upon good grounds,) otherwise minded: and whilst it is, on all parts, agreed by wise and unprejudiced Christians, that the calling is thus ancient and sacred, let it not violate the peace of the church to scan the original, whether ecclesiastical, apostolical, or divine. Shortly, let all good men humbly submit to the ordinance, and heartily wish for the reformation of any abuses. And so many as are of this mind, peace be upon them, and the whole Israel of God."

<sup>12</sup> *The Determination of the Question concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacy.* By the famous and learned divine Dr. Abrahamus Scultetus, late

professor of divinity in the University of Heidelberg. Faithfully translated out of his observations upon the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

## THE QUESTION.

*Whether episcopacy be of divine right; that is, whether the apostles ordained this government of the church, that not only one should be placed over the people, but over presbyters and deacons, who should have the power of imposition of hands or ordination, and the direction of ecclesiastical councils.*

This was anciently denied by Aërius; as is related by Epiphanius, in his seventy-fifth heresy: and by John of Jerusalem; as appears by Jerome, in his epistle to Pammachius.

And there are not wanting, in these days, many learned and pious men, who, although they acknowledge Aërius to have erred, in that he should disallow of that manner of ecclesiastical government which had been received by the whole world<sup>13</sup>, yet in this they agree with him, that episcopal government is not of divine right.

From whose opinion why I should sever my judgment, I am moved by these strong reasons, famous examples, and evident authorities.

My judgment is this:—

First, in the apostles' epistles the name of bishop did never signify anything different from the office of a presbyter. For a Bishop, Presbyter, and an Apostle were common names; as you may see in Acts xx.; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i.; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2; Acts i. 20.

Next, in the chief apostolical church, the church was governed by the common advice of presbyters; and that, for some years, in the time of the preaching of the apostles. For, first of all, companies must be gathered together, before we can define anything concerning their perpetual government.

Then, the Apostles, as long as they were present in or near

<sup>13</sup> "All times, all histories, all authors, all places, are for us. Yea, which is most remarkable, even those factions which divided themselves from the church, as the Arians, Novatians, Donatists, yet still held themselves to the government of their bishops. It

was their question, whether this or that man should be their bishop; it was never questioned, whether they should have any bishops at all."—HALL, *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part ii. sect. 21.

their churches, did not place any bishop over them, properly so called, but only presbyters; reserving episcopal authority to themselves alone.

Lastly, after the gospel was far and near propagated; and that, out of equality of presbyters, by the instigation of the devil, schisms were made in religion; then the apostles, especially in the more remote places, placed some over the pastors or presbyters<sup>14</sup>; which, shortly after, by the disciples of the apostles, Ignatius and others, were only called Bishops, and by this appellation were distinguished from presbyters and deacons<sup>15</sup>.

Reasons moving me to this opinion:—

First, Jerome, upon the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus,

<sup>14</sup> “This was the apostles’ course. For the plantation of the church, and the better propagation of the gospel, wherever they came they found it necessary to ordain meet assistants to them: and they promiscuously imparted unto them all their own style, but apostolical; naming them bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, according to the familiarity and indifferency of their former usage therein. But, when they, having divided themselves into several parts of the world, found that the number of Christians, especially in the greater cities, so multiplied, that they must needs be divided into many congregations, and those congregations must necessarily have many presbyters, and those many presbyters in the absence of the apostles began to emulate each other, and to make parties for themselves to their own advantage; then, as St. Jerome truly notes, began the manifest and constant distinction, betwixt the office of bishops and presbyters, to be both known and observed. For now, the apostles, by the direction of the Spirit of God, found it requisite and necessary, for the avoiding of schism and disorder, that some eminent persons should everywhere be lifted up above the rest, and ordained to succeed them in the overseeing and ordering both the church and their

many presbyters under them; who, by an eminence, were called their bishops, or, as the word signifies, supervisors and governors; so, as the ministers, σκοποῦντες, Phil. iii. 17, they, ἐπισκοποῦντες: for, as the offices, so the names, of bishop and deacon, were of apostolical foundation. These bishops, therefore, were the men whom they furnished with their own ordinary power, as church governors, for this purpose. Now the offices grew fully distinct, even in the apostles’ days, and under their own hands; although, sometimes, the names, after the former use were confounded.”—BR. HALL, *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part ii. sect. 4.

<sup>15</sup> “After the churches were settled, and bishops fixed upon their several sees, then the names also were made distinct, only those names which did design temporary offices did expire. Τότε γὰρ τέως ἐκωνώνουν ὀνόματι, saith St. Chrysostom,—Thus far the names were common,—λοιπὸν δὲ τὸ ἰδίαν ἐκάστῳ ἀπονενέμνται ὄνομα, ἐπισκόπου ἐπισκόπου, πρεσβυτέρου πρεσβυτέρου, —but immediately the names were made proper and distinct, and to every order its own name is left, of a bishop to a bishop, of a presbyter to a presbyter.”—JEREMY TAYLOR, *Episcopacy Asserted*, sect. 23.



writeth, that “A presbyter is the same with a bishop; and before that, by the instigation of the devil, factions were made in religion, and it was said among the people, ‘I am of Paul, I of Apollos, but I of Cephas,’ the churches were governed by the common counsel of presbyters: afterwards, it was decreed, in the whole world, that one, chosen out of the presbyters, should be placed over the rest.”—From whence I thus argue;—When it began to be said among the people, “I am of Paul, I of Cephas, and I of Apollos,” then one chosen out of the presbyters, was placed over the rest;—but while the apostles yet lived it was so said among the people, as the first Epistle to the Corinthians, besides other of St. Paul’s epistles, puts it out of doubt;—therefore, while the apostles lived, one chosen out of the presbyters was placed over the rest.

Again:—there can be no other term assigned, in which bishops were first made, than the time of the apostles; for all the first successors of the apostles were bishops: witness the successions of bishops in the most famous churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome; as it is in Eusebius<sup>16</sup>. Therefore, either the next successors of the apostles changed the form of ecclesiastical government received from the apostles, according to their own pleasure, which is very unlikely; or, the episcopal government came from the apostles themselves. Besides, even then, in the time of the apostles, there were many presbyters, but one bishop: even then, in the time of the apostles, *ὁ προεστὼς*, he that was placed over the rest, which afterwards was

<sup>16</sup> “Our learned Bilson hath cleared this point, beyond all contradiction. In whom (*Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church*, ch. 13), you may please to see, out of Eusebius, Hegesippus, Socrates, Jerome, Epiphanius, and others, as exact a pedigree of all the holy bishops of the primitive church, succeeding each other in the four apostolical sees, until the time of the Nicene Council, as our Godwin or Mason can give us of our bishops of England; or a Speed or Stow, of our English kings. Then you shall find, from James, the Lord’s brother, who, as Jerome him-

self expressly, sat as bishop in the church of Jerusalem, to Macarius, who sat in the Nicene Council, forty bishops punctually named:—from St. Peter, who governed the church of Antioch, and was succeeded by Evodius, and he by Ignatius, twenty-seven;—in the see of Rome, thirty-seven; in the see of Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, twenty-three:—a catalogue which cannot be questioned without too much injurious incredulity; nor denied, without an unreasonable boldness.”—*BR. HALL, Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part ii. sect. 8.

called bishop, did impose hands, or ordain ministers of the word; which presbyters alone did not presume to do. Even then, therefore, the calling of bishops was distinct from the office of presbyters.

If any desire the examples of Apostolical Bishops, the books of the ancients are full of the episcopal authority of Timothy and Titus; either of whom, however, first performed the office of an evangelist; yet, notwithstanding, ceased to be an evangelist, after that Timothy was placed over the church of Ephesus, and Titus over the church of Crete: for evangelists did only lay the foundations of faith in foreign places, and then did commend the rest of the care to certain pastors; but they themselves went to other countries and nations, as Eusebius writes in his third book of Ecclesiastical History, and thirty-fourth chapter. But Paul taught sometimes in Ephesus and Crete, and laid the foundations of faith there; therefore he commandeth Timothy to stay at Ephesus, and Titus at Crete, not as evangelists, but as governors of the churches. And indeed, the epistles, written to either of them, do evince the same: for, in these, he doth not prescribe the manner of gathering together a church, which was the duty of an evangelist; but the manner of governing a church already gathered together, which is the duty of a bishop: and all the precepts in those epistles are so conformable hereunto, as that they are not referred, in especial, to Timothy and Titus; but, in general, to all bishops; and, therefore, in no wise do they suit with the temporary power of evangelists. Besides, that Timothy and Titus had episcopal jurisdiction, not only Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrosius, Jerome, Epiphanius, Œcumenius, Primasius, Theophylact, but also the most ancient writers of any that write the History of the New Testament, whose writings are now lost, do sufficiently declare. Eusebius, without doubt appealing unto those, in his third book of Ecclesiastical History and fourth chapter, “Timothy,” saith he, “in histories is written to be the first which was made bishop of the church of Ephesus; as Titus was the first that was made bishop of the church of Crete.”

But, if John the apostle, and not any ancient disciple of the apostles, be the author of the Revelation, he suggests unto us

those seven new examples of apostolical bishops; for all the most learned interpreters interpret the seven Angels of the churches to be the seven Bishops of the churches; neither can they do otherwise, unless they should offer violence to the text.

What should I speak of James, not the apostle<sup>17</sup>, but the brother of our Saviour, the son-in-law of the mother of our Lord? He, by the apostles, was ordained bishop of Jerusalem<sup>18</sup>, as is related by Eusebius, in his second book of Ecclesiastical History, and first chapter, out of the Hypotyposes of Clement, and by Jerome, concerning Ecclesiastical Writers, out of the first of the Comments of Hegeſippus:—Ambrose upon the first chapter to the Galatians, Chrysostom in his twenty-third Homily upon the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, Augustin in his second book and thirty-seventh chapter against Cresconius, Epiphanius in his sixty-fifth Heresy, and the sixth Synod in Trullo and thirty-second canon, all assenting thereunto. For, indeed, this is that James who had his fixed residence at Jerusalem, as an ordinary bishop; whom Paul, in his first and last coming to

<sup>17</sup> This point has been much disputed. Many contend that the James who presided over the church of Jerusalem was the apostle James the younger, son of Alphaeus.

<sup>18</sup> “It is unanimously delivered by all ancient writers, that James, the Lord’s brother, was the first bishop of the church of Jerusalem. St. Jerome says, ‘He was ordained by the apostles, immediately after our Lord’s crucifixion.’ (HIERON. *Catal. Script.* c. 3.) Epiphanius calls him, therefore, the first bishop; the first who had an episcopal chair; the first to whom Christ committed his own throne upon earth. (EPIPHAN. *Hær.* 78, *Antidicomar.* n. 7; *Hær.* 29, *Nazor.* n. 3; *Hær.* 66, *Manich.* n. 19.) Chrysostom says, ‘He was made bishop by Christ himself.’ (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 38 in 1 Cor. xv.) The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, ‘both by Christ and the apostles.’ (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 35.) In like manner, Eusebius always speaks of him under that character, as first

bishop of Jerusalem, ordained by the apostles. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23; lib. iii. c. 5, 7; lib. vii. c. 19.) So Hegeſippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, all cited by Eusebius. (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23; lib. ii. c. 1; lib. iv. c. 23;) to whom we may add St. Augustin, who styles John, bishop of Jerusalem, St. James’s successor, and possessor of the chair, wherein he sat as first bishop of the place. (AUG. *contra Crescon.* lib. ii. c. 37; *Cont. Liber. Petil.* lib. ii. c. 51.) And it is remarkable what Clemens, one of the most ancient of these writers, says, ‘That this was designed as a peculiar honour to St. James, in regard that he was the brother of Christ; for though our Saviour usually gave the preference to Peter, and John, and James his brother, yet none of those contended about this honour, but chose this James surnamed Justus, to be bishop of the place; where he lived a saint, and died a martyr.’—BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book ii. ch. i. § 4.

Jerusalem, found in the city (almost all the apostles preaching in other places, Gal. i. 19); and who concluded those things which were decreed in the assembly of the apostles, Acts xxi. For he was, with Chrysostom, bishop of the church of Jerusalem; from whom when certain came, Peter would not eat with the Gentiles, Gal. ii. 12.

From examples, I pass to authorities<sup>19</sup>; which Ignatius confirms by his own authority: whose axioms are these:—"The bishop is he, which is superior in all chieftly and power. The presbytery is a holy company of counsellors and assessors to the bishop. The deacons are the imitators of angelical virtues, which show forth their pure and unblamable ministry. He who doth not obey these is without God, impure, and contemns Christ, and derogates from his order and constitution," in his *Epistle to the Trallians*<sup>20</sup>. In another place, "I exhort that ye study to do all things with concord: the bishop being president, in the place of God; the presbyters, in place of the apostolic senate; the deacons as those to whom was committed the ministry of Jesus Christ," in his *Epistle to the Magnesians*<sup>21</sup>. And again, "Let the presbyters be subject to the bishop, the deacons to the presbyters, the people to the presbyters and deacons," in his *Epistle to those of Tarsus*<sup>22</sup>. But Ignatius was the disciple of the apostles: from whence then had he this hierarchy, but from the apostles?

Let us now<sup>23</sup> hear Epiphanius, in his seventy-fifth Heresy.

<sup>19</sup> Bishop Hall quotes, as of great value, the supposed testimony of CLEM. OF ROME, *Ep. ad Corinth.* c. 44, 45.

<sup>20</sup> Passages of this nature abound in the epistles of Ignatius; but they are written so much in the style of the third and fourth centuries, and are often introduced so gratuitously, as to have fallen under strong suspicion of having been inserted in the original epistles by some later hand. The words here quoted as from the epistle to the Trallians are not even admitted into the text by later editors of the genuine epistles.

<sup>21</sup> *Ep. ad Magnes.* § 6.

<sup>22</sup> This epistle is now entirely rejected as spurious.

<sup>23</sup> The testimony of *Irenæus* is here overlooked; but it has been often appealed to by Hall and others. "*Irenæus*," says Bingham, (*Antiq.* book ii. chap. i. § 3,) "declares himself of the opinion that there were bishops as well as presbyters in the apostles' days;" "for the assembly of Miletus," he says, (lib. iii. c. 14,) "was composed of bishops and presbyters that were of Ephesus, and the neighbouring cities of Asia." And therefore, agreeably to that hypothesis, he always derives the succession of bishops, and their original, from the apostles; as where he says, "that Hyginus, bishop of Rome, was [the ninth in order of episcopal succession from the apostles]"

“The apostles could not presently appoint all things. Presbyters and deacons were necessary; for, by these two, ecclesiastical affairs might be despatched. When there was not found any fit for the episcopacy, that place remained without a bishop; but, where there was need, and there were any fit for episcopacy, they were made bishops. All things were not complete from the beginning; but, in course of time, all things were provided, which were required for the perfection of those things which were necessary: the church, by this means, receiving the fulness of dispensation.”

But Eusebius comes nearer to the matter, and more strongly handles the cause; who, in his third book of Ecclesiastical History, and twenty-second chapter, as also in his Chronicle, affirmeth that Evodius was ordained the first bishop of Antioch, in the year of our Lord 45, in the third year of Claudius, the Emperor: at which time, many of the apostles were alive.

Now, Jerome writeth to Evagrius, that, at Alexandria, “from Mark the evangelist, unto Heraclas and Dionysius the

(lib. i. c. 28). And, in another place, (lib. iii. c. 3,) giving an exact catalogue of the twelve bishops of Rome that governed successively in that see, to his own time, he says of Linus, the first of them, “that he was ordained bishop immediately by the apostles, upon the first foundation of the church; and of Eleutherius, the last of them, that he was the twelfth bishop from the apostles.” Irenæus tells us that in his early life he saw Polycarp, “who,” says he, “was appointed bishop of the church of Smyrna by the apostles,” (lib. iii. c. 3.)

The following passage from Tertulian (*De Præscript.* c. 33) has been frequently quoted in this controversy: —“Edant origines ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesie

apostolicæ census suos deferunt: sicut Smyræorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne collocatum refert: sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit: proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent, quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos, apostolici seminis traduces habent:”—*i. e.*, “Let them show us the origin of their churches, and display to us a catalogue of their bishops, in a regular succession from first to last; by which it may appear that their first bishop had either some apostle, or some apostolical man who continued with the apostles, for his founder and predecessor. For thus it is that the apostolical churches trace their pedigree. The church of Smyrna counts up to Polycarp, ordained by St. John; the church of Rome to Clement, ordained by St. Peter; and so the other churches in like manner exhibit those who were ordained bishops by the apostles, by whom the apostolical succession was propagated and continued.”

bishop, the presbyters called one, chosen out of themselves, and placed in a higher degree, the bishop." But Mark died, as Eusebius and Bucholeerus testify, in the year of our Lord 64: Peter, Paul, and John, the apostles being then alive. Therefore, it is clear that episcopacy was instituted in the time of the apostles; and good Jerome suffered some frailty when he wrote that "bishops were greater than presbyters, rather by the custom of the church, than by the truth of the Lord's disposing;" unless, perhaps, by "the custom of the church" he understands the custom of the apostles; and by "the truth of the Lord's disposing," he understands the appointment of Christ<sup>24</sup>. Yet, not so he satisfies the truth of history: for it appears, out of the

<sup>24</sup> Jerome, "as he was naturally a waspish and hot good man, so now, being vexed with some cross proceedings, as he thought, of John, bishop of Jerusalem, he flew out into some expressions, indeed, but yet such as in other places he doth either salve or contradict. The passages are scanned thoroughly by many authors. It is true, then, that he saith bishops are greater than presbyters, rather *consuetudine ecclesiæ* than *Dominicæ dispositionis veritate*; but even in that, withal, he grants episcopacy to be an apostolical institution; for he interprets himself that this custom was derived and continued from the apostles, and that the *Dominica dispositio* of which he spake, was to be taken of a personal appointment from Christ our Saviour. Wherefore, what can be more plain than that his *toto orbe decretum* relates to apostolic constitution? The very pedigree of it is by himself fetched from the time of the quarrels which St. Paul mentions in his epistle to the Corinthians, 'One says, I am of Paul; another, I am of Apollos; I am of Cephas,' which was in the heart of the apostolic times. And, relating those words of the bishop of Jerusalem's letters, 'There is no difference betwixt a bishop and a presbyter,' he passes a *satis imperitè* upon it: profess-

ing to his Marcella, against the novelty of Montanus, 'With us, our bishops hold the place of the apostles; and that the depression of their bishops below their place was utterly perfidious;' and, commenting upon that passage of the Psalm, *Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children, &c.*, 'The apostles,' saith he, 'O church, were thy fathers,' &c. 'Thou hast, instead of them, children, which are the bishops, created by thyself.' And, which is for all, where he is most vehement for the dignity of a presbyter, yet he adds, *Quid facit episcopus exceptâ ordinatione, quod presbyter non facit?* [*non faciat*, as Bishop Taylor particularly remarks,] *what doth a bishop besides ordination, which a presbyter doth not [may not do]?* That very exception exempts him from Aërianism, and those other clear testimonies, besides more which might be cited, show him, though but a presbyter, no friend to the equality of our presbyterians."—BISHOP HALL, *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part ii. sect. 21; Conf. *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*, sect. 6. See also BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR, *Episcopacy Asserted*, sect. 21; HOOKER, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book vii. ch. 5; BINGHAM, *Antiquities*, book ii. chap. 3, sect 5.

first, second, and third chapters of the Revelation, that the form of governing the church by Angels or Bishops was not only ratified and established in the time of the apostles, but it was confirmed by the very Son of God. And Ignatius calls that form “the order of Christ.”

And when Jerome writes that “it was decreed, in the whole world, that one chosen out of the presbyters should be placed over the rest;” and when I have demonstrated that, in the lifetime of the apostles, bishops were superior to presbyters, in ordination, and that each church had one placed over it; do we not without cause demand where, when, and by whom episcopacy was ordained? Episcopacy, therefore, is of divine right<sup>25</sup>.

Wherefore, all bishops are warned from hence, that they thoroughly weigh with themselves the nature of apostolical episcopacy, of which they glory that they are the successors.

That episcopacy had two things peculiar to it,—the privilege of succeeding, and the prerogative of ordaining<sup>26</sup>:—all other

<sup>25</sup> “Although we had not proved the immediate divine institution of episcopal power over presbyters and the whole flock, yet episcopacy is not less than an apostolical ordinance, and delivered to us by the same authority that the observation of the Lord’s day is. . . . Baptism of infants is most certainly a holy and charitable ordinance, and of ordinary necessity to all that ever cried, and yet the church hath founded this rite upon the tradition of the apostles. . . . Of the same consideration are divers other things in Christianity, as, the presbyters consecrating the eucharist. . . . This also rests upon the practice apostolical and traditive interpretation of holy church, and yet cannot be denied that so it ought to be, by any man that would not have his Christendom suspected. . . . To these I add the communion of women, — the distinction of books apocryphal from canonical,—that such books were

written by such evangelists and apostles,—the whole tradition of Scripture itself,—the apostles’ creed,—the feast of Easter. . . . These, and divers others of greater consequence, (which I dare not specify for fear of being misunderstood,) rely but upon equal faith with this of episcopacy, (though I should waive all the arguments for immediate divine ordinance,) and therefore it is but reasonable it should be ranked amongst the ‘credenda’ of Christianity, which the church hath entertained upon the confidence of that which we call ‘the faith of a Christian,’ whose master is truth itself.”—BP. JEREMY TAYLOR, *Episcopacy Asserted*, sect. 19.

<sup>26</sup> “Bishops had a power distinct from, and superior to, that of presbyters; as, of ordination;—and confirmation;—and jurisdiction.”—JEREMY TAYLOR, *Episcopacy Asserted*, sect. 32—34.

things were common to them with the presbyters. Therefore, both bishops and presbyters should so exercise themselves in godliness, should so free themselves from contempt by their conversation, and so make themselves examples to their flock: not neglecting especially the gift of prophesying received from above: but being wholly intent to reading, consolation, and teaching; to meditate on these things, to be wholly conversant in them; and so perpetually employed in this holy function and divine affairs, with this promise, that, if they shall do these things, they shall both save themselves and their auditors; but if, after the custom of some great ones, they follow the pride and luxury of this world, they shall both destroy themselves and them that hear them.

Such is the resolution of the question concerning the origin and institution of episcopacy by the learned Scultet: and in this short treatise, together with the notes which I have appended from the writings of our own divines, we have as complete a representation of the views of those who maintain the doctrine of the apostolical institution as can be comprised within the limits of the present work.

The following passage, extracted from Lindsay's Preface to MASON'S *Vindication of the Church of England*, may perhaps be considered by some persons as giving, in brief and general terms, a still more satisfactory representation of the truth upon this subject. It became a fashion, at least as early as the third century, to represent the Christian ministry as formed, by divine dispensation, upon the model of the Aaronic priesthood.

“When Almighty God, the sovereign disposer of his creatures, thought fit, in his divine wisdom, to gather a church in the world, he himself did institute a holy priesthood in the tribe of Levi, whose peculiar office it was to offer sacrifice to him for the sins of the whole people, and to bless them in the name of the Lord. And this priesthood, by his own express appointment, consisted of three distinct orders, namely, a high priest, priests, and Levites; all which, in their respective degrees of subordination, being expressly called and selected out of the rest of the tribes of Israel by God himself, were also, by the like



divine appointment, formally and solemnly consecrated to their respective offices, with a grant thereof to them and their heirs male, in due course of succession, exclusive of, and (as to their sacerdotal powers) wholly distinct from, and independent upon, all persons whatsoever.

“How sacred and inviolable this office was, appears evidently, among divers others, in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the dreadful judgment inflicted upon them and all their adherents, for their rebellious and schismatical invasion of that sacred function; which the Holy Ghost has recorded as a rebellion against the Lord who had instituted the same, and honoured it with the sanction of his divine authority.

“Agreeable to which Levitical hierarchy, our blessed Saviour selected and separated a people, called his church, from the rest of mankind, and constituted them an incorporation, with laws, governors, and subjects, rights and privileges, purely spiritual: in which he himself, in person, sustained the office of high priest and bishop, being the supreme ruler of his church; under whom the apostles were then only as priests; and under them again the seventy disciples, as in the place of Levites. But when he had, immediately before his ascension, conferred upon his apostles the plenitude of power, he thereby preferred them to the first order, namely, that of bishops; under whom we find a second order, in every church, deriving their authority and mission from them, namely, elders, presbyters, or priests; and under both, a third, called deacons. Who did all, accordingly, exercise their respective offices, as committed unto them by God, independent on the secular powers, and notwithstanding any temporal prohibition to the contrary.

“Nor did these orders in the church cease with the apostles themselves; but they provided for the continuance of the same ‘alway, even unto the end of the world,’ by consecrating into their own order and fellowship, in the Apostolical College, Timothy, Titus, Silvanus, Sosthenes, Epaphroditus, and others; whom St. Paul styles his partners, fellow-helpers, brethren, companions in labour, and fellow-soldiers; yea, and expressly apostles too; joining them with himself in the authoritative part of several of his epistles; and to whom it peculiarly belonged

(in right of their office), ‘to set in order the things that were wanting,’ or necessary to be done, in the church, and particularly to ordain elders or presbyters ‘in every city,’ in subordination to themselves. For to them, and to their respective true and lawful successors, no less than to the apostles themselves, are those words of our blessed Saviour applied, ‘As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.—All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: go ye therefore and disciple all nations, &c. And lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.’ Which they likewise did (as the apostles had done before), notwithstanding all the threatenings and terrors of the temporal powers; for which many of them were glorious martyrs and confessors; as is well known to all who are acquainted with ecclesiastical history.

“Now, of these bishops, or overseers, as they were called, (from their having the oversight over all the flock of Christ,) we find St. James the Just, the first who was called, at Jerusalem; St. Peter at Antioch, and afterwards of the Jewish Proselytes, as was St. Paul of the Gentile converts, at Rome; St. Mark at Alexandria; Timothy at Ephesus; Titus in Crete; Dionysius at Athens, &c. Every true church of Christ being able, at this day, to produce a catalogue of their bishops, in a due course of succession, from the first planting of Christianity among them.”

§ 6.—DIVISION OF THE CHURCH INTO METROPOLITICAL AND PATRIARCHAL DIOCESES AT THE LATTER END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

THE Greek word *Διοίκησις*, as denoting a portion of territory, was at first applied to a district subject to the jurisdiction of a Roman prætor; and in this sense we find the word frequently used by Cicero (e. g., *ad Famil.* iii. 8; xiii. 53, 67; *ad Attic.* v. 21). This meaning of the word was afterwards enlarged, so that during the period of the Byzantine Empire it denoted a district containing several distinct provinces subject to the authority of one chief magistrate or governor; (*διοίκησις δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ πολλὰς ἐπαρχίας ἔχουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ*, says an old *Glossary*.) The governor of such a diocese, who resided in the metropolis or chief city of

the district, was a *præfectus prætorio*; and the several provinces of which the diocese consisted, were each placed under the immediate jurisdiction of a *comes* or *vicarius*.

When Christianity had become the religion of the empire, the division and administration of the church were gradually brought to a conformity with the model of the civil government, with which it also became continually more and more intimately blended. Hence the term *diœcesis* was applied to a large section of the church corresponding with the civil district distinguished by that name; at the head of which stood an archbishop or metropolitan, corresponding to the *præfectus prætorio*, having his residence in the same metropolis, and intrusted with the superintendence of the bishops of the several *parochiæ* or sees. Such is the meaning of the word diocese in the ecclesiastical history of the fourth and fifth centuries. In later times, as is well known, the term has been employed to denote the district committed to the care of an individual bishop; which was included as a *παροικία*, *parochia*, under the term diocese in its earlier acceptation.

From a work, quoted by Bingham, which is supposed to have been compiled by some unknown author during the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, we learn that the whole Roman empire was at that time placed under the jurisdiction of four *præfecti prætorio*, to each of whom were assigned several dioceses, which were again subdivided into numerous provinces. These divisions and subdivisions of the empire, with the corresponding distributions of ecclesiastical government, were the following:—

#### I. PRÆFECTUS PRÆTORIO PER ORIENTEM.

FIVE dioceses were subject to his jurisdiction; namely,—  
 1. The *Oriental* diocese, properly so called. 2. The diocese of *Egypt*. 3. The diocese of *Asia*. 4. The diocese of *Pontus*.  
 5. The diocese of *Thrace*.

1. *The Oriental diocese* contained fifteen provinces; namely,—  
 —1. *Palæstina*. 2. *Phœnicia*. 3. *Syria*. 4. *Cilicia*. 5. *Cyprus*.  
 6. *Arabia*. 7. *Isauria*. 8. *Palæstina Salutaris*. 9. *Palæstina Secunda*. 10. *Phœnicia Libani*. 11. *Phœnicia Euphratensis*.

12. Syria Salutaris. 13. Osroena. 14. Mesopotamia. 15. Cilicia Secunda.

2. *The diocese of Egypt* consisted of six provinces; namely,—  
1. Libya Superior. 2. Libya Inferior. 3. Thebais. 4. Ægyptus (i. e., Egypt Proper). 5. Arcadia. 6. Augustannica.

3. *The diocese of Asia* included eleven provinces; namely,—  
1. Pamphylia. 2. Hellespontus. 3. Lydia. 4. Pisidia. 5. Lycaonia. 6. Phrygia Pacatiana. 7. Phrygia Salutaris. 8. Lycia. 9. Caria. 10. Insulæ Cyclades. 11. Asia Proconsularis.

4. *The diocese of Pontus* was composed of eleven provinces; namely,—1. Galatia. 2. Bithynia. 3. Honorias. 4. Cappadocia Prima. 5. Paphlagonia. 6. Pontus Polemoniacus. 7. Helenopontus. 8. Armenia Prima. 9. Armenia Secunda. 10. Galatia Salutaris. 11. Cappadocia Secunda.

5. *The diocese of Thrace* was formed by six provinces; namely,—1. Europa. 2. Thracia (i. e., Thrace Proper.) 3. Hæmimontis. 4. Rhodope. 5. Mœsia Secunda. 6. Scythia.

The territorial divisions of the Church correspond to this civil distribution of the Roman empire during the fourth century, and part of the fifth, throughout the Oriental diocese. “By comparing,” says Bingham, “the broken fragments that remain in the acts and subscriptions of the ancient councils, with the notitia of the empire, and conferring both with the later notitiæ of the church, it plainly appears that the church was divided into dioceses and provinces much after the same manner as the empire.” With reference to the large district already described, this conformity appears from the following table:—

1. <i>The Oriental Diocese.</i>	<i>Patriarch of Antioch.</i>
Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Palæstina Prima . . . . .	Cæsarea.
2. Phœnicia . . . . .	Tyrus.
3. Syria . . . . .	} Antiochia (seat of the Patriarch).
4. Cilicia Prima . . . . .	
5. Cyprus . . . . .	Constantia.
6. Arabia . . . . .	Bostra.
7. Isauria . . . . .	Seleucia.
8. Palæstina Salutaris . . . . .	Jerusalem or A'li.

Provinces.	Metropolises.
9. Palestina Secunda . . . . .	Scythopolis.
10. Phœnicia Libani . . . . .	Emissa.
11. ——— Euphratensis . . . . .	Hierapolis.
12. Syria Salutaris . . . . .	Apamea.
13. Osroene . . . . .	Edessa.
14. Mesopotamia . . . . .	Amida.
15. Cilicia Secunda . . . . .	Anazerbus.

N.B.—The new patriarchate of Jerusalem, consisting of the provinces of Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia, was formed out of this patriarchate by the Emperor Theodosius II. and the General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 450.

2. *Diocese of Egypt.* *Patriarch of Alexandria.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Libya Superior . . . . .	Ptolemais.
2. ——— Inferior . . . . .	Dranicon.
3. Thebais . . . . .	Antinoc, or Lycopolis.
4. Ægyptus . . . . .	Alexandria.
5. Arcadia . . . . .	Oxyrinchus.
6. Augustammica . . . . .	Pelusium.

*Diocese of Asia.* *Exarch of Ephesus.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Pamphylia . . . . .	Perga, or Sida.
2. Hellespontus . . . . .	Cyzicus.
3. Lydia . . . . .	Sardes.
4. Pisidia . . . . .	Antiochia.
5. Lycaonia . . . . .	Iconium.
6. Phrygia Pacatiana . . . . .	Laodicea.
7. ——— Salutaris . . . . .	Synada.
8. Lycia . . . . .	Myra.
9. Caria . . . . .	Aphrodisias.
10. Insulæ Cyclades . . . . .	Rhodus.
11. Asia Proconsularis . . . . .	Ephesus.

4. *Diocese of Pontus.* *Exarch of Casarca.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Galatia . . . . .	Ancyra.
2. Bithynia . . . . .	Nicomedia.

Province.	Metropoles.
3. Cappadocia Prima . . . . .	Cæsarea.
4. ———— Secunda . . . . .	Tyana.
5. Honorias . . . . .	Claudiopolis.
6. Paphlagonia . . . . .	Gangra.
7. Pontus Polemoniachus . . . . .	Neocæsarea.
8. Helenopontus . . . . .	Amasea.
9. Armenia Prima . . . . .	Sebastia.
10. ———— Secunda . . . . .	Melitine.
11. Galatia Salutaris . . . . .	Pessinus, or Justinianopolis.

5. *Diocese of Thrace.*

*Exarch, first of Heraclea, afterwards of Constantinople.*

Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Europa . . . . .	Heraclea.
2. Thracia . . . . .	Philippopolis.
3. Hæmimontis . . . . .	Hadrianopolis.
4. Rhodope . . . . .	Trajanopolis.
5. Mœsia Secunda . . . . .	Marcianopolis.
6. Scythia . . . . .	Tomi.

This patriarchate was afterwards included in the more favoured patriarchate of Constantinople.

## II. PRÆFECTUS PRÆTORIO PER ILLYRICUM.

ONLY two dioceses were committed to the superintendence of the Præfectus Prætorio per Illyricum; namely,—1. The diocese of *Macedonia*. 2. The diocese of *Dacia*.

1. *The diocese of Macedonia* contained seven provinces; namely,—1. Achaia. 2. Macedonia. 3. Creta. 4. Thessalia. 5. Epirus Vetus. 6. Epirus Nova.

2. *The diocese of Dacia* consisted of five provinces; namely,—1. Dacia Mediterranea. 2. Dacia Ripensis. 3. Mœsia Prima. 4. Dardania. 5. A part of Macedonia Salutaris and Prævalitana.

The corresponding ecclesiastical divisions are as follow:—

1. <i>Diocese of Macedonia.</i>	<i>Exarch of Thessalonica.</i>
Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Achaia . . . . .	Corinthus.
2. Macedonia . . . . .	Thessalonica.

Provinces.	Metropoles.
3. Creta . . . . .	Gortyna.
4. Thessalia . . . . .	Larissa.
5. Epirus Vetus . . . . .	Nicopolis.
6. — Nova . . . . .	Dyrrachium.

*Exarch, first of Sardica, afterwards of Achridis, or Justiniana Prima.*

2. *Diocese of Dacia.*

Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Dacia Mediterranea . . . . .	Sardica.
2. — Ripensis . . . . .	*Uncertain.
3. Mœsia Prima . . . . .	*Uncertain.
4. Dardania . . . . .	Scupi.
5. Prævalitana . . . . .	Achridis.

### III. PRÆFECTUS PRÆTORIA ITALIÆ.

THREE dioceses were subject to the jurisdiction of this governor; namely,—1. The diocese of *Italy*. 2. The diocese of *Illyria*. 3. The diocese of *Africa*.

1. *The diocese of Italy* contained seventeen provinces; namely,—1. Venetia. 2. Æmilia. 3. Liguria. 4. Flaminia and Picenum Annonarium. 5. Tuscia and Umbria. 6. Picenum Suburbicarium. 7. Campania. 8. Sicilia. 9. Apulia and Calabria. 10. Lucania and Bruttii. 11. Alpes Cottia. 12. Rhætia Prima. 13. Rhætia Secunda. 14. Samnium. 15. Valeria. 16. Sardinia. 17. Corsica.

2. *The diocese of Illyria* was composed of six provinces; namely,—1. Pannonia Secunda. 2. Savia. 3. Dalmatia. 4. Pannonia Prima. 5. Norieum Mediterraneum. 6. Noricum Ripense.

3. *The diocese of Africa* consisted of six provinces; namely,—1. Byzacium. 2. Numidia. 3. Mauritania Sitiphensis. 4. Mauritania Cæsariensis. 5. Tripolis. 6. Africa Proconsularis.

The ecclesiastical distribution of this territory in the fourth century may be stated in the following manner. Towards the end of the fifth century, however, Rome was exalted to the rank of one of the five great patriarchates.

1. *Diocese of Italy.* *Exarch of Milan, Bishop of Rome.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Flaminia and . . . . .	} Bishop of Ravenna.
2. Picenum . . . . .	
3. Æmilia . . . . .	
4. Liguria . . . . .	} Exarch of Milan.
5. Alpes Cottiaë . . . . .	
6. Rhætia Prima . . . . .	
7. Picenum Suburbicarium	} Bishop of Rome.
8. Campania . . . . .	
9. Tuscia and Umbria	
10. Apulia and Calabria	
11. Lucania and Bruttii .	
12. Samnium . . . . .	
13. Valeria . . . . .	} Bishop of Aquileia.
14. Venetia and Istria . . . . .	
15. Sicilia . . . . .	Syracuse.
16. Sardinia . . . . .	Calaris.
17. Corsica . . . . .	*Uncertain.

2. *Diocese of Illyria.* *Exarch of Sirmium.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Pannonia Prima . . . . .	Laureacum.
2. ———— Secunda . . . . .	Sirmium.
3. Salvia . . . . .	Vindemana.
4. Dalmatia . . . . .	Solona.
5. Noricum Mediterraneum	*Uncertain.
6. ———— Ripense . . . . .	*Uncertain.

3. *Diocese of Africa.* *Exarch of Carthage.*

Provinces.	Metropolises.
1. Africa Proconsularis . . . . .	Carthago.
2. Byzacium . . . . .	Adrumetum.
3. Numidia . . . . .	Cirta Julia.
4. Tripolis . . . . .	Tripolis.
5. Mauritania Sitifensis . . . . .	Sitifi.
6. ———— Cæsarensis . . . . .	Cæsarea.

} The civil metropolises. The ecclesiastical followed the see of the senior bishop.

## IV. PREFECTUS PRÆTORIO GALLIARUM.

THE fourth Præfectus Prætorio had the command of three dioceses; namely,—1. The diocese of *Spain*. 2. The diocese of *Gaul*. 3. The diocese of *Britain*.



1. *The diocese of Spain* contained seven provinces, namely,—  
1. Bætica. 2. Lusitania. 3. Gallicia. 4. Tarraconensis. 5. Carthaginensis. 6. Tingitana. 7. Insulæ Baleares.

2. *The diocese of Gaul* consisted of seventeen provinces; namely,—1. Viennensis. 2. Lugdunensis. 3. Germania Prima. 4. Germania Secunda. 5. Belgica Prima. 6. Belgica Secunda. 7. Alpes Maritimæ. 8. Alpes Penninæ. 9. Maxima Sequanorum. 10. Aquitania Prima. 11. Aquitania Secunda. 12. Novem Populi. 13. Narbonensis Prima. 14. Narbonensis Secunda. 15. Lugdunensis Secunda. 16. Lugdunensis Tertia. 17. Lugdunensis Senonia.

3. *The diocese of Britain* included five provinces; namely,—  
1. Maxima Cæsarensis. 2. Valentia. 3. Britannia Prima. 4. Britannia Secunda. 5. Flavia Cæsarensis.

Corresponding divisions of the church:—

1. <i>Diocese of Spain.</i>	<i>Exarch uncertain.</i>
Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Bætica . . .	Hispalis.
2. Lusitania . . .	Emerita Augusta.
3. Gallicia . . .	Bracara.
4. Tarraconensis . . .	Tarraeco.
5. Carthaginensis . . .	Carthago Hispanica.
6. Tingitana . . .	} *Uncertain.
7. Insulæ Baleares . . .	
2. <i>Diocese of Gaul.</i>	<i>Exarch uncertain.</i>
Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Viennensis . . .	Arelate. Vienna.
2. Lugdunensis . . .	Lugdunum.
3. Germania Prima . . .	Treveris, hod. Mentz.
4. — Secunda . . .	Treveris, hod. Cologn.
5. Belgica Prima . . .	Treveris, hod. Treves.
6. — Secunda . . .	Rhemi.
7. Alpes Maritimæ . . .	Ebrodunum.
8. — Penninæ . . .	Vienna.
9. Maxima Sequanorum . . .	Visontium.
10. Aquitania Prima . . .	Bituriges.
11. — Secunda . . .	Burdigala.
12. Novem Populi . . .	Angusta Ausciorum.

Provinces.	Metropoles.
13. Narbonensis Prima .	Narbo.
14. ——— Secunda	Aquæ Sextiæ.
15. Lugdunensis Secunda .	Rothomagus.
16. ——— Tertia .	Turones.
17. ——— Senonia .	Senonæ.

3. *Diocese of Britain.**Exarch of York, if any.*

Provinces.	Metropoles.
1. Maxima Cæsareensis, <i>i. e.</i> at first, all from the Thames to the northern borders . . . . .	} Eboracum (York).
2. Flavia Cæsareensis, taken out of the former, and containing all from the Thames to the Humber.	
3. Britannia Prima, <i>i. e.</i> all south of the Thames . . . . .	} Londinum (London).
5. Britannia Secunda, <i>i. e.</i> all beyond the Severn . . . . .	
5. Valentia, beyond the Piets' wall . . . . .	} Eboracum.

## § 7.—OF COUNCILS.

MANY writers, Protestants as well as Romanists, have regarded the assembly of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, of which we read in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, as the first ecclesiastical council, and the model on which others were formed, in accordance, as they suppose, with a divine command or apostolic institution. But this view of the matter is unsupported by the testimony of antiquity, and is at variance with the opinions of the earliest writers, who refer to the councils of the church. Tertullian in his *Treatise de Jejuniis* (c. 13), speaks of the ecclesiastical assemblies (*concilia*) of the Asiatic and European Greeks, as a human institution; and in a letter written by Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, to Cyprian, about the middle of the third century, the same custom is referred to merely as a convenient arrangement existing at that time among the churches of Asia Minor, for common deliberation on matters of extraor-

dinary importance<sup>27</sup>. Besides this, it will be found upon examination that the councils of the church were assemblies of altogether a different nature from that of the apostles and elders;—the only point in which the alleged model was really imitated, being, perhaps, the form of preface to the decree,—“It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.”

By church councils, we understand certain solemn assemblies of the representatives of several independent churches, convened for the purpose of deliberating and making laws for the benefit of the whole church, or some considerable section of it.—The first traces of such councils are clearly to be found among the Greeks;—they originated in a country which had been accustomed to a federal system, and to the use of public assemblies in matters of legislature and jurisprudence; and they were, doubtless, occasioned by existing circumstances of the times. The first councils of which history makes mention, were those held between the years 160 and 173 in Asia Minor and Thrace, against the Montanists (*Conf. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 16*). It was inconvenient, or even impossible, for all the members of the several churches to meet together, especially during the prevalence of persecution; and hence, doubtless, arose the practice of sending bishops and presbyters as representatives or delegates of the communities to which they belonged. It soon became evident to the politic Greek bishops, say some, that assemblies thus constituted, and regularly held, would tend to establish and increase their influence, and to give distinction and power to the whole order of the clergy. Times and places were appointed for the assembling of yearly councils in a province; and it fell naturally to the lot of the chief archbishop or metropolitan to convene these periodical assemblies, to appoint his own city as the place of meeting, to act as president, to take the notes, and to draw up the decrees of the council.

It is well known that the Amphictyonic council (*σύνοδος*), composed of deputies from the several states of Greece, used to

<sup>27</sup> Necessario apud nos fit ut per singulos annos seniores et prepositi in unum conveniamus ad disponenda ea, quæ curæ nostræ commissa sunt,

ut, si quæ graviora sint, communi consilio dirigantur.—AP. CYPRIAN. *Ep. 75.*

meet twice in every year, namely, in spring and autumn, at Delphi; and that this institution, restored by Augustus after the battle of Actium, was in existence as late as the time of Pausanias. It is remarkable that, at the first Nicene council, and in the Apostolical Canons, the same seasons of the year are fixed for the regular Synods of the church (*Can. Apost.* 30; *Conc. Nic.* c. 5) And hence it has been supposed that the practice had existed from an earlier period, and had been formed at first upon the amphictyonic model. But it must be remembered that Firmilian speaks of the councils of the church, in his time, as having been held only once in the year,—“per singulos annos.”

Ecclesiastical councils, however, were not long confined to the countries in which they had received their origin. Towards the end of the second century, they increased in number and extent, on occasion especially of the disputes concerning the time of the celebration of Easter, carried on between the eastern and western churches. During the heat of this controversy, councils were held in all parts of Christendom, with the exception, perhaps, of Africa alone. Concerning this one question, for example, provincial councils were assembled in Palestine, at Cæsarea or Ælia; in the province of Rome under the presidency of the Roman bishop, Victor, as Metropolitan; in Pontus, under the presidency of the senior bishop, Palmas of Amastris; in Gaul, under the presidency of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons; in the province of Osroene in Mesopotamia; in Proconsular Asia at Ephesus, under the presidency of Polycrates, bishop of that city, as Metropolitan, who convened the neighbouring bishops, and composed the Synodal Epistle; and probably in other places. In the course of the third century, councils were held in Africa; and although they do not seem to have acquired so regular a form as among the Greeks, yet their number was greater in this country than in any other, especially during the latter half of the century. The controversy concerning the baptism of heretics, and the Novatian schism, furnished them with abundant matter for discussion.

*Extent of early councils.*—At first, councils do not appear to have received any fixed limits, even among the Greeks. The

earliest of those which were assembled in Asia, against the Montanists, were most probably provincial councils. Thus the council of Hierapolis, was that of the province of Phrygia, where the Montanists had made great progress; and the council held at Anchiolus, may, perhaps, be regarded as representing the whole province of Thrace; although this is doubtful, inasmuch as the chief bishop or metropolitan of Thrace had his seat at Heraclea. Subsequent councils, however, which met on occasion of the paschal controversy, were certainly provincial. The same may be said of those which were held in Arabia, in the years 243 and 246; of the council convened at Rome, by Cornelius, in 251; of that at Antioch, against Novatian; that at Rome, 260; and the three which met at Antioch against Paul of Samosata, from 264 to 269. But these were not after all *strictly* provincial; inasmuch as seats and votes were given to the clergy of other and distant parts, who sometimes attended in consequence of express and earnest invitation. Origen, for instance, was present, as a presbyter, in the Arabian councils; and the first council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata was distinguished by the presence of the metropolitan Firmilian from Cappadocia, the Bishops Gregory Thaumaturgus and Athenodorus from Pontus, Helenus, bishop of Tarsus, Nicolas of Iconia, Hymenæus of Jerusalem, Thecoteenus of Cæsarea, and the Arabian bishop, Maximus of Bostra. And, in like manner, many foreign bishops were present at the second and third councils held in the same city. The point was at length carried against Paul by the instrumentality of a single learned presbyter, Malchion.

On the other hand, the council of Iconia in Phrygia, A.D. 235, was something more than provincial; and that of Synada, in the same country (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 7), was something less. The councils held in Africa during the third century were for the most part provincial; although some were rather general councils of the African church, such as were regularly convened at the end of the fourth century under the name of *Concilia Plenaria*.

*Form or constitution.*—The church and bishop of the metropolis, or chief city of a province, naturally acquired, at a very early period, a superiority and influence over the other churches

in the district. Hence, when councils began to assemble, the lead and presidency was voluntarily conceded to the metropolitan bishop; and to him it was afterwards assigned by law. As a natural consequence of the privileges attached to this office of president,—and especially of the right of proposing or bringing forward the questions to be discussed,—the views and wishes of the metropolitan obtained a predominance in the council. And at length provincial synods became to a great extent the mere organs of the metropolitans; as they had been the great means of advancing them in the scale of the hierarchy.

It is certain that presbyters as well as bishops were admitted to deliberate and vote in the early councils; as appears from the language of Firmilian about the middle of the third century (ut seniores et præpositi in unum conveniamus), and from the celebrated examples of the presence of Origen in the Arabian councils, and of Malchion at the third council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata. Deacons also were present at the early synods, but it has been a matter of debate whether or not they were allowed to vote. They probably attended in the capacity of secretaries, or assistants, to the bishops. But from the language of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 28), respecting the first council of Antioch against Paul, it would seem that presbyters *and* deacons were present for the same purpose as bishops. “We might reckon up,” says he, “many other (bishops) together with presbyters and deacons who then assembled in the said city (Antioch) concerning this matter (namely, the heresy of Paul); but the aforementioned were the most celebrated among them.” It seems natural to conclude that presbyters and deacons attended the council for the same purpose as bishops,—that of sitting in judgment upon Paul of Samosata and his doctrines.

It has also been made a question whether or not the laity possessed seats and votes in the early councils. Walsh supposes that this privilege was conceded at least to laymen belonging to the place in which the council met, or, as others maintain, to lay deputies from the several provinces. But perhaps it is more correct to say that the laity never took any part in the proceedings; although they were allowed, and sometimes even invited, *to be present* during the deliberation of a council. The assembly

in the province of Arsinoë, A.D. 256, to which Walch refers in support of his opinion, was rather a religious conference or learned disputation than a regular council.

Notaries appear to have been first introduced in the Second Council of Antioch against Paul.

After the conversion of Constantine, the councils of the church fell under the influence of the Byzantine emperors; and at a still later period they submitted to the presidency and dictation of the Bishop of Rome.

The celebrated council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, is distinguished as having been the first which pronounced a decision respecting a Christian doctrine, or article of religious faith; as well as the first over which a temporal prince presided. It is also usually reckoned as the first general council; but it was, in fact, a council of only the Oriental church; the Spanish bishop Hosius, and two Roman presbyters, were the only ecclesiastics from the West by whom it was attended. The following works may be consulted for full particulars respecting this remarkable and important council:—*Historia Synodi Nicænæ, coactæ opera Constantini Constantii ante annos circa 1218, collecta et descripta a Joachimo Camerario.* Lips. 1552.—THOM. CACCINI *Storia del Concilio Niceno.*—JO. GEORG. DORSCHER *Exercitatio ad diatyposin Concilio Nicæni.*—TILLEMONT *Histoire du Concile Œcumenique de Nicée,* in his *Mémoires.*—BALTHAZAR MENTZER *Dissertatio de innocentia Concilii Nicæni.*—THOM. ITTIG, *Historia Concilii Nicæni.*—JO. LAMI *De Recta Patrum Nicænorum fide Dissertatio.*—A. W. ERNESTI *Disputatio qua Hosium Concilio Nicæno præsedisse ostenditur.*—NATALIS ALEXANDRI *Dissertationes de Nicæni Concilii convocacione, and De Præsidi Nicæni Concilii;* in *Thesaur. Theol. Venet.* 1762.

The number of Œcumenical or General Councils is variously reckoned by different churches.

The orthodox Greek church enumerates seven; namely,—

	A.D.
The First of Nicæa . . . . .	325
The First of Constantinople . . . . .	381
Ephesus . . . . .	431
Chalcedon . . . . .	451

	A. D.
The Second of Constantinople . . . .	553
The Third of Constantinople . . . .	680
The Second of Nicæa . . . . .	787

The church of Rome recognises eighteen general councils, sanctioned by the pope, of which the Council of Trent is the last. But Romish writers are not quite agreed upon this subject. A list set up in the Vatican, by command of Sixtus V., enumerates the following:—

	A. D.
The First of Nicæa . . . . .	325
The First of Constantinople . . . .	381
The First of Ephesus . . . . .	431
Chalcedon . . . . .	451
The Second of Constantinople . . . .	553
The Third of Constantinople . . . .	680
The Second of Nicæa . . . . .	787
The Fourth of Constantinople . . . .	869
The First Lateran . . . . .	1122
The Second Lateran . . . . .	1139
The Third Lateran . . . . .	1179
The Fourth Lateran . . . . .	1215
The First of Lyons . . . . .	1245
The Second of Lyons . . . . .	1274
Vienne . . . . .	1311
Florence . . . . .	1439
The Fifth Lateran . . . . .	1512
Trent . . . . .	1545

It appears from this list that the Councils of Pisa, A.D. 1409, of Constance, A.D. 1414, and of Basle, A.D. 1431, which are commonly regarded as general councils, are not recognised as such at Rome.

Protestants, for the most part, recognise four general councils; namely,—

	A. D.
Nicæa . . . . .	325
Constantinople . . . . .	381
Ephesus . . . . .	431
Chalcedon . . . . .	451

Some receive also,—

The Second of Constantinople . . . .	553
The Third of Constantinople . . . .	680



## CHAPTER IV.

## OF PRESBYTERS AND PRESBYTERIES.

## § 1.—OF THE NAME OR TITLE.

THE word *πρεσβύτερος*, signifying properly *an elder*, i.e., *an aged person*, is used in the New Testament, and afterwards by ecclesiastical writers, chiefly as a title of office or dignity; and it denotes superiority, or authority. “The name *πρεσβύτεροι*, presbyters or elders, is a word borrowed from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, where it commonly signifies rulers or governors, being (as St. Jerome notes) a name of office and dignity, and not a mere indication of men’s age, for elders were chosen not by their age, but by their merits and wisdom. So that, as a *senator* among the Romans, and an *alderman* in our own language, signifies a person of such an order and station, without any regard to his age; in like manner, a presbyter or elder in the Christian church is one who is ordained to a certain office, and authorized by his quality, not by his age, to discharge the several duties of that office and station, wherein he is placed.”

—BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book ii. chap. 19, § 1.

This name has been given in the Christian church to persons who exercise the offices of governing and teaching. At the first it appears to have denoted especially governors, such as were the *זְקֵנִים*, or *elders*, in the Jewish synagogue; but the duties of a governor and a teacher may be easily combined, and were in fact united at a very early period in the Christian church, as appears from the application of the word *πρεσβύτερος* even in the writings of the New Testament. The apostles entitled themselves *πρεσβυτέρους*, or *συμπρεσβυτέρους* (1 Peter v. 1; 2 John i.; compare Philipp. ii. 25); and they were certainly both governors and teachers. In some places we find the *πρεσβύτεροι* described as *ποιμένες και διδάσκαλοι*, i.e., pastors and teachers. And the twofold nature of their office is implied in a passage in the first Epistle to Timothy, which has been the subject of much criticism and of various interpretation in the

controversy which has arisen respecting the name and office of presbyter in the early church. This passage, to which frequent reference is made, is 1 Tim. v. 17; it stands thus in the original, and in our authorized version; Gr., οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν· μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ; Angl., “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.”

In the New Testament, and in the earliest ecclesiastical writers, the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are synonymous, and denote one and the same office.—See Acts xx. 17, 28; Philipp. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, seq.; Titus i. 5—7; and compare Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 1 Cor. xii. 28—30; Eph. iv. 11<sup>1</sup>.

#### § 2.—QUALITY AND OFFICE OF PRESBYTERS.

THE quality and office of the first presbyters or bishops have formed a subject of dispute.

It has been maintained by Presbyterians and Puritans, that the first Christian churches, having received from the founder no express rules on the subject, adopted for themselves a constitution or form of government which appeared to them most consistent with Christian liberty, and was sanctioned by the apostles. They framed a representative system, and delivered the whole administration of their affairs to a body of men, or committee, elected by the votes of all qualified members of the church. This body was called the πρεσβυτέριον, *the presbytery*. Of the members of this body, the presbyters, some were appointed to *govern* the church, and others to *teach*. And it was by an abuse

<sup>1</sup> Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸ πιδαιὸν ἐκαλοῦντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι (ἐκαλοῦντο) πρεσβύτεροι. ΣΗΝΥΣΟΤ. *Hom.* i. in Phil. i.; conf. *Hom.* xi. in 1 Tim. iii.—Ἐπισκόπους δὲ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους κλεῖν ἀμφότερα γὰρ εἶχον κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν τὰ ὀνόματα. κ. τ. λ. ΤΗΕΟΔΩΡΕΤ. *Comment.* in Phil. i.—Ὡς εἶναι δῆλον, ὅτι ὑπὸ τούτων ἐτίλουν οἱ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ κληθέντες ἐπίσκοποι,

τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου δηλονότι τὴν τάξιν πληροῦντες. *Ibid.* in Phil. ii. 25; conf. in 1 Tim. iii. 1.—Οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἦς σὺ εἶναι ἀφηγγῆ. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 24. In this latter passage Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus, bishops of Rome, are called presbyters by Ireneus, whose words Eusebius reports.

of the term that the latter came to be called especially, and exclusively, by the name which originally belonged to all alike,—presbyters.

This was the foundation of the presbyterian form of church government proposed by Calvin, and introduced at Geneva, and afterwards established in Scotland, Holland, and elsewhere; in which a presbytery was composed partly of the teachers, and partly of lay members of the church, chosen for that purpose.

Some have supposed that, in the New Testament, and the earliest writings of the church, the term *πρεσβύτερος* was applied especially to lay members; and that the first presbyters and bishops were no teachers, but only presidents and managers of ecclesiastical affairs. They adduce, in support of this opinion, 1 Tim. v. 17, and 1 Thess. v. 12. But, it has been replied, although in these passages the apostle may appear to make a distinction between *presiding* and *teaching* presbyters, and although the *πρεσβύτεροι προεστῶτες* may not be reckoned among the teachers, yet this cannot by any means warrant the conclusion that the majority of presbyters were not spiritual persons or preachers of the Gospel. On the contrary, such a supposition would represent the apostle as contradicting himself, since he elsewhere demands of bishops and presbyters, between whom he makes no distinction, the qualifications requisite for the office of a teacher. According to 1 Tim. iii. 2, a bishop ought to be *διδασκατικός*, “apt to teach;” and according to Titus i. 9, (with which compare v. 5, 6,) *δυνατὸς καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν*, i. e., (more accurately than in our common version,) “able both to exhort with sound doctrine, and to convince (refute) the gainsayers;” in other words, qualified both to instruct the church, and to answer opponents.—See also 1 Cor. xii. 25, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 7.

But, whether the quality of presbyters can be accurately determined from the writings of the New Testament or not, it is evident that from the earliest formation of an hierarchy in the church, and as soon as any distinction began to be made between clergy and laity, the term presbyter was always exclusively applied to ordained spiritual teachers.

Passages are of frequent occurrence in writings of the third and fourth centuries, in which Christians are exhorted to obey the *ἐπίσκοπος καὶ πρεσβυτέριον*, the *bishop and presbytery*, as the apostles, or even the Lord himself<sup>2</sup>.

Expressions of this kind in the epistles ascribed to Ignatius (*Ep. ad Trall.* § 4, 9; *Ad Magnes.* § 6), have been reasonably regarded as the work of a later hand. It is impossible to attach any importance to any separate portions of those epistles, in which it is highly probable that spurious clauses have been artfully mixed up with the genuine expressions of the apostolical father.

The word *πρεσβύτερος* was usually retained in ecclesiastical writings; or, if translated into Latin, it was rendered by *Sacerdos*, *pastor*, or the like. The word *senior*, which is its literal translation, very rarely occurs; and is never applied to spiritual parsons. In Optetus Milevitanus (lib. i. *De Schism. Don.* c. 17), and Augustin (*Ep.* 137), we read of *episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, et seniores, or seniores plebis*; and we find *Clerus et seniores* expressly distinguished. Bingham compares these *seniores* with our churchwardens, vestrymen, or stewards; persons not concerned with instruction, or discipline, or any spiritual matters; but intrusted with the care of the goods, or the outward affairs, of the church.

The office or duties of presbyters consisted in the following particulars:—

1. In the earliest times, when no formal distinction between *ἐπίσκοποι* and *πρεσβύτεροι* had taken place, the presbyters, especially the *προεστώτες* (1 Tim. v. 17), discharged those episcopal functions, which afterwards, when a careful distinction of ecclesiastical offices had been made, they were not permitted to discharge, otherwise than as substitutes or vicars of a bishop. Instances, however, do sometimes occur, in later times, of presbyters having officiated in matters which, according to the canon law, belonged only to the episcopal office.

2. When the bishop was regarded as president of the whole

<sup>2</sup> See IGNAT. (?) *Ep. ad Trall.* § 4, 9; | ii. c. 23; CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. *Ep. ad Magnes.* § 6; *Const. Apost.* lib. | iii. c. 15; SYNES. *Ep.* 67.

course of public worship, and the administrator of all sacred offices, the presbyters performed the *sacra ordinaria*, or common services of the church, as his representatives or assistants. In the earliest times, *teaching* and *preaching* were considered as the chief duties of the bishop; and hence it was that presbyters were allowed to preach only by permission of the bishop, and that, in many cases, the duty was intrusted to deacons. This, however, holds good only concerning those churches, in which both bishops and presbyters were present, and during the times in which bishops were both able and willing to preach. Jerome (*Ep. 2. ad Nep.*; compare *Dial. c. Lucif.*) complains that presbyters, in his time, did not receive full liberty to preach. During the first seven centuries, the bishops were assiduous in the discharge of this part of their office. But afterwards, the duty of preaching devolved chiefly upon the presbyters.

3. With regard to the sacraments, presbyters were regarded as *συν λειτουργοί*, *co-ministri*, *co-sacerdotes*, *joint* or *fellow-ministers*, in accordance with the theory that whatever was done in the church was done by the bishop. This still appears in the office of ordination, which is called exclusively the work of the bishop; inasmuch as the assistant presbyters, as well as the bishop, lay their hands on the heads of the persons ordained. (See *Conc. Carthag. iv. c. 3, 4*; *Constit. Eccl. Alex. c. 8*; *DECRET. Gratiani, dist. xxiii. c. 8*.) In later times, the presbyters became the ordinary officiating ministers in the administration of the sacraments; especially,—

*In the office of baptism*; and this particularly after the introduction of infant baptism. Confirmation was usually administered by the bishop alone, although some exceptions occur.

ii. *In the sacrament of the Lord's supper*. The consecration of the elements has been always regarded as the chief office in this sacrament; and this was performed by presbyters, unless the bishop was present. It was also an old rule for the bishop, if present, to distribute the bread; and to pronounce the concluding benediction.

The discharge of these eucharistical functions was viewed by the ancient church as the highest point of a presbyter's dignity and office. (see *Chrysost. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 1*; *lib. vi. c. 4*; *Homil. 4 in Jesa.*; *Homil. 15 in 2 Ep. in Corinthi*).

With reference to this part of his office, the presbyter was called *μεσίτης*, *mediator*; an appellation which Augustin very properly censured, as derogating from the dignity and office of the true and only Mediator of the Christian covenant (*Contr. Parmen.* lib. ii. c. 8; compare *De Civ. Dei*, lib. ix. c. 15). It ought to be remarked that this word was used also to denote that the presbyter occupied a middle rank between the bishop and deacon.

iii. The presbyter took part in conducting *the offices of public penance*; which, however, were under the superintendence of the bishop.

iv. In the early church, mention is made especially of *public prayer* (*προσφώνησις*, *εὐχὴ τῶν πιστῶν*), and the *ἐπίκλησις*, or *collect*, as a function of the bishop or presbyter, besides the general conduct of divine worship, and the oversight of deacons and inferior officers.—(*Constit. Apost.* c. 9, 10, 11; *Concil. Milevit.* c. 12.)

4. It is evident that the presbyters took part with the bishops in the exercise of *ecclesiastical discipline*, with regard to clergy as well as laity. (See CYPRIAN, *Ep.* xxxiii. al. 38; vi. al. 14; 46 (49); 24 (29); 55 (59); BASIL. M. *Ep.* 319; EPIPHAN. *Hær.* 57, § 1; 69, § 3; CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. iii. c. 15.) Differences sometimes arose respecting the extent and application of their power in these matters; but the principle of a right of concurrence was firmly established, if not in favour of individual presbyters, yet, at least, in favour of the collective body, or the presbytery (or in cathedral establishments, of more modern date, the chapter).

The influence of the presbyters extended also to the *management of church property*, and the business of *Synods*. It appears indeed, that presbyters had seats and votes in several synods. (See EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43; vii. c. 28, 30; *Concil. Illiber.* c. 36; *Arclat.* 1; *Tolet.* 1; *Bracar.* 2; *Chalcedon*; and others.)

5. The *chief business* of the presbyters, however, was *the cure of souls*, both general and special. In the discharge of this useful and important office, they often encountered great difficulties.

### § 3.—DIFFERENT ORDERS OR CLASSES OF PRESBYTERS.

1. By a distinction analogous to that observed with regard to bishops, presbyters were divided into those of the city and of the country. The latter (*ἐπιχώριοι πρεσβύτεροι*, *regionarii*, *rural presbyters*), were regarded as inferior to the *city presbyters* (*πρεσβύτεροι πόλεως*).

2. The oldest among the presbyters was styled *Ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος*, *archpresbyter*, or *πρωτοπρεσβύτερος*, *pastor primarius*, *first presbyter*, (GREG. NAZ., *Orat.* 20; *Conc. Chalced.* c. 14).

From the fifth to the seventh centuries, these archpresbyters possessed great influence, and shared in the administration of the bishop's office, as suffragans and general vicars. When the see was vacant, they discharged all the episcopal duties; and usually succeeded to the bishopric. Some parts of the episcopal administration were committed exclusively to their care. Hence misunderstandings often arose between them and the bishops; and the latter were in the habit of favouring and supporting the archdeacons, as a check upon the power of the archpresbyters. The first trace of this is to be found in the canons of the fourth council of Carthage (c. 17). We may not, perhaps, be right in admitting the account of Isidore, that the archpresbyters were subjected to the archdeacons as early as the seventh century; but this subordination was established by Innocent III., (*De offic. Archidiacon.* c. 7), "Archipresbyteri, qui a pluribus decani nuncupantur, archidiaconi jurisdictioni se noverint subjacere," *Let the archpresbyters, commonly called deans, know that they are subject to the jurisdiction of the archdeacon.*

The word *decanus*, *dean*, which we find in this passage, was unknown in the earlier centuries. *Decanus* (*δεκαδάρχος*, *δεκάρχος*), is originally a military title, and is explained by, *decem militibus præpositus et contubernii præfectus*, *i. e.*, *a subaltern officer*. The *copiatæ*, likewise (see chap. xiii. of this book), were so called. (JUSTIN. *Nor.* 43, 59.) The name is given by Augustin (*De Mor. Eccl. Cath.* c. 31), and Jerome (*Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.*), to the overseers of monks and cœnobia. The *præpositi canonicorum cathedralium*, heads of cathedral chapters, were not called *decani*, *deans*, until the eleventh or

twelfth century. The name was first applied to them in England. These deans have hitherto maintained their station and importance; but the rural deans, or archpresbyters, were for the most part supplanted by periodontæ or visitors, and became entirely subject to the archdeacons or general vicars.

The feminine *πρεσβυτέρα*, or *πρεσβυτις*, presbytera, or presbyterissa, is of frequent occurrence in early writers, and denotes either the wife of a presbyter, or a female officer of the church (*vidua*, *diaconissa*). Concerning their office, see COTELER. *ad Constitut. Apost.* lib. iii. c. g, and ZIMMERMAN, *De Presbyteris et Presbyterissis*.

## CHAPTER V.

### OF DEACONS.

#### § 1.—THEIR NAME AND RANK.

THE terms *διάκονος*, *διακονία*, and *διακονεῖν*, were originally applied to any kind of service or ministration. They are of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, both in a general, and in a more limited, signification; but are for the most part applied especially to acts of religious or spiritual service, and ministrations for the good of the church. Thus we read of *διακονία τοῦ λόγου*, Acts vi. 4; *διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος*, 2 Cor. iii. 8; *διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας*, 2 Cor. ix. 12; *κλῆρος τῆς διακονίας*, Acts i. 17, 25; xx. 25; xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13; *διάκονοι κυρίου*, 1 Cor. iii. 5; *διάκονοι καινῆς διαθήκης*, 2 Cor. iii. 6; *διάκονοι Θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. vi. 4. See also 1 Pet. iv. 10; i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 18; Acts xix. 22. These passages refer to the labours and zeal of the apostles, and their assistants, for the edification, discipline, and order of the churches which they had founded. The apostles themselves are entitled *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*.

More particularly, *διακονία* sometimes denotes a peculiar service or ministration, appointed by the apostles in the churches; and *διάκονος* denotes an almoner, or an officer who presided over the distribution of alms to the poor; *an overseer of the poor*.



See Acts xi. 29, 30; xii. 25; Rom. xvi. 1, 31; xv. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1, 13, 19, 20; Heb. vi. 10; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 10, 12, 13; Phil. i. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11.

We have a particular account of the appointment of the first deacons, or overseers of the poor, in the church of Jerusalem, in Acts vi. 1—7. Concerning this narrative, it may be well to remark;—first, That the arrangement there mentioned was made by the apostles, in consequence of a misunderstanding which had arisen between the Jewish and Gentile Christians; the latter having complained that their widows were neglected *in the daily ministration* (ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ).—Secondly, The history presupposes that there were already almoners or overseers of the poor in the church, but that these had belonged exclusively to the class of Jewish believers; and it has been supposed that the institution of such officers had passed over to the Christian assemblies from the Jewish synagogues, to each of which three such eleemosynary officers were attached, who were intrusted with the care of the poor. (MOSHEIM, *de Rebus Christian. ante Constant. M.*) Perhaps there were already seven such officers in the church at Jerusalem.—Thirdly, The seven deacons whose election is here recorded, were Grecians (Hellenists), as appears by their names, mentioned in verse 5; and it is likely that they were appointed only on behalf of the Hellenists; since the Jewish members of the church would have felt themselves aggrieved, if the entire management of the alms had been intrusted to persons of the other class.—Fourthly, Although it is said that these men were full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, and concerning one of them that he was full of faith and power, yet it does not appear that they were appointed to the ministration of the world; but rather the contrary may be inferred from v. 2, and v. 4.—Fifthly, They were not spiritual persons, in the ecclesiastical sense of the term; but yet at their ordination they received an ecclesiastical appointment, and a liturgical character (διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας, 2 Cor. xi. 12).

Such was the origin of deacons, whom we find here to have been at first intrusted with the management or administration of eleemosynary affairs, but with no other office. They appear to have existed for a considerable time in the church of Jerusalem

alone. At least it is remarkable that we find no further trace of such officers, either in the Acts of the Apostles (not even in chap. xiv. 23, where, as well as in Tit. i. 5, we might have expected to find some mention of them), or in the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, and Thessalonians.

In Philippians i. 1, we find a simple mention of “bishops and deacons,” without any allusion to the offices which they had been appointed to fulfil.

But in 1 Tim. iii. 8—13, we meet with certain regulations respecting the qualifications of deacons, which entirely disagree with the nature of this office, as described in the Acts of the Apostles.—First, in this place the *διάκονοι* are named immediately after the *ἐπίσκοποι*, of whom St. Luke makes no mention.—Secondly, in the Acts they are represented as having been chosen by the members of the church; but it has been thought, according to the analogy of Titus i. and ii., that Timothy was fully authorized to make the appointment by himself.—Thirdly, if we suppose, as is usual, that the *πρεσβύτεροι* were included in the term *ἐπίσκοποι*, then the *διάκονοι* evidently compose a class distinct from both. But if the *διάκονοι* and *πρεσβύτεροι* are identical (since they have the same kind of *διακονία* or ministry), it would follow, that there is no mention in the New Testament of any third order. The ancients adopted the former interpretation, and hence they always united the terms *Ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*.

In the earliest ecclesiastical documents after the date of the New Testament, deacons are mentioned as spiritual persons, and assistants of the bishops and presbyters in the duties of divine worship, and generally in the discharge of their office, and especially,—to use a modern military term, which seems exactly to convey the requisite idea,—as the bishop’s adjutants. Early writers continually repeat the statement, that the bishop cannot be without his deacons. In the Apostolical Constitutions it is said, that the deacon ought to refer everything to the bishop, as Christ did to the Father; and that he was to derive all his authority from the bishop, according to the same analogy; which, it may be observed, was a favourite analogy on this subject during the second and third centuries. And it is added, “Let the

deacon be the bishop's ear and eye, his mouth, his heart, and his soul."—(*Constitut. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 44.) A little before (lib. ii. c. 30), the deacon had been called ἄγγελος καὶ προφήτης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *the bishop's messenger and interpreter.*

It appears from the tenour of several ecclesiastical canons, that at a very early period the deacons made great account of their relation to the bishop, and were disposed to refuse their assistance to presbyters, on the ground that it was their duty to attend solely on the bishops. Thus in the eighteenth canon of the Council of Nice we read, "Let the deacons abide in their own station, knowing that they are indeed the ministers of the bishop, but that they are inferior to the presbyters." And this was confirmed by the thirty-seventh canon of the fourth Council of Carthage; "Let the deacon know that he is the minister of the presbyter as well as of the bishop." The latter council (can. 4) ordered, that the deacon should be ordained by the bishop *alone*, "quia non ad sacerdotium sed ad ministerium consecratur," i. e., *on the ground that he was consecrated not as a priest, but as a minister.*

As the dignity of bishops increased, so also the rank and influence of deacons gained ground; especially of those of their number who were entitled Ἀρχιδιάκονοι, whose services the bishops made use of as a check upon the power of the presbyteries. One circumstance which favoured the growth of the influence of deacons was, that their numbers were not suffered to extend; and this was in consequence of a persuasion which existed, that the institution of the seven deacons at Jerusalem was designed as a pattern for the whole church. We learn from Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43,) that in the third century there were only seven deacons in Rome, where, at the same time, the presbyters amounted to forty-six. Such also was the case, according to Sozomen, in his time, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 19.) but he adds, that "the number varied in other places." According to JUSTIN. *Noxell.* III. c. 1; CXXIII. c. 13, deacons were at that time very numerous in Constantinople. At an earlier period, the church found itself restricted by the fifteenth canon of the Council of Neocæsarea, which allowed of only seven deacons in large cities. Hence the remark of Augustin and

Jerome, that the paucity of numbers gave weight to the office of deacon.

It appears to have been with a view to uphold this dignity of the diaconate, and at the same time to provide for the discharge of the numerous sacred and ecclesiastical duties which pertained to the office, that a new order of officers was appointed under the title of *ὑποδιάκονοι*, *subdeacons*. These persons undertook the discharge of the inferior officers which belonged to the deacon, and hence retained the name *ὑπηρέται*, i. e. ministers or servants. Hence it is that, in several ecclesiastical systems, the subdeacons are reckoned among the ordines majores or superiores.

Deacons were sometimes called Levites; especially in the later councils of the western church, in which the corresponding term sacerdotes, priests, was applied to presbyters.

#### § 2.—OFFICE AND DUTIES OF DEACONS.

WITH regard to the duties of deacons, it follows from the nature of their ministry, that they discharged certain offices belonging to the bishops and presbyters, which the latter were unable or unwilling to undertake; those functions being always excepted which, according to ecclesiastical laws, or established usage, could not be so delegated to an inferior minister. Those episcopal functions which the bishop could not commit to the presbyter, could not be devolved upon the deacon; and although this was sometimes done, the proceeding was always irregular. The greatest number of exceptions were made in favour of archdeacons.

When deacons were entrusted with the discharge of episcopal functions, they regarded themselves as representatives of the bishop, in whose name they acted, and they claimed a superiority over presbyters, which often furnished ground of complaint.

From the duties of a presbyter which the deacons were empowered to perform, the consecration of the eucharist formed the only exception. Deacons were strictly forbidden to perform that office.—(*Concil. Nicen.* c. 18; *Arelat.* i. c. 15; *Ancyr.* c. 2; *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 28; *HIERON. Ep.* 85, *ad Eragr.*; *Dial. c. Lucif.*; *AUGUSTIN. Quæst. V. et N. T. qu.* 46; *HILAR. Fragm.*)

The prohibitions of councils prove that some cases had occurred in which deacons had officiated in this matter; but the rule, at all events, was always maintained.

Hence deacons were called, at an early period, sacerdotēs secundi vel tertii ordinis, *priests of the second or third order*.

It must not, however, be supposed that deacons acted only as deputies or substitutes. From the time in which the ecclesiastical hierarchy was first organized, certain offices were especially entrusted to the deacons, the discharge of which was regarded as their appropriate duty.

1. It was their especial duty *to assist the bishop or presbyter in the administration of the Lord's supper*. This is expressly stated in a passage of Justin Martyr<sup>1</sup>.

In the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii. c. 13), the bishop is said to distribute the consecrated bread, and the deacon the cup. In his absence this duty was discharged by the presbyter.

But the deacons performed also other duties in the course of this sacred service.

i. They took down and called over the names of the communicants.—(CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 9, al. 16; HIERON., *Comm. in Ezeck.* 18.)

ii. They received the Easter offerings, and gave them to the inferior officers to keep and distribute.

iii. They took care of the sacred vessels and furniture which were employed in the service.

2. It was the office of the deacons *to read the Scriptures in the congregation*, until the appointment of special persons for this purpose—(Anagnostæ, *Readers*.) Sozomen says, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 19,) “At Alexandria the archdeacon alone reads the Scriptures; but in other places the deacons do this; in many churches the presbyters also; on festivals even the bishop, as at Constantinople on Easter day.” Afterwards it continued to be the especial duty of the deacon to read the Gospel, especially in the communion-service; but when a bishop officiated, this duty devolved upon a presbyter. Hence the Gospel is the usual

<sup>1</sup> Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶ- | τηθέντος [εὐχαρισθέντος], ἄρτον καὶ  
τος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος [ἐπευφήσαν- | οῖνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν  
τος] παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι | ἀποφέρουσι.—(JUSTIN MART. *Apol.* i.  
παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδάσασιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν | al. 2, § 65.)  
παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαρισ-

emblem of a deacon.—(See *Constit. Ap.* lib. ii. c. 57; *HIERON. Ep.* 57; *Concil. Vasens.* ii. c. 2.)

3. The deacons pronounced the common formularies of exhortation, &c., which were usual during the celebration of divine worship (formulæ solennes, προσφώνησεις, acclamations); whence these ministers were called κήρυκες, ἱεροκήρυκες, præcones, tubicines sacri, heralds. Such are the forms mentioned in the Apostolical Constitutions,—δεηθῶμεν, oremus; orate catechumeni; attendamus; fleetamus genua; ἀπολύεσθε; προέλθετε; ite; missa est; sursum corda; sancta sanctis; and the like. All exhortations to silence and order are included in the meaning of the word κηρύσσειν. (See *Constit. Apost.* viii. 5, 6, 10; *CHRYSOST. Hom.* 17 in Heb. ix.; *Hom.* 2 in 1 Ep. ad Corinth.; *SYNESII, Ep.* 67.)

4. With this was combined the duty of exercising a general care that all things pertaining to the celebration of divine worship were in due place and order.

5. Although the office of preaching was assigned only to bishops and presbyters, yet instances occur in which this duty was discharged by deacons. The celebrated Chrysostom preached as a deacon before his bishop Flavianus at Antioch. Gregory the Great was in the habit of causing deacons or readers to deliver the discourses which he had written, being unable to preach himself on account of bodily infirmity.

The following canon of A.D. 529 relates to this matter:—“Si presbyter aliqua infirmitate prohibente per se ipsum non potuerit prædicare, sanctorum patrum homiliæ a diaconis recitentur. Si enim digni sunt diaconi, quæ Christus in evangelio locutus est legere, quare indigni judicentur sanctorum patrum expositiones publice recitare?” i. e., *If a presbyter be prevented by any bodily infirmity from preaching, let some homilies of the holy fathers be read by the deacons. For if the deacons are worthy to read the discourses of our Saviour in the gospels, why should they be thought unworthy to recite the expositions of the holy fathers?* (*Conc. Vas.* 2, c. 2.)

6. The business of catechetical instruction stood on the same footing. This duty originally belonged to the bishop; but it was frequently committed to the deacon, especially so far as related

to the longer preparation of candidates for baptism. Hence the deacons were called catechetæ, *catechists*.

7. The deacons *administered baptism*, if not as the proper ministers of that sacrament, yet as representatives of the bishops and presbyters. (See TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 17; CYRILL. HIEROS. *Catech.* 17, § 17; HIERON, *contr. Lucif.* c. 4; *Concil. Illiberit* c. 77.)

8. *Absolution of penitents* in cases of necessity was not only permitted to deacons, but was enjoined upon them as a duty. See a passage from Cyprian to this effect in the note<sup>2</sup>.

9. As the deacons were entrusted with the *superintendence of the inferior orders of ecclesiastical officers*, and were responsible for the discharge of their duties, so they had also the right of immediate suspension of such officers until further examination, in cases of delinquency<sup>3</sup>.

10. Deacons were often *present at ecclesiastical synods, as representatives or plenipotentiaries of their bishops*. In the East, the deacons, thus delegated and empowered, took the place in the council which belonged to their bishops; but in the West they were not permitted to sit among the bishops or to vote in their own names. Exceptions to the latter rule were, however, sometimes made in provincial synods.

11. It seems to have been the duty of deacons *to make reports to their bishops concerning the lives and conversation of the members of the church, both clerical and lay*. Hence they were entitled "the eyes and ears of the bishop." Such a commission must have attached importance to the office; but may have tended, at the same time, to make it somewhat odious.

12. The deacons were employed also in *collecting and distributing alms and contributions*. As the revenues of the church

<sup>2</sup> Si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint (pœnitentes), non exspectata præsentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit et urgere exitus cœperit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint: ut manu eis in pœnitentia imposita veniant ad Do-

minum cum pace.—CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 13 (al. 18) *ad Cler.*

<sup>3</sup> Διάκονος ἀφορίζει ὑποδιάκονον, ἀναγνώστην, ψάλτην, διακόνισσαν, ἐὰν ἢ τι τοιοῦτον μὴ παρόντος πρεσβυτέρου ὑποδιακόνου οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀφορίζειν, οὔτε μὴ ἀναγνώστην, οὔτε ψάλτην, οὔτε διακόνισσαν, οὔτε κληρικόν, ἢ λαικόν ἕπηρέται γάρ εἰσι διακόνων.—*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 28.

increased, this occupation became proportionably more important and laborious; and the assistance of the deacons, partly as keepers of accounts, and partly as managers of the property, became indispensable to the bishops.

### § 3.—OF ARCHIDEACONS.

THE office of deacon, as has been already stated, derived increased and progressive importance from the spirit of jealousy and rivalry which existed between bishops and presbyters, when the church had declined from its primitive simplicity, and the ministers had become ambitious of dignity and power. But during this struggle, and the consequent growth of episcopal authority, the Ἀρχιδιάκονοι, *archdeacons*, especially were opposed to the ἀρχιεπισβύτεροι, *archpresbyters*, with a view to diminish the influence of the latter.

Some writers, especially certain of the Roman Catholic church (*e. g.*, BARONIUS, *Annal.* a. 34, n. 285), trace the origin of the archidiaconate to the New Testament, regarding Stephen as the first who held this office; in accordance with an expression of Augustin, (*Serm.* 94, *de Diversis*.) Stephanus inter diaconos illos nominatus primus, sicut inter apostolos Petrus, i. e., *Stephen was named first among those deacons, as Peter among the apostles.* But even if the seven deacons at Jerusalem were the type of the diaconate afterwards generally established in the church, (which is by no means certain,) and if the primacy of Stephen among those deacons were admitted, it would only follow that archdeacons created after this model would be chief among their equals, without anything like a distinct authority, or a right of governing their fellow-deacons.

The real origin of the office appears to be the following. During the celebration of divine worship it was usual for one of the deacons to stand by the side of the bishop at the altar, whilst the other deacons belonging to the church discharged their several offices in the assembly (*Constit. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 57). This deacon was called primus, primicerius diaconorum, *the first or chief deacon.* He was also usually the bishop's man of business. (*ORIG. Tract.* 5 in Matth.) Hence came the rank and office of



archdeacon, which was in high repute as early as the fourth century. It is probable that Laurence, mentioned by Prudentius, (*Hymn de S. Laurentio*, v. 10,) was archdeacon of the church at Rome:—

Hic primus e septem viris  
 Qui stant ad aram proximi,  
 Levita sublimis gradu  
 Et cæteris præstantior.

“*This was the first of those seven men who stand nearest to the altar, levite of a high degree, and superior to the others.*”

It is likely that at first the deacon senior both in years and office was elevated to the rank of archdeacon; as in the similar case of the archpresbyter. But as the office increased in importance, it became necessary to select not the oldest, but the most able and proper, person to discharge it. Thus Athanasius at Alexandria appears to have been made archdeacon while he was a young man; according to Theodoret, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 26,) *νεὸς μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν, τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ τῶν διακόνων ἡγούμενος*, i. e., *being young in years, but taking the lead in the company of deacons.*

In Hieron. *Ep.* 85 *ad Eragr.*, we read, concerning the church of Alexandria, “*Aut diaconi eligent de se, quem industrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent,*” i. e., *or as the deacons may elect from their own body one whom they may know to be diligent in the discharge of his duties, and call him archdeacon.* And the same writer says, (*Ep.* 4 *ad Rustic.*), “*Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi,*” i. e., *each church has one bishop, one archpresbyter, and one archdeacon.*

While the archdeacon was appointed to his office in some places by election, it is probable that in others the choice rested entirely with the bishop; and indeed when the relation of bishop and deacon became very intimate, and the latter was of especial importance to his superior in the discharge of his episcopal functions, it was in the nature of the case that the bishop should, at least, have considerable influence in the appointment. Hence, although it was according to rule that the bishop or the college of deacons should choose the oldest among the deacons to the office of archdeacon, it was permitted to the bishop, while he left

the person so elected in possession of his due title and rank, to transact his business by the hands of some other deacon better qualified. A canon of the Council of Agde to this effect is quoted in a note<sup>4</sup>.

Concerning the history of this office, the following observations are worthy of remark :—

1. In the fourth and fifth centuries we sometimes find mention of the office of archdeacon, without the title. Such was the case with regard to Athanasius; who, it may be remarked, was a person of much greater influence at the Council of Nicæa than his own bishop Alexander. To the same class belongs the deacon Cæcilian, of Carthage; to whom Optatus Milevit. (*De Schism. Donat.* lib. i. c. 16.) gives the title of archdeacon, although Cæcilian styled himself only deacon (*Ibid.* c. 19). Thus also the celebrated Leo the Great, as a deacon at Rome, evidently discharged the duties of an archdeacon, and even those of a bishop.

2. According to the testimony of Jerome, the archdeacon possessed great influence in his time; and this writer greatly complains of their pride and arrogance<sup>5</sup>. This arrogance, which took its rise in the fifth century, and evinced itself by an assumption of superiority over the presbyters, attained subsequently a still greater height, and became troublesome even to the bishops.

3. Archdeacons, even although they did not bear that title, often became the successors of their bishops, as in the cases of Cæcilian, Athanasius, and Leo the Great. But there was no fixed rule and custom to this effect.

4. During the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, the archdeacons possessed considerable authority. They had the right of censuring deacons and inferior ministers (*Concil. Aurel.* iv. c. 26; *Concil. Chalced.* act. 10). Presbyters aspired to the dignity; and

<sup>4</sup> Episcopus, quorum vita non reprehenditur, posteriorem priori nullus præponat, nisi fortasse clatus superbia, quod pro necessitate ecclesiæ episcopus jusserit, implere contemnat. Sane si officium archidiaconi propter simpliciorum naturam implere aut expedire nequiverit, ille loci sui nomen teneat, et ordinationi ecclesiæ, quem episcopus

elegerit, præponatur.—*Conc. Agath.* (A. D. 506,) c. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Ultra Sacerdotes, hoc est Presbyteros, intumescunt: et dignitatem non merito, sed divitiis, æstimant. Certe, qui primus fuerit ministrorum, quia per singula concionatur in populos, et a Pontifici latere non recedit, injuriam putat, si Presbyter ordinetur.—*HELENUS, Comment. in Ezek.* 48.

it was even declared that archpresbyters were subject to the jurisdiction of archdeacons (*Decret. Gratiani*, dist. xxv. c. 1). Bingham supposes that in the time of Gratian archdeacons were all chosen from the order of presbyters.

5. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the bishops began to use efforts to set limits to the extensive and encroaching power of the archdeacons. In this attempt, however, they found considerable difficulty, in consequence of the influence of the archdeacons in the ecclesiastical councils, and with temporal princes. In France, they even enjoyed the title of princes. And the establishment and increase of their power was favoured at Rome, as a means of weakening the hands of the bishops, and extending the influence of the Romish see. So that the very order of men which the bishops first employed to assist them in gaining ascendancy over the presbyters was now employed by a still more grasping power against themselves.

6. It was not until the thirteenth century that the archbishops succeeded in putting an effectual check upon the immoderate power of archdeacons. At that period, the councils began to take part in the same effort. (See *Concil. Turon.* A.D. 1231, c. 8, 12; *Con. Salmur.* A.D. 1253 (54) c. 7.) Archdeacons were then enjoined to discharge all their duties in their own persons,—a regulation which at once set limits to their operations. The archbishops required bishops to employ officers distinct from the archdeacon, as their vicars or *officials*. This title, *official*, was first used by Innocent IV., A.D. 1250.

From this period, the power of archdeacons declined in the western churches. In the east, it had come to an end as early as the eighth century.

The duties of an archdeacon may be referred partly to those of a deacon, and partly to those of a bishop; according as we regard this officer in his capacity of a deacon, or as the representative of a bishop, (so far as the laws of the church allowed the bishop to delegate his powers.) Many of the complaints which were made against the archdeacons arose from their claiming as their proper right or office what was entrusted to them only by episcopal commission.

The offices of the archdeacon, as enumerated by Bingham,

were:—1. To attend the bishop at the altar, &c. 2. To assist him in managing the revenues of the church; 3. in preaching; 4. and in ordaining the inferior clergy. 5. The archdeacon had power to censure deacons and the inferior clergy, but not presbyters.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### OF DEACONESSES AND OTHER FEMALE MINISTERS.

The office of deaconess may be regarded as nearly, although not entirely, one and the same with that of presbyteress, mentioned above, chap. iv. sect. 3. And not only the terms *πρεσβύτεδες* (or *πρεσβύτεραι*), *presbyteresses*, and *διακόνισσαι*, *deaconesses*, were used synonymously, but the same may be said also concerning *episcopæ* or *episcopissæ* (wives of bishops, or female superintendents), *antissæ*, *χήραι*, *viduæ*, *viduatus* (*viduitas*), *προκαθήμεναι*, *ministræ*, *ancillæ*; all which terms denote certain *female ministers or assistants*, whose services were used by the ancient church. These several expressions denote a genus or order which contained several species or classes, to which various names were specially applied according to the nature of the service performed.

The most usual appellation was that of deaconess, (*διακόνισσα*, ἡ *διάκονος*, *diacona*.) This term does not occur in the New Testament, except, indeed, that St. Paul, Rom. xvi., speaks of “Phebe our sister which is a servant (*διάκονος*) of the church which is at Cenchrea,”—which is the same thing, the word *διάκονος* being applied to a female. But the title of deaconess prevailed more than any other, partly, perhaps, from its frequent use by very early ecclesiastical writers, and partly from its peculiar suitability, as being likely to obviate many prejudices and misconceptions which might have arisen from the adoption of any other equivalent term.

Concerning these female ministers of the church, the following particulars appear to be most worthy of remark.

1. It appears from Rom. xvi. 1, 2, compared with verse 12; 1 Tim. v. 3, *seq.*; Titus ii. 3, *seq.*; 1 Tim. iii. 11, that the *διά-*

κοιαι, χήραι, and πρεσβύτεραι, were appointed, in order to fulfil the same offices with regard to the female members of the church, as those which the πρεσβύτεροι and διάκονοι discharged with respect to the males. It is uncertain whether this arrangement was derived from the Jewish institutions, or was peculiar to the Christian church. Grotius (*Comment. in Rom. xvi. 1*), asserts that there was no such institution among the Jews<sup>1</sup>. During the second, third, and fourth centuries, these peculiar services of female ministers appear to have been employed, if not universally, yet in many countries and churches.

That the services of deaconesses were not, however, confined to the female members of the church, may be inferred from Rom. xvi. 2, where St. Paul, speaking of Phebe, says, “καὶ γὰρ αὕτη προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐμοῦ,” *for she hath been a succourer of many, and of me also*. Theodoret observes that this προσασία of Phebe may be most properly understood of φιλοξενία and κηδεμονία, *domestic services*.

That St. Paul entrusted the πρεσβύτεραι with the office of teaching, cannot admit of a doubt. The expressions which he uses concerning them evidently show that he did so. In Titus ii. 3, he requires that the πρεσβύτιδες should be καλοδιδασκαλοι, *good teachers*, or, as in our version, *teachers of good things*. Some suppose, indeed, that this passage relates only to aged women; but this makes no difference with regard to the question whether female teaching was, or was not, permitted and in use. And in Acts xviii. 26, we find Priscilla joined with her husband Aquila in teaching Apollos “the way of God more perfectly.” On the other hand, St. Paul expressly interdicts women from teaching in the churches (1 Cor. xiv. 34; compare 1 Tim. ii. 8, 9, 11, 12). From all which it seems to follow, that although women were not allowed to give homiletical instruction, or to preach, in the

<sup>1</sup> In Judæa diaconi viri etiam mulieribus ministrare poterant: erat enim ibi liberior ad feminas aditus, quam in Græcia, ubi viris clausa γυναικωνίτις. Ideo duplici in Græcia fœminarum auxilio ecclesiæ opus habuere. Alteræ erant πρεσβύτιδες sive προκαθήμεναι, quæ fœminarum mores formabant, et

ante Laodicenam Synodum manibus impositus ordinabantur, ut videre est canone xi. Aliæ erant διάκονοι, Latine etiam Diaconissæ, quod Plinius in Ep. ad Trajanum vertit ministras, quæ fœminas pauperes aut ægrotas pecunia atque opera subleuabant.—GROTIUS, *Comment. in Rom. xvi. 1*.

public assemblies, they were, however, employed in giving catechetical, or private instruction, in the truths of religion. And accordingly the ancient church entrusted the presbyteresses and deaconesses with at least a share in the elementary or catechetical instruction of the women.

2. Besides the testimony of apostles and early ecclesiastical writers in this matter, we possess that of some heathen writers to the same effect. Pliny tells us that, among the Christians, certain “*ancillæ, quæ ministræ dicebantur,*” *women called female ministers, or deaconesses*, had been examined concerning their religion (PLIN. *Ep.* lib. x. ep. 96, al. 97). Lucian of Samosata (*De morte Peregrini*, § 12) makes mention of some “old women, widows, and orphans, belonging to the Christians, who visited Peregrinus Proteus in prison, and supplied him with food.” These were the *χῆραι* and *διακόνισσαι*, whose chief duty seems to have been to visit the sick and prisoners, like the “sisters of charity” of modern times. (See also LIBANI *Orat.* 16.)

3. Sixty years, at least, was the required, or canonical, age, according to 1 Tim. v. 9. (See TERTULL. *de Veland Virgin.* c. 9; *Constit. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 1; BASIL. M. *Epist. Can.* c. 24; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 16; COD. THEODOS. lib. xvi. tit. 2, l. 27.)

It may appear strange that we not only find many exceptions to the apostle’s rule, but that a much lower age than that which he prescribed was actually established by law. In Tertullian (*De Veland. Virg.* c. 9) we read of a young woman in the widow’s office, under twenty years of age. (Compare SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 9.) And it was ordered by the council of Chalcedon, (can. 14, al. 15,) “that no woman should be ordained a deaconess under forty years of age.” (Thus also Justin. *Nov.* 123, c. 13; but in *Nov.* 6, c. 6, the age of fifty years is required.) “By which we may judge,” says Bingham, “that as the church varied in her rule about this matter, so bishops took a liberty to ordain deaconesses at what age they thought fit, provided they could be assured of their probity and virtue.”

But this is hardly satisfactory. We find ourselves compelled to ask, why any deviation and license from an established rule should have been allowed in this respect more than in others?

The difficulty, however, is greatly decreased if we keep in view the difference which, probably, subsisted between *πρεσβύτεραι* and *διακόνισσαι*, and their respective offices. A lower age sufficed for the latter, partly because the apostle had made no regulation concerning it, and partly because it was consistent with the nature of their duties. An advanced age was, to say the least, highly desirable in a *πρεσβυτέρα*, whose duties included catechetical instruction, and a kind of superintendence or government. But for the offices of distributing alms, visiting the sick, and assisting at baptisms, a younger person would be admissible. Indeed, it may have been necessary, that those who undertook to discharge these duties should have been persons of a strong constitution, and of active habits. And although the rule may have been retained, that such female ministers should be widows, (whence the whole class is called *viduatus*, or *gradus vidualis*,) and these the relicts of one husband, having children; yet exceptions to this rule may have been made in favour of other widows, or even married women, well fitted to discharge the duties of the office.

Even young unmarried women were sometimes ordained deaconesses.—(See IGNAT. *Ep. ad Smyrn.* § xiii; *Constit. Apost.* lib. vi. c. 18; EPIPHAN. *Expos. Fid.* c. 21; JUSTIN. *Nov.* vi. c. 6.) But it should be borne in mind, that the ecclesiastical writers sometimes give the title of *παρθένος* to widows of sober life and conversation.

4. A controversy has arisen, respecting *the ordination of deaconesses*. But the dispute is merely verbal, and therefore unimportant. It was the constant practice of the church to ordain deaconesses; that is to say, they were consecrated to their office by imposition of hands, joined with a prayer of benediction.—See CLEM. ALEX. *Pædagog.* lib. iii. c. 12; *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 19; *Concil. Chalced.* c. 15; *Concil. Trull.* c. 14, 40; *Concil. Nic.* c. 19.

The duties of deaconesses were the following:—

1. *To visit and take care of the poor and sick.* Martyrs and confessors were especial objects of their care. Even the heathen emperor Julian held up the institutions of Christians in this respect, as a pattern to his people.

2. *To prepare catechumens, and to assist at baptism.* Perhaps the office of instructing catechumens was entrusted chiefly to the *πρεσβύτειδες* and *προκαθήμεναι*; and the services at baptism were performed principally by deaconesses. Hence the latter, who assisted in undressing and dressing the candidates, in anointing, and the like, were called *ὑποδέκται*, *ἀνάδοχοι*, susceptores, exceptrices.—See *Constit. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 15, 16; *ΕΠΙΦΑΝ. Εξρως. Fid.* c. 21; *JUSTIN. Νοσ.* vi. c. 6.)

3. *To preside over the women in public worship, and at the administration of the eucharist, and other religious offices; and also to keep watch over their domestic and private life, to admonish them, and to report their conduct to the presbyters and bishops.* In these points we trace the chief resemblance of their office to that of deacons and subdeacons.—(See *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 28; lib. ii. c. 26, 57, 58; lib. iii. c. 7.)

It is certain that the office of deaconess ceased to exist at a very early period; but the exact date of its discontinuance cannot be clearly ascertained. It was abolished first in France, and the western church in general. Canons were passed prohibiting all future ordinations as early as the fifth and sixth centuries.—(*Concil. Araus.* i. a. 441, c. 26; *Epanon.* a. 507, c. 21; *Aurel.* ii. c. 18.) Some say that this office came quite to an end in the western churches during the eighth, but others suppose not before the tenth or eleventh, century.

The name diaconissa and archidiaconissa were retained, but only as the name of an officer in nunneries.

In the Greek church deaconesses continued to officiate until the end of the twelfth century.

No reasons are assigned by ancient writers for the extinction of this office. The question is not without interest; and perhaps we shall not mistake, if we reckon the following among the principal causes of the change.

First. The discontinuance of the *Agapæ*, or feasts of charity, which furnished some employment to deaconesses, while they lasted. It may also be observed, that the mode of celebrating the Lord's supper in later times must have abridged their services at that solemnity, since they never acted as servants of the altar, or of sacred things, but only of the church and its ministers.



Secondly. In the early centuries the care of the sick and poor belonged entirely to the church; but from the time of Constantine the Great this was made a business of the state.

Thirdly. The introduction of infant baptism. We find that the ancient services of deaconesses at the sacrament of baptism had become more or less superfluous, as early as the fifth and sixth centuries.

Fourthly. The arrogance and misconduct of the female ministers themselves. The old rule, "Mulier taceat in ecclesiâ," *Let the woman keep silence in the church*, is very often repeated by ecclesiastical writers. We know that, in more modern times, abbesses and prioresses have claimed the right of exercising sacerdotal and even episcopal functions; and that the abuse has been prohibited by canons of councils and decrees of popes.

## CHAPTER VII.

### OF SUBDEACONS.

THE *ὑπηρέται*, *servants*, mentioned in the New Testament and the earliest ecclesiastical writers, are the same as the *ὑποδιάκονοι*, subdeacons, of whom we read from the fourth century downwards. Athanasius is the first Greek writer who uses the term *ὑποδιάκονος*.

As early as the fourth century, subdeacons were appointed, in both the Western and Oriental churches, as the immediate representatives and assistants of the deacons, whose limited numbers were unequal to the discharge of all their duties. At first the subdeacons corresponded to the deacons in point of number, as well as of ministry. In Rome seven subdeacons were appointed to assist the seven deacons, (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43.) But when, in later times, it was found that this aid was inadequate, the sacred number of seven subdeacons was tripled; and twenty-one of these ministers were appointed, divided into three classes, namely, *Palatini*, or the immediate assistants of the bishop; *Stationarii*, whose duties related chiefly to processions; *Regionarii*, who were employed in various occupations in the

several regiones or districts of Rome. This arrangement was made in the eleventh century.

In other places, this rule, relating to the number of deacons and subdeacons, was not so strictly observed. At Constantinople, in the time of Justinian, there were no fewer than ninety subdeacons; but the number was reduced to seventy under Heraclius.

It is uncertain whether or not subdeacons were regularly ordained to their office, in the same manner as deacons and presbyters. The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* speaks of them as being ordained by the imposition of the bishop's hands and prayer.—(*Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 21.) On the other hand, Basil speaks of the subdiaconate as *ἀχειροτόνητον ὑπηρέσιν*, i. e., a ministry without the imposition of hands, an unordained ministry.—(BASIL M. *Ep. Can.* c. 51.) The fourth council of Carthage (c. 5) uses the word “ordinatur,” respecting the subdeacon, but adds, “quia manus impositionem non accipit,” *that he does not receive imposition of hands*. The Oriental church does not recognise any ordination; and usually places the subdeacons in a lower rank than readers, and in the same class as the acolytes.

In the western churches, the rule of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, respecting the rank of the subdeacon, was at first generally followed; and the first place among the inferior orders was assigned to this minister; but in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the subdeacon began to be classed with the superior orders. It is probable that this change took place in consequence of the elevation of the episcopate, which had at that time attained its greatest height.

The duties of subdeacons, before their promotion in the western church, were the following:—to convey the bishop's letters or messages to foreign churches, and to execute other commissions of the superior ministers;—to fit and prepare the sacred vessels of the altar, and to deliver them to the deacons in the time of divine service;—to attend the door of the church during the communion service, taking care that no one went in or out during the time of the oblation;—and, perhaps, to conduct those who came into the church to their proper places.—(See

*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 11 ; *Concil. Laodic.* 21, 22, 25 ; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 4 ; CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 24, 29 ; 4, 9.)

After the advancement of their order, the subdeacons were permitted to minister at the altar ; although they were never allowed to consecrate or distribute the sacred elements. And accordingly at their ordination an empty paten and cup were delivered to them, and a book containing the epistles. In short, their office was invested with as much dignity as possible ; and we find that many persons, ordained as subdeacons, rose afterwards to the higher, and even to the highest offices, in the church. This was entirely opposed to the ancient rules, which did not suffer any advancement from the rank of subdeacon.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### OF READERS.

THE office of an *ἀναγνώστης*, (*ὁ ἀναγνώσκων*, *legens*, lector,) i. e., *Reader*, has been regarded by some as of apostolical institution, and has been traced to the customs of the Jewish synagogue (Luke iv. 16 ; Acts xiii. 15, 27 ; 2 Cor. iii. 14) ; and it is certain that *ἀναγνώσις*, (*τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα*,) i. e., *reading*, formed an important part of ancient public worship (See JUSTIN MARTYR. *Apol.* i. § 67). But there is no proof of the early appointment of a special minister in the capacity of reader ; for although, in the passage of Justin, a distinction is made between “the reader,” and “the president ;” yet the former may be explained as referring to a deacon or a presbyter ; and there is nothing to preclude the supposition that one of these was actually intended.

It is most probable that the office of Reader was instituted in the course of the third century. The first mention which we find of it is in TERTULL. *de Præscript. Her.* c. 41 ; where the “lector” is expressly distinguished from the “episcopus, presbyter, and diaconus ;” and it is implied that the catholic church observed a fixed rule respecting the office and duties of these several ministers. Cyprian speaks of the ordination of readers, and observes that their office was an introduction to the higher

offices of the church (*Ep.* 24. *al.* 29; see also *Ep.* 33, *al.* 38; *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 22). In his time, they were distinguished by the title of *doctores audientium*, *teachers of the audientes or hearers*.

It appears that, both in the synagogue and in the early Christian church, any person who was able to discharge the duty was allowed to hold the office of a reader, without reference to age. Boys of twelve, ten, eight, or even seven years of age were frequently employed in this manner. The office appears to have been a favourite one with youths of the higher orders in society. The imperial princes, Julian (afterwards the Apostate) and Gallus, in their younger years, were readers in the church at Nicomedia.

In the western church the subdeacons assumed the privileges of the readers at a very early period; and the office at length became almost extinct.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### OF ACOLYTHS.

THE term *ἀκόλουθος*, *acolythus*, *acolyth*, *acolyte*, *acolythist*, denotes properly a servant who waits continually upon another, an attendant (*pedisequs*); and the office corresponds to that of an apparitor or bedellus (*bedel*).

This order was peculiar to the Latin church for more than four hundred years; it is probable that in the Greek church the subdeacons performed all the duties of the acolyth in the west. They are mentioned by Cyprian, but by no Greek writer before the time of Justinian.

It was the duty of acolyths to attend the bishop and superior ministers, especially in processions and other solemnities, and to execute their commands; also to light the candles of the church, and to attend the ministers with wine and water for the eucharist. There is a canon of the fourth council of Carthage which prescribes the form of their ordination, and gives some intimation of the nature of their office. "When an acolyth is ordained, the

bishop shall inform him how he is to behave himself in his office ; and he shall receive a candlestick, with a taper in it, from the archdeacon ; that he may understand that he is appointed to light the candles of the church. He shall also receive an empty pitcher, to signify that he is to furnish wine for the eucharist of the blood of Christ," (*Concil. Carthag.* iv. c. 6). It is probable that the lighting of candles here spoken of took place at night, when the church met for evening prayer.

"This office of acolythist," says Bingham, "as much as the Romanists contend for the apostolical institution of it, is now no longer in being the church of Rome, but changed into that of the *cero ferarii*, or taper-bearers, whose office is only to walk before the deacons, &c., with a lighted taper in their hands ; which is so different from the office of the ancient acolythists, that Duarenus cannot but express his wonder how the one came to be changed into the other, and why their doctors should call him an acolythist of the ancient church, who is no more than a taper-bearer of the present. Cardinal Bona carries the reflection a little further, and with some resentment complains that the inferior orders of the Romish church bear no resemblance to those of the primitive church, and that for five hundred years the ancient discipline has been lost." (Book iii. chap. 3, § 3.)

---

## CHAPTER X.

### OF EXORCISTS.

IN the earliest ages of Christianity, the power of exorcising, or casting out evil spirits, by the name of Jesus, was not confined to the clergy, much less to any particular order ; but was common to all Christians, as appears from ORIGEN. *contr. Cels.* lib. vii. ; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 27 ; TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 23 ; JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1. ; IRENEUS, lib. ii. c. 56, 57.

But it is probable that, during the greater part of the first three centuries, bishops and presbyters were the usual exorcists of the church ; and that exorcists were constituted a separate order about the latter end of the third century (See *Concil.*

*Antioch.* c. 10; *Concil. Laodic.* c. 24, 26; EPIPHAN. *Expos. Fid.* n. 21).

Exorcists were charged with the more especial care of the energumens, or persons possessed with an evil spirit. It was their duty to pray over these persons, and to use all means for their cure and restoration. Their appointment and ministry are thus described by the fourth council of Carthage:—"When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written; the bishop saying, 'Receive thou these, and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized, or only catechumens.'" (*Concil. Carthag.* iv. c. 7.)

It is doubtful whether it was part of the exorcist's office regularly to exorcise catechumens before baptism, or whether this was done only when the catechumens were in the class of energumens.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### OF SINGERS OR PRECENTORS.

THE importance of psalmody in the Jewish temple and synagogue services, and in the apostolical churches, (see *Eph.* v. 19, 20; *Coloss.* iii. 16,) and the early introduction of it into Christian worship in general, may lead us to look for the appointment of singers or precentors in a very remote period of ecclesiastical antiquity. And we learn, from many passages of ancient writers, that the office of *ψάλλτης*, or *singer*, was recognised among the other early ecclesiastical appointments. (See *IGNATI Ep. ad Antioch.* § 12; *Canon. Apost.* c. 43, 69; *Constit. Ap.* lib. iii. c. 11; *EPHRAEM. SYR. Serm.* 93; *JUSTIN. Novell.* iii. c. 1.)

It is remarkable that the fifteenth canon of the Council of Laodicea forbids all persons to sing in the church, except the canonical singers; who went up into the ambo, or singing desk, and sang out of a book. But it is exceedingly probable that, as Bingham observes, "this was a temporary provision, designed

only to restore and revive the ancient psalmody, by reducing it to its primitive harmony and perfection. That," adds this writer, "which the rather inclines me to put this sense upon the canon, and to look upon it only as a prohibition for a time, is, that in after-ages we find the people enjoyed their ancient privilege of singing all together; which is frequently mentioned by St. Austin, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Basil, and many others, who give an account of the psalmody and service of the church in their own ages." Augusti speaks of this conjecture as altogether gratuitous and without foundation; but while he overlooks the appeal to more recent fathers, he adduces no argument of any weight to the contrary effect.

The Latin writers translate *ψάλτης* sometimes, but very rarely, by *Psalta*, usually by *Psalmista* (and sometimes *Psalmistanus*), and *Cantor*; and for the most part these terms are used synonymously, although the latter has properly the more extensive signification.

We find also the term *ὑποβολεῖς*, in connexion with *ἀναγνώσται* (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 22,) which may be most strictly interpreted psalmi pronuntiatores, or succentores, *leaders*; denoting that the persons so called began the psalm or hymn, and sang a portion of the verse by themselves, and thus led the singing by prompting, or pronouncing the words.

We find no mention of any special ordination of singers by the bishop. According to the fourth council of Carthage (c. 10), they were invested with their office by the presbyters alone. "The singer (psalmista) may enter upon his office without the knowledge of the bishop, and by the mere appointment of the presbyter; the presbyter using the form of words, 'See that what thou singest with thy mouth, thou believest also in thine heart, and that what thou believest in thine heart, thou confirmest also in thy life.'"

The estimation in which the services of these canonical singers were held, appears from the institution of schools for their instruction and training, and the great attention which was paid to these schools and their presidents. Such schools existed as early as the sixth century, (GREGOR. TURON. *de Mir. S. Martini*, lib. i. c. 33.) But the most celebrated was that founded at

Rome, by Gregory the Great, which was the model of many others afterwards established. The primicerius, or prior scholæ cantorum, the head of such an establishment, was a man of considerable dignity and influence in the church.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### OF OSTIARII OR DOOR-KEEPERS.

THE institution of *πυλωροὶ*, ostiarii, *door-keepers*, appears not to have been either of very early origin, or of long continuance, in the church. The order began to be spoken of by some writers in the fourth century; and it appears to have become extinct about three or four centuries afterwards.

The manner of their designation to their office, or ordination, in the Latin church, is mentioned in the fourth council of Carthage (c. 9). “When a door-keeper is ordained, let the bishop, at the suggestion of the archdeacon, deliver to him the keys of the church, saying, ‘Behave thyself as one who must give account to God of the things that are kept locked under these keys.’”

“Their office,” says Bingham, “is commonly said to consist in taking care of the doors of the church in the time of divine service, and in making a distinction betwixt the faithful, and the catechumens, and excommunicated persons, and such others as were to be excluded from the church. But I confess that this is more than can be made out from ancient history; at least in reference to the state and discipline of many churches. . . . All that the door-keepers could have to do in this matter, was only to open and shut the doors as officers and servants under the deacons, sub-deacons and deaconesses, and to be governed wholly by their direction. It belonged to them, likewise, to give notice of the times of prayer, and church assemblies; which, in time of persecution, required a private signal for fear of discovery; and that, perhaps, was the first reason for instituting this order in the church of Rome, whose example, by degrees, was followed by other churches. However it be, their office and station seems



to have been little more than that of clerks and sextons in our modern churches." Augusti, however, refers the institution to the *Disciplina Aræani*.

The *Ostiarîi* were sometimes called *Mansionarii*, and *Janitores*.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

### OF INFERIOR SERVANTS OF THE CHURCH AND CLERGY.

THE inferior officers whose names most frequently occur in the writings of ecclesiastical antiquity, are the following:—

1. *Κοπιαταὶ*, *copiatæ* or *fossarii*, *undertakers and grave-diggers*, whose office was to take care of funerals, and provide for the decent interment of the dead.

The derivation of the Greek name is somewhat doubtful. Some deduce it from *κοπία*, *rest*, *κοπάζειν*, *to rest*; others from *κοπιᾶν*, *to labour*; and others again from *κοπετός*, *mourning*. Jerome calls them *fossarii*, and reckons them as the lowest order of *clerici* (HIERON. *De Sept. ordin. Eccl.*). Augustin entitles them *fossores* (AUGUSTIN, *c. Crescent.* lib. iii. c. 21, and *Ep.* 241). These titles are evidently assigned to them from their office of digging graves. In Justinian's Novels (43, 49), they are called *Lecticarii*, from their carrying the corpse or bier at funerals. In the latter place, it is said that the order was first appointed by Constantine, and restored afterwards by Anastasius.

The laws sometimes styled them *collegiati*, *collegiates*, and *decani*, *deans*. They were called by the former of these names, most probably, from the circumstance of their having been incorporated into a kind of society at Constantinople; but the reason of the latter name has not been ascertained.—(COD. JUSTIN. lib. i. tit. 2, leg. 4; lib. xi. tit. 17; COD. THEODOS. lib. vi. tit. 33, leg. 1.)

At Constantinople, certain revenues of land were settled upon this society, in order that the poor might have a decent interment, without expense to their friends. But in other places, it

is likely that the copiate were maintained partly out of the common stock of the church, and partly by their own labour.

2. *Parabolani*. These were officers appointed to attend upon the sick. It is supposed that their name is derived from *ἔργον παράβολον*, *i. e.*, a dangerous office, or from *παραβάλλεσθαι*, *i. e.*, to run a great risk, to expose one's life to danger; with reference to the hazard which they incurred in the discharge of their duties, especially during the prevalence of infectious or pestilential diseases. Or the name may have been given, for the same reason, with allusion to the *παράβολοι*, those desperate men who used to hire themselves out to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatre; a name which, as we have already seen, was applied to those undaunted Christians who exposed themselves to martyrdom in the profession or defence of their religion (See above, book ii. chap. 2, sect. 2).

These officers appear to have been employed especially in Egypt and Asia Minor; countries which were peculiarly subject to epidemical diseases. Their numbers were considerable; and were sometimes abridged, in consequence of their having been implicated in civil commotions (*See* COD. THEODOS. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 42, 43; COD. JUSTIN. lib. i. tit. 3, leg. 18; *Coll. Constitut. Eccl.* lib. i. tit. 3, c. 18; *Conc. Chalced.* act. i.). In the west, during the middle ages, spiritual fraternities and sisterhoods arose, which discharged the duties assigned elsewhere to the *parabolani*.

3. *Παραμονάριοι* or *mansionarii*, whose office is uncertain; *custodes locorum sanctorum*, keepers of sacred places; *scuophylaces*, or *ceimeliarchæ*, keepers of sacred vessels, utensils, and such precious things as were laid up in the sacred repository of the church; *ἑρμηνευταὶ*, or *interpreters*, who rendered one language into another, where need required, for edification of the people, or for the service of the church; *notarii*, *notaries*, who reported the examinations and trials of martyrs and confessors, prepared protocols for the synods, and acts of the councils, and otherwise fulfilled the office of secretaries; *apocrisarii*, or *responsales*, resident in the imperial city, who transacted business in the name of foreign churches; *œconomi*, *stewards*, whose office was to take

care of the revenues of the church, especially during the vacancy of a bishopric.

4. Other inferior officers, concerned chiefly with the care of the church, or of sacred vessels, are mentioned by comparatively modern writers. Such were the *sacristæ*, *custodes*, *parafrænarii*, *matricularii* (See *DURANDI Ration. Div. Off.* lib. ii. c. 1, n. 14; *Decret. GREG.*; *Concil. Later.* 5; *DU CANGE, Ordo St. Victor; Ceremon. Rom.* lib. i. sect. 2; *MABILLON Mus. Ital.* tit. 2). The *parafrænarii* were the coachmen or grooms of the superior clergy.

5. *Σύγκελλοι*, *syncelli*, spiritual advisers of bishops and patriarchs.—*Syndici*, or *defensores*, whose office it was to watch over the rights of the church,—to act as superintendents of the *copiatæ*,—and to see that all clerks attended the celebration of morning and evening service in the church. Much dispute has arisen respecting their quality and functions. See Bingham, book iii. chap. 11.—*Cancellarii*, *chancellors*; whom Bingham supposes to have had some such office in the church, as those of the same name in the state, and who acted as guards of the judge's consistory; but some suppose them to have been identical with the *defensores*.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### OF ORDINATION.

#### § 1.—ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE RITE.

As the office of Christian pastors and teachers was derived, not from any of the Levitical institutions, but rather from the constitution of the Jewish synagogue, as it existed after the return from the Babylonish captivity; so was also the method of their ordination or appointment to their office. It has been shown by Selden (*De Synedr. Hebr.* lib. ii. c. 7), and Vitringa (*De Synagoga. Vet.* lib. iii. p. i. c. 15) that the presidents and readers of the synagogue were appointed to their office with the solemn imposition of hands; and that this custom is to be traced to Exod. xxix., Lev. viii., and similar passages. In a later period of

the church, we find the introduction of the customs of anointing, investing with the sacred garments, and delivering the sacred vessels into the hands of the person ordained (Exod. xxix. 24; Lev. xxi. 10; Numb. iii. 3), in accordance with the Levitical ceremonies which took place at the consecration of the priests and high priests.

The terms *χειροτονία* and *ordinatio*, are derived from the civil customs of the Greeks and Romans. The words *ordinatio* and *ordinare* are used in the common ecclesiastical sense of *ordination* and *to ordain*, by Tertullian, Cyprian, Optatus, and Leo the Great. Jerome, in like manner, explains “*ordinare*” by “*ordines sacros et ecclesiasticos conferre, quod faciunt episcopi.*” *Ordo*, corresponding to the Greek *τάξις*, is the word commonly used by the Latin writers of the middle ages. Greek writers use the term *ἀφορισμὸς* (a setting apart), and *καθιέρωσις* (*consecration*).

The first passage of the New Testament in which we read of the ordination (properly so called) of ministers to any office in the church, is Acts vi. 1—7, which contains an account of the appointment of seven deacons in the church of Jerusalem; (with which compare Mark xvi. 18; Acts viii. 14, 18, 19, 20; ix. 10—19.) And we have further accounts of the appointment and ordination of ecclesiastical officers in Acts xiii. 1—4; xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6. In the first Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul reminds him of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; but in the second Epistle, he speaks of the laying on of his own (the apostle’s) hands. The Roman canonists maintain that two separate ordinations are here spoken of, the former, in which Timothy was ordained priest by the presbytery, and the latter, in which he was made bishop by the apostle; but many Protestant interpreters suppose that St. Paul refers to only one ordination; and that the imposition of his own hands, and of those of the presbytery, formed a concurrent act, performed at one and the same time.

The church always regarded a formal and solemn dedication of ministers to their office, as a useful and even necessary custom. It was a rule in the earliest days of the church, that all things should be done *εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν* (1 Cor. xiv. 40,

conf. 33,) *decently, and in order*. The ministry of the word (*διακονία τοῦ λόγου, οἰκονομία τοῦ χαρίσματος, ἱερουργία.*) was deemed a sacred office, and the election and appointment of ministers (*χειροτονία*) was viewed as a solemn transaction. Forms of ordination are found in the earliest liturgies of both eastern and western churches. The different sects of reputed heretics and schismatics (the Donatists not excepted) observed the ceremony of ordination.

## § 2.—DISQUALIFICATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR ORDINATION.

THE church used every precaution in order that none but fit persons should be ordained to the sacred ministry. Hence persons of the following classes were declared incapable of receiving ordination.

1. *Women*. This rule was in accordance with the apostolic precept, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12. (*Const. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 9; conf. TERTULL. *de Præscript. Her.* c. 41; *De Bapt.* c. 17; EPIPHAN. *Hæres.* lxxix. n. 3, 4; *Hæres.* lxix. n. 2.) The appointment of deaconesses did not interfere with this rule, since they had no share in administering the word and sacraments<sup>1</sup>. They were ordained to their office in the earlier ages of the church (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 19; *Conc. Nic.* i. c. 19; *Conc. Chalced.* c. 15; *Conc. Trullan.* c. 14, 40; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 9); but this custom was afterwards discontinued, (*Conc. Araus.* i. c. 26; *Conc. Epaon.* c. 21; *Conc. Aurel.* ii. c. 18).

2. *Catechumens*. The cases of Ambrose, Neectarius, Eucherius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and others, were exceptions; but the rule was generally observed, that none but a full member of the church (*Fidelis*), or one who had been baptized and not excommunicated, could be ordained to the sacred ministry.

### 3. *Neophytes*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ ὅτι μὲν Διακονισσῶν τάγμα ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεῦειν, οὐδὲ τι ἐπιχωρεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν, ἔνεκεν δὲ σεμνότητος τοῦ γυναικείου γένους, ἢ δι' ὄραν λουτροῦ, ἢ ἐπισκέψεως πάθους, ἢ πόνου, καὶ ὅτε γυμνωθεῖη σῶμα γυναικῶν, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν ἱερουργούντων θεηθείη, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς

διακονούσης. EPIPHAN. *Hæres.* 79, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Μὴ δὲν πρόσφατον [προσφάτως] φωτισθέντας προσάγεσθαι ἐν τάγματι ἱερατικῷ. *Conc. Laodic.* can. 3. Conveniens non est, nec ratio, nec disciplina patitur, ut temere vel leviter ordinetur, aut Episcopus, aut Presbyter,

4. *Energumens*; including all persons of weak intellect, or disordered in mind.

5. *Penitents*; including all persons who had ever been subject to the censure of the church, even though absolution may have been obtained.

6. All persons who had notoriously led a vicious or scandalous life after baptism (*Canon. Apost. can. 61*; *Concil. Neocæsar. c. 8, 9*; *Nicen. c. 2*; *Illiberit. c. 30*; ORIGEN *contra Cels. lib. iii, p. 142*).

7. Persons who exercised such trades or professions as disqualified from the reception of baptism.

8. *Slaves*, and such *Freedmen* as continued to owe any allegiance to their masters. These persons were excluded not on account of the lowness of their condition, or any supposed inferiority; but simply because it was deemed inexpedient to appoint to the ministry any persons who were not entirely at liberty to discharge its duties, and whose services could not be at all times commanded.

9. *Soldiers*, (*Conc. Tolet. i. c. 8*; INNOCENT I. *Ep. xxiii. c. 4*; ii. c. 2,) *persons serving in civil offices*, or who by virtue of their estates were bound to bear such offices (*curiales*), (INNOCENT I. *Ep. iv. c. 3*; xxiii. c. 6), and *Advocates*, (INNOCENT I. *Ep. xxiii. c. 6*.) These, also, were excluded on the ground not of moral, but of civil, incapacity.

10. *All maimed or deformed persons*, especially *eunuchs*. But this rule was subject to many exceptions and limitations<sup>3</sup>. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 32*; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl. vi. 15*; SOZOMEN. *Hist. Eccl. viii. 24*; *Conc. Nic. can. 1*).

11. *Persons who had contracted a second marriage*<sup>4</sup>. This law

aut Diaconus, qui Neophytus est. . . . Sed hi, quorum per longum tempus examinata sit vita, et merita fuerint comprobata. *Conc. Sardic. c. 10*; *Conf. GREGOR. M. Epist. lib. iv. ep. 50*; lib. vii. ep. 3; JUSTIN. *Nov. 6, c. 1*; *Nov. 137, c. 1*; *Conc. Paris. A. D. 829, can. 5*.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐάν τις ἀνάπηρος, ἢ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν, ἢ τὸ σκέλος πεπληγμένος, ἀξίος δέ ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπῆς, γινέσθω· οὐ γὰρ λώβῃ σώματος αὐτὸν μαιίνει, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς μολυσμός· κωφὸς δὲ ὢν, καὶ τυφλὸς, μὴ γι-

νέσθω ἐπίσκοπος, οὐχ ὡς βεβλαμμένος, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά παρεμποδίζηται. *Canon. Apost. can. 77*.

4 Nunc vero et secundæ et tertie et quartæ nuptiæ, ut de pluribus tacem, reperiantur, et non ignoramus, quod tale conjugium ejiciet nos de regno Dei. Sicut enim ab ecclesiasticis dignitatibus non solum fornicatio, sed et nuptiæ repellunt, neque enim Episcopus, nec Presbyter, nec Diaconus, nec Vidua possunt esse digami: sic forsitan

was made with especial reference to 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 6. Bingham enumerates three different opinions among the ancients, concerning disqualification on account of digamy; the first, That all persons were to be refused orders, as digamists, who were twice married after baptism; The second, That the rule extended to all persons twice married, whether before or after baptism; the third (and most probable), That the apostle by digamists meant polygamists, and such as married after divorce. He adds that no vow of celibacy was required of the clergy, as a condition of their ordination, during the first three centuries. (*Antiq.* book iv. ch. 5.)

12. *Persons who had been baptized in time of sickness, or under some urgent necessity* (clinici,) (*Conc. Neocæsar.* c. 12); and *those who had been baptized by heretics* (*Conc. Illiberit.* 3. 51; INNOCENT I. *Ep.* xxii. c. 4); but this with an exception in favour of baptism received at the hands of Novatians and Donatists (*Conc. Nic.* c. 8). This rule grew out of date after the general prevalence of infant baptism.

13. *Persons guilty of Simoniacal conduct*, i. e. of using bribery, or any unfair means, in order to obtain ordination. The term Simony (Simonia, or Simoniaca hæresis), in this sense, was made current, if not first used by Gregory the Great, who also introduced the threefold classification—*munus a manu, a lingua, ab obsequio*—which was afterwards established by law. But the evil practice which this term denotes, namely, that of buying and selling appointments to spiritual offices, or the obtaining of them by unfair and dishonourable means, such as bribery, services, or the like, existed in the church long before the time of Gregory, having taken its rise as soon as the times of persecution were ended, and when spiritual offices began to be attended with honour or profit. Even in the Apostolical Constitutions, this species of iniquity is recognised and severely denounced; all parties concerned in such nefarious traffic being threatened with complete excommunication<sup>5</sup>. In the fifth century, this infamous crime was

et de cœtu primitivorum immaculato-  
torumque ecclesiæ, quæ non habet  
maculam, neque rugam, ejicietur digama-  
mus; non quo in æternum mittatur

incendium, sed quo partem non habeat  
in regno Dei. ORIGEN. *Hom.* 17 in  
*Luc.*

<sup>5</sup> Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος διὰ χρημάτων τῆς

aptly denoted by the term *Χριστεμπορεία* (*impia ex Christo nundinatio*), *trafficking with Christ* (THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 4); a much better word than Simony, inasmuch as the crime of Simon Magus does not exactly correspond to the wicked practice denoted by that term, either in its original acceptation, or in the sense which it acquired after the time of Gregory VII., when it was generally applied to the interference of temporal princes in the disposal of the higher dignities and emoluments of the church.

“The church inflicted very severe censures upon all such as were found guilty of Simony. The Council of Chalcedon decreed (can. 2), ‘that if any bishop gave ordination, or an ecclesiastical office or preferment of any kind, for money, he himself should lose his office, and the party so preferred be deposed.’ And the reader may find several other constitutions of the same import in those called Apostolical Canons, the Council of Constantinople under Gennadius A.D. 459, the second Council of Orleans, the second of Bracara, and many others. The imperial laws, also, were very properly contrived so prevent this abuse; for by one of Justinian’s laws it was enacted, ‘that, whenever a bishop was to be chosen, the electors themselves take an oath, and insert it into the election-paper, that they did not choose him for any gift, or promise, or friendship, or any other cause, but only because they knew him to be a man of the true Catholic faith, and an unblameable life, and good learning,’ (JUSTIN. *Novel.* cxxiii. c. 1). And in another of his laws where this same injunction is repeated, it is further provided, ‘that the party elected shall also at the time of his ordination take an oath upon the holy Gospel, that he neither gave nor promised, by himself or other, nor hereafter will give, to his ordainer, or to his electors, or any other person, anything to procure him an ordination,’ (*Novel.* cxxxvii. c. 2). And for a bishop to ordain another without observing the rule prescribed, is deposition by the same law, both

ἀξίας ταύτης ἐγκρατῆς γένηται, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρεῖσθω, καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἐκκοπήσθω τῆς κοινωρίας ὡς Σίμων ὁ Μάγος ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ Πέτρον. *Canon Apost.* c. 22.

In many Greek manuscripts, the last clause is entirely omitted. The old Latin translation has only “sicut Simon Magnus a Petro.”



for himself and the others whom he ordained." (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book iv. ch. iii. § 14.) These laws are directed to a good end; but they force upon us a conviction of the sad truth that in the time of Justinian the church was the seat of corruptions which must have taken their rise at a still earlier period.

Besides the observance of these negative rules, or the absence of disqualification, it was necessary in order to ordination that certain positive regulations should be complied with, or that persons to be ordained should possess some real and definite qualifications.

1. *They were required to be of a certain age.* The rules of the early church concerning the canonical or legitimate age for ordination were undoubtedly borrowed from the Jewish institution; the age of twenty-five years required for the Levites being adopted for deacons, and that of thirty years required for the priests being applied to presbyters and bishops. In the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. ii. c. 1.) the age of at least fifty years is required for a bishop; and we find reference made to this rule by Boniface in the eighth century. It is certain, however, that at no very late period this law had grown out of date, and the term of thirty years was fixed as the lowest canonical age for a bishop, as well as for a presbyter. It appears, indeed, that exceptions even to this rule were sometimes made in favour of persons of a lower age. Thus we are told, that Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodorus were raised to the episcopal dignity while they were young men (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 30); and the general rule was perhaps dispensed with in the case of Acholius, bishop of Antioch (AMBROS. *Ep.* 60), Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (THEODORET *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 26), Paul, bishop of Alexandria (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 5); and Remigius, bishop of Rheims (HINCMMARI. *Rhem. Vit. Remig.*;—but as the youth of these persons is alluded to only in general terms, it is possible that they may have attained the age of thirty years before they were made bishops. Athanasius, indeed, who was elected to succeed Alexander, in the year 326, could hardly have been thirty years old at that time; but as he was considered very young to be chosen to the episcopal office, it is probable that the canonical age for a bishop was then higher than thirty

years, at least in the church of Alexandria. In Justin. *Norell. Constit.* 123, c. 1, the lowest canonical age for a bishop is fixed at thirty-five years; but in *Norell.* 137, c. 2, at thirty. The Roman bishops Siricius (*Ep.* i.) and Zosimus (*Ep.* i.) required as the lowest age, for a deacon thirty years, for a presbyter thirty-five, and for a bishop forty-five.

The age at which our blessed Lord entered on his ministry was frequently alleged as the reason for fixing thirty years as the canonical age for presbyters and bishops.—(*Conc. Neocæsar.* c. 11; *Agath.* c. 17; *Tolet.* iv. c. 19; *Arelat.* iv. c. 1.) The Council of Trent fixed the age for the diaconate at twenty-three; for the priesthood at twenty-five<sup>6</sup>.

Children were sometimes appointed to the office of reader; but by the laws of Justinian none were to be appointed under twelve years of age. (*Nov. Const.* 123.)—The age for subdeacons, acolyths, and other inferior officers, was fixed sometimes at fourteen years, sometimes at fifteen, eighteen, twenty, or twenty-five.

2. *They were obliged to undergo an examination*, which related to their faith, morals, and condition.—(BASIL. M. *Ep.* liv; *Conc. Nicæn.* A.D. 325, c. 2, 6, 10; *Conc. Illiberit.* c. 76; *Conc. Neocæsar.* c. 9). This examination was conducted chiefly by the bishops; but the concurrence of the people was requisite, in order to the admission of a candidate<sup>7</sup>. A remarkable testimony to the fact of its having been usual to publish the names of candidates for holy orders, is given by the Roman historian, Lampridius, in his *Life of Alexander Severus*<sup>8</sup>. Afterwards, the examination extended to the qualifications of the party to be

<sup>6</sup> Nullus imposterum ad subdiaconatus ordinem ante vigesimum secundum, ad diaconatus ante vigesimum tertium, ad presbyteratus ante vigesimum quintum ætatis sue annum promoveatur. Sciant tamen episcopi, non singulos in ea ætate constitutos debere ad hos ordines assumi, sed dignos duntaxat, et quorum probata vita senectus sit.—*Conc. Trident. Sess.* xxiii. c. 12.

<sup>7</sup> Ut nullus clericus ordinetur non

*probatus vel episcoporum examine vel populi testimonio*, (*Conc. Carthag.* A.D. 398, can. 22).—President apud nos probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti, (*FERTULL. Apologet.* c. 39).—Episcopus deligatur plebe præsentem, que singulorum vitam plenissime novit et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. (*CYPRIAN, Ep.* 68, al. 67.)

<sup>8</sup> See note 3, in page 329.

ordained, in respect of orthodoxy and learning<sup>9</sup>. By a law of Justinian, every candidate for holy orders was required to give in a testimonial or account of his faith, in his own handwriting, as well as to take the oath against simony<sup>10</sup>. And a council held in the beginning of the ninth century enacted, that every presbyter should go through a course of preparation or probation, previously to ordination<sup>11</sup>.

3. It was a rule, that *no person should be appointed to the higher offices of the church, without having passed through the*

<sup>9</sup> Qui episcopus ordinatus est, antea examinetur: si natura sit prudens, si docilis, si moribus temporatus, si vita castus, si sobrius, si semper suis negotiis vacans [al. cavens], si humilis, si affabilis, si misericors, si literatus, si in lege Domini instructus, si in Scripturarum sensibus cautus, si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus, et ante omnia, si fidei documenta verbis simplicibus afferat [asserat]. Querendum etiam ab eo; si novi vel veteris Testamenti, id est legis et prophetarum et apostolorum, unum eundemque credat auctorem et Deum; si Diabolus non per conditionem sed per arbitrium factus sit malus. *Conc. Carth. iv. c. 1.*—Quando episcopus ordinationes facere disponit, omnes, qui ad sacrum ministerium accedere volunt, feria quarta ante ipsam ordinationem evocandi sunt ad civitatem, una cum archipresbyteris, qui eos representare debent. Et tunc episcopus a latere suo eligere debet sacerdotes et alios prudentes viros, gnaros divinæ legis, et exercitatos in ecclesiasticis sanctionibus, qui ordinatorum vitam, genus, patriam, ætatem, institutionem, locum ubi educati sunt, si sint bene literati, si instructi in lege Domini, diligenter investigent, ante omnia si fidem catholicam firmiter teneant, et verbis simplicibus asserere queant. Ipsi autem, quibus hoc committitur, cavere debent, ne aut favoris gratia, aut

cujuscunque numeris cupiditate illecti a vero devient, et indignum et minus idoneum ad sacros gradus suscipiendos episcopi manibus applicent. *Conc. Nannetense, A. D. 658. can. 11.*

<sup>10</sup> Exigi etiam ante omnia ab eo, qui ordinandus est, *libellum, ejus propria scriptione complectentem quæ ad rectam ejus fidem pertinent.* Enuntiari etiam ab ipso et sanctam oblationis formulam, quæ in sancta communione fit, eam quæ fit in baptisate precatorem, et reliquas deprecationes. *Jusjurandum* autem suscipere eum, qui ordinatur, per divinas scripturas, quod neque per se ipsum, neque per aliam personam, dedit aut promisit, neque posthac dabit, vel vocanti ipsum, vel his, qui sacra pro eo suffragia fecerunt, vel alii cuiquam ordinationis de ipso faciendæ nomine. Si quis autem præter memoratam observationem episcopus ordinetur, jubemus et ipsum omnibus modis episcopatu dejici, et eum, qui contra talem observationem eum ordinare ausus fuerit. **JUSTINIAN Nov. Constit. 137. c. 2.**

<sup>11</sup> Presbyterum ordinari non debet ante legitimum tempus, hoc est, ante xxx ætatis annum; sed priusquam ad presbyteratus consecrationem accedat, maneat in episcopio discendi gratia officium suum tam diu, donec possint et mores et actus ejus animadverti; et tunc, si dignus fuerit, ad sacerdotium promoveatur. *Conc. Turon. 3. A. D. 813, c. 12.*

*inferior degrees*<sup>12</sup>. This rule, which at one time furnished matter for a dispute between the churches of Rome and Constantinople, was generally observed; exceptions to it being admitted, for the most part, only in extraordinary cases.

4. *Every one was to be ordained to some special charge*, for the exercise of spiritual functions, in some specified church or place<sup>13</sup>. exceptions to this rule, as in the cases of Paulinus and Jerome, were rare<sup>14</sup>.

5. *Every spiritual person was required to remain in the diocese in which he was ordained*. This rule related especially to bishops. It was not strictly observed.

6. *The clerical tonsure was not made requisite until the end of the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth*. In the fourth and fifth centuries we find it censured as unbecoming spiritual persons, on the ground of its being among the tokens of penance. (OPTAT. MILEV. *De Schism. Donat.* lib. ii. c. 22; HIERON. *Comment. in Ezech.* c. 44.)

### § 3.—ADMINISTRATION OF THE RITE.

THE testimony of the ancient church is in few points so clear and decided, as in recording the rule, that the bishop was regarded as, *ex officio*, the regular minister of ordination. At an early period, the power of ordaining was vested in the bishop or governing presbyter, or at least it was arranged that no ordination by a presbyter could be valid, without episcopal concurrence and

<sup>12</sup> Ut ex laico ad gradum sacerdotii ante nemo veniat, nisi prius in officio lectorati vel subdiaconati disciplinam ecclesiasticam discat, et sic per singulos gradus ad sacerdotium veniat. *Conc. Bracar.* 2, A. D. 563, 3. 20.

<sup>13</sup> Μηδένα ἀπολελυμένως (absolute) χειροτονείσθαι μήτε πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον, μήτε ὄλωσ τινῶ τῶν ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῷ τάγματι· εἰ μὴ ἰδικῶς (specialiter) ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πόλεως, ἢ κώμης, ἢ μωρτυρίῳ, ἢ μοναστηριῳ, ὃ χειροτονούμενος ἐπικηρύττειτο. Τοὺς δὲ ὑπολύτως χειροτονουμένους ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἄκρον ἔχειν τὴν τοιαύτην χειροθεσίαν,

καὶ μηδαμοῦ δύνασθαι ἐνεργεῖν ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ χειροτονήσαντος. *Conc. Chalced.* A. D. 451, c. 6; *Conf. Conc. Valent.* c. 6.

<sup>14</sup> Ea conditione in Barchinonensi ecclesia consecrari adductus sum, ut ipsi ecclesie non alligarer; in sacerdotium tantum Domini, non in locum ecclesie, dedicatus. PAULINUS, *Ep.* 4. *ad Sever.*—*Conf. SOZOMEN, Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 34; THEODORET, *Hist. Rel.* c. 3. Jerome was ordained presbyter for the church of Antioch; although he did not confine himself to local ministrations; *conf. HIERON, Ep.* 61, *ad Pammach.*; *Ep.* 110.

assent. The canons of councils, for the most part, attribute the power of ordaining to the bishop without further remark (*Conc. Nic. c. 19; Antioch. c. 9; Chalced. c. 2; Carthag. iii. c. 45; iv. c. 3*); and early ecclesiastical writers often expressly assert, that ordination is valid only when performed by a bishop. Thus CHRYSOST. *Hom. xi. in 1 Ep. ad Timoth.; Hom. i. in Ep. ad Phil.*; where it is distinctly said, that a presbyter possessed no power of ordaining (See also HIERONYM *Epist. 85 ad Evagr.*). EPIPHANIUS (*Hæres. lxxv. n. 4*) represents it as an error of Aërius, that he desired to place bishops and presbyters on an equal footing (See book iii. chap. 3, sect. 5). Ordinations by presbyters were frequently declared invalid (*Conc. Sardic. c. 19; Conc. Hispal. ii. c. 5; ATHANAS. Apol. c. Ar.*). The ordinations of Novatians, Donatists, and other reputed heretics or schismatics, were admitted as valid, on condition that they were administered regularly (rite), that is, by a bishop. And the only right in the matter of ordination which belonged to presbyters, was that of assisting the bishop in ordaining their fellow-presbyters<sup>15</sup>.

Ordination was administered in the church, in the presence of the congregation; any more private administration was regarded as an abuse (GREG. NAZ. *Carm. de Vita sua; SOCRATES, Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 29*).

No fixed seasons for ordination were appointed during the first four centuries; the rite was performed at any part of the year, according to the necessities of the church. During the same period we find no certain rules restricting the performance of this rite to the Lord's day; a law which afterwards prevailed (LEONIS. M. (?) *Ep. lxxxvi. ad Dioscur. c. 1; GELAS. Ep. ix. c. 11*). It was then usually administered at the time of the celebration of the Lord's supper (*Conc. Laodic. c. 5; THEODORET.*

<sup>15</sup> Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri qui presentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant; *Conc. Carth. iv. c. 4.*—Presbyteros quoque et diaconos sola manuum impositione ordinabant; sed suos presbyteros quisque episcopus cum presbyterorum collegio ordinabat. Quanquam

autem idem agebant omnes, quia tamen præibat episcopus et quasi ejus auspiciis res gerebatur, ideo ipsius dicebatur ordinatio. Unde veteres hoc sæpe habent, non differre alia re ab episcopo presbyterum, nisi quia ordinandi potestatem non habeat. CALVIN. *Instit. Rel. Chr. lib. iv. c. 4, § 15.*

*Hist. Eccl.* c. 13); the candidate kneeling before the table (THEODORET *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 15; DIONYS. *de Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 5; *Contempl.* iii. n. 7, 8).

Candidates for the ministry, having prepared themselves by prayer and fasting, were ordained by the bishop with prayer and imposition of hands (*ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν, χειροθεσία* or *χειροτονία*<sup>16</sup>). No mention of the additional ceremony of anointing is found in any laws or regulations of the church anterior to the ninth century; Innocent III. (*Decret.* lib. i. tit. 15), and Durandus (*Rational. Div. Off.* lib. i. c. 8), are the first who treat of the usefulness, necessity, and mystical signification of unction at ordination. It has been said, that some traces of this custom are found in the age of Gregory the Great; it is certain, however, that its general adoption must be assigned to a later period.—The ceremony of delivering the sacred vessels, ornaments, and vestments, to the parties ordained (investiture), was not established as a whole, until the seventh century; although several particulars of it may be traced to an earlier date, being mentioned in the records of the third and fourth centuries. The idea is evidently borrowed from the Levitical institutions; and it is well known that the Gregorian era was distinguished by the assimilation of the Christian to the Jewish hierarchy. (Concerning similar or rather corresponding ceremonies of investiture, observed at the ordination or appointment of the inferior ministers or officers, see above, chap. ix. xii.) The party ordained was signed with the sign of the cross<sup>17</sup>; and was embraced, after his ordination, by the ordaining minister and his assistants, with the kiss of charity (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 5; DIONYS. AREOP. *de Hier. Eccl.* c. 5).

<sup>16</sup> Some make a distinction between *χειροθεσία* and *χειροτονία*, supposing that the former denoted the ordinary imposition of hands, as at baptism, confirmation, and absolution, while the latter was restricted to imposition of hands at ordination.

<sup>17</sup> *Κὰν ἀναγεννηθῆναι δέη, σταυρὸς πυραγίνεται, κὰν τραφήναι τὴν μυστικὴν*

*ἐκείνην τροφὴν, κὰν χειροτονηθῆναι, κὰν ὁτιοῦν ἕτερον ποιῆσαι, πανταχοῦ τοῦτο τῆς νίκης ἡμῶν παρίσταται σύμβολον.* CIRCULOS. *Hom.* 55, in Matth.—Thus also, in Dionys. Areop. *de Hier. Eccl.* c. 5, imposition of hands is called not only *σφραγίς* (consignatio), but also *σταυροειδὴς σφραγίς* (consignatio cruciformis, i. e., in forma crucis).

§ 4.—FORMS OF PRAYER USED AT ORDINATIONS.

THE *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii.) prescribe the following forms of prayer to be used at the ordination of bishops, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, subdeacons, and readers. They are probably compositions of the fourth century; and may be regarded as patterns of the forms generally used at that period of the Christian church<sup>16</sup>.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Bishop.*

O eternal and almighty Lord God, the only unbegotten and supreme, who art from eternity, before all time and all things; thou who hast need of nothing, and art exalted far above all circumstances and events; thou who art the only true, the only wise, the highest over all; whose nature is inscrutable, and whose knowledge is without beginning; thou who alone art good, and with whom no one may compare; thou who knowest all things, before they come to pass; thou from whom no secrets are hid, whom no one can approach unto, whom no one can command; O thou God and Father of thine only-begotten Son, our Lord and Saviour; thou who through time hast created all things, and who upholdest and preservest all; thou father of mercy, and God of all consolation; thou who dwellest in the highest, and regardest the things that are below; thou who hast given to the church its bounds by the incarnation of thy Christ, with the testimony or the Comforter, by thine apostles, and by the bishops here present by thy grace; thou who from the beginning, amongst the first men, didst for the good of thy people appoint priests, even Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, and Job;—thou who didst choose thy faithful servants Abraham and the other patriarchs, Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, and Phineas, and didst appoint from among them princes and priests for the service of the cove-

<sup>16</sup> Concerning these ordination services, Bingham observes very properly:—"It is not to be imagined that one and the same form was used in all churches; for every bishop having liberty to frame his own liturgy, as there were different liturgies in dif-

ferent churches, so it is most reasonable to suppose the primates or metropolitans had different forms of consecration, though there are now no remains of them in being, to give us any further information."—*Antiq.* book ii. chap. 11, sect. 9.

nant; who didst make Samuel both priest and prophet, who didst not leave thy sanctuary without ministers and attendance, and didst show favour unto those whom thou didst cause to minister to thy glory;—we beseech thee to pour out now through us, by the mediation of thy Christ, the power of thine almighty spirit, which is given through thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, and which he imparted to thine holy apostles, according to thy will, O eternal God. Grant, O thou searcher of the heart, that this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to the office of a bishop, may feed thy holy flock in thy name, and may serve thee unblameably as thine high priest, day and night; and that he, propitiating thy countenance, may gather unto thee the number of those who shall be called, and may present the offerings of thy holy church. Grant unto him, O Lord Almighty, by thy Christ and the communication of the Holy Spirit, that he may have power to remit sins according to thy commandment, to confer orders (*διδόναι κλήρους*) according to thy appointment, and to loose every bond (*πάντα σύνδεσμον*) according to the power which thou didst grant unto thine apostles. Grant that he may please thee by meekness, purity of heart, constancy, sincerity, and a blameless conversation; that so he may offer unto thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice which thou hast appointed by Christ in the sacrament of the new covenant, and as the offering of a sweet-smelling savour, through thy dear Son Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour, through whom be unto thee glory, honour, and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Presbyter.*

O almighty Lord, our God, who by Christ has created all things, and dost preserve them, upholding all by him; seeing that he who hath power to create, hath power also to uphold; thou, O God, dost provide for the immortals by thy guardianship alone, but for mortals by ruling their spirits by laws, and supplying their bodily wants; look down now, we beseech thee, upon thy holy church, assist its growth, and increase the number of its rulers. Give them power to work, by word and deed, for the edification of thy people. Oh! look now upon this thy servant, who has been chosen into the presbytery by the suffrage (*ψήφῳ*)



and judgment of all the clergy; replenish him with the spirit of grace and counsel, that he may aid and govern thy people with a pure heart. As thou didst once graciously look down upon thy chosen people, and didst command Moses to choose elders, and didst fill them with thy Spirit, so grant, Lord, that now the Spirit of grace may remain undiminished among us; that this man, being plentifully provided with healing powers and instructive words, may teach thy people with meekness, may serve thee with a pure heart and a willing mind, and perform the sacred service unblameably for the good of thy people; through thy Christ, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory, honour, and adoration, for ever. Amen<sup>19</sup>.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Deacon.*

O almighty God, who alone art true, who art rich in blessing to all who call upon thee faithfully, terrible in thy decrees, wise in thy thoughts, of great power and majesty:—Hear, O Lord, our prayer, accept our supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon this thy servant, who has been chosen to thy service. Fill him with the Holy Ghost and with power, with which thou didst replenish Stephen the witness and follower of the sufferings of Christ. Grant that he, having fulfilled the office committed to him acceptably, steadfastly, unblameably, and without rebuke, may be worthy of a higher degree (*μείζωνος βαθροῦ*); through the mediation of thine only-begotten Son, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory, honour, and adoration for ever. Amen.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Deaconess.*

O eternal God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the creator of man and woman; thou who didst replenish with thy Spirit, Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, and Hulda; thou who wast

<sup>19</sup> “The words which the Roman church makes to be the most necessary and essential part of a priest’s ordination, namely, ‘Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass both for the living and the dead,’ were not in any of the ancient forms of consecration.” BING. *Antiq.* book ii. chap. 19, sect. 17; with reference to *Conc. Carth.* iv. c. 3; (DIONYS.) *de Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 5, part ii.; BISHOP BURNET, *Of Ordination.*

not ashamed that thine only-begotten Son should be born of a woman; thou who didst appoint, in the tabernacle and the temple, female watchers of thy holy gates;—look now, we beseech thee, upon this thine handmaid, who has been chosen to the service (of the church); grant unto her the Holy Spirit, and cleanse her from all pollution of the flesh and spirit, that she may fulfil the office committed unto her acceptably, to thy glory, and to the honour of thy Christ; to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be honour and adoration, for ever. Amen.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Subdeacon.*

O Lord God, the creator of heaven and earth, and of all things that are therein, who didst appoint in thy tabernacle attendants (*νεωκόρους*) and overseers of the sacred vessels, look now upon this thy servant appointed to the office of a subdeacon, and grant unto him the Holy Spirit, that he may reverently handle the vessels employed in thy worship (*τῶν λειτουργικῶν σου σκεύων*), and in all things perform thy will; through thy Christ, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory and adoration, now and for ever. Amen.

*Prayer at the Ordination of a Reader.*

O eternal God, who art rich in grace and mercy, who dost display thy goodness and providence in thy works, and hast preserved the number of thine elect;—look now upon this thy servant, who has been chosen to read the holy Scriptures to thy people, and grant unto him the holy and prophetic Spirit. As thou didst once instruct thy servant Ezra to read thy law to thy people, so now instruct this thy servant, we beseech thee, and grant that he, having faithfully discharged the duties of his office, may be counted worthy of a higher degree; through Christ, to whom, &c.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> “ In the Greek church, Habertus (*Archieratic.* par. iv. obs. 1) thinks readers were ordained with the imposition of hands; but among the Latins without it. The author of the *Constitutions* prescribes a form of prayer to

be used with imposition of hands\*; but whether that was the practice of all

\* Of the right hand only (*τὴν χεῖρα*). —ED.

## CHAPTER XV.

## OF APPOINTMENT TO ECCLESIASTICAL OFFICES.

THE various modes of electing persons to ecclesiastical offices may be reduced to the following heads:—

## § 1.—ELECTION BY THE VOTES OF A WHOLE CHURCH.

SOME suppose that, in the days of the apostles, the whole church or congregation took part in electing their teachers and governors. In confirmation of this opinion they appeal to the fact, (Acts i. 15, *seq.*) that even the apostles themselves did not proceed to elect another in the room of Judas Iscariot, without the consent of the church at Jerusalem. And they remark that, on occasion of the election of the seven deacons in the same church, recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts, “the twelve called the multitude of disciples unto them, and said, . . . Look ye out seven men—and the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen, &c., whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.” But it has been said, in reply, that these instances relate only to the appointment of apostles, and of overseers of the poor; and that there does not exist in the New Testament any trace of the election of bishop or presbyter by the lay members of a church; whereas it appears on the contrary, from Acts xiv. 23; 2 Tim. ii. 1; and Tit. i. 5, that the apostles themselves appointed presbyters, and that St. Paul empowered and commissioned Timothy and Titus to do the same. In reply to this again, it has been urged

the Greek church is very much questioned. In the Latin church it was certainly otherwise. The Council of Carthage (*Conc. Carth.* iv. c. 8) speaks of no other ceremony but the bishop's putting the Bible into his hands in the presence of the people, with these words, ‘Take this book, and be thou a reader of the word of God, which office if thou fulfil faith-

fully and profitably, thou shalt have part with those that minister in the word of God.’ And in Cyprian's time, they seem not to have had so much as this ceremony of delivering the Bible to them; but they were made readers by the bishop's commission and deputation only to such a station in the church.” BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book iii. chap. 5, sect. 3.

that the word *χειροτονεῖν*, in these passages of Scripture, refers to the work of confirmation and ordination, and by no means excludes the idea of a previous election or nomination by the whole church. The apostle, in giving his directions, presupposes that Timothy and Titus, to whom he committed the ordination, designation, or solemn investment, of presbyters elect, would proceed in the same manner as himself and other apostles had done in similar cases; and that they would make it a rule to say in effect, “Look ye out among you men of honest report;” that is to say, that they would not appoint any presbyter over the members of a church, without their previous knowledge and approbation of the person to be appointed. That the advice and consent of the churches was demanded on other occasions also, is evident from Acts xv. 1 *seq.*; i. 15; 1 Cor. v. 2; 2 Cor. ii.; 1 Cor. viii. 19, 20, and other passages of the New Testament.

The best interpreter of the intention of the apostle, and the oldest witness in this matter whom we have the opportunity of consulting, is Clemens Romanus (?) (*Ep. ad Corinth.* § 44). This writer, in speaking of the succession of pastors to their office, mentions the consent and approbation of the church concerning the person who should fill the place of a deceased pastor, grounded upon previous trial or experience of his fitness for the office; and makes it evident that in his time there was an active co-operation of the church in the appointment of its ministers; not merely a power of negating an appointment made by some independent authority<sup>1</sup>.

In the writings of Cyprian, likewise, we find the most unequivocal testimony to the fact of the concurrence of the people in the election of bishops and presbyters<sup>2</sup>. The respectful title

<sup>1</sup> The apostles appointed bishops and deacons,—Καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομήν δεδῶκασιν, ὅπως εἴν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ’ ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ’ ἐτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμελητηρημένους τε

πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δίκαιως νομιζόμεν ἀποβαλέσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. CLEM. ROM. *Ep.* (1) *ad Corinth.* § 44.

<sup>2</sup> Quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere ut sacerdos plebe presente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico iudicio ac testimonio comprobetur. . . Coram omni synagoga jubet Deus constitui sacerdotem, id est, instruit atque

of *parentes*, which was given by the bishops to their constituents the people, serves to indicate the influence possessed by the latter with reference to the appointment of their ministers. (AMERGS. *Comment. in Luc.* lib. viii. c. 17.)

We have, moreover, the testimony of a profane writer on this subject. Lampridius, in his *Life of Alexander Severus* (c. 45), relates that this emperor, who reigned from A. D. 222 to 235, gave the people a negative vote relating to the appointment of procurators, or chief presidents of provinces, in imitation of the Christians and Jews in the appointment of their priests<sup>3</sup>. It may be observed, on reference to this passage, that it establishes no more than the right of negating or rejecting an appointment; and the expression “in prædicandis sacerdotibus,” “in proclaiming or announcing their priests,” implies merely that an election which had already taken place, was submitted to the notice and approbation of the people. And, in fact, it seems to have been usual for the clergy or presbytery (or the retiring bishop or presbyter) to propose or nominate a person to fill the vacant office; and then this proposal or nomination was followed

ostendit ordinationes sacerdotales non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut plebe presente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur, et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quæ omnium suffragio et iudicio fuerit examinata. Quod postea secundum divina magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum.

. . . Nec hoc in episcoporum tantum et sacerdotem, sed et in diaconorum ordinationibus apostolos fecisse animadvertimus. . . Quod utique ideo tam diligentur et caute convocata plebe tota gerebatur, ne quis ad altaris ministerium, vel ad sacerdotalem locum, indignus obreperet. CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 68. — Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus iudicio, de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis, quæ tunc adfuit, suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio, cum nemo ante se factus esset. cum Fabiani locus, id est,

cum locus Petri et gradus cathedre sacerdotalis, vacaret: quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato, quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fieri necesse est, nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, qui ecclesie non tenet unitatem. *Id. Ep.* 52.

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Severus, ubi aliquos voluisset vel rectores provinciis dare, vel prepositos facere, vel procuratores, id est, rationales, ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans populum, ut si quis quid haberat criminis, probaret manifestis rebus; si non probasset, subiret pœnam capitis: dicebatque grave esse, cum id Christiani et Judæi facerent in prædicandis sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in provinciarum rectoribus, quibus et fortune hominum committerentur et capita. LAMPRIID, in *Vit. Alexandri Severi*, c. 45.

by the suffrages of the people,—suffrages not merely testimonial, but really judicial and elective.

Instances, however, occur, in which there was no kind of *propositio*, or *prædicatio*, *i. e.*, *nomination*; but in which the people of their own accord, and by acclamation, elected individuals to the office of presbyter or bishop. Thus Ambrose, even before he was baptized, was called by the people, or lay members, of the church of Milan, to the office of bishop, and was compelled to undertake that office. (PAULIN. *Vit. Ambros.*; RUFFIN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 11; THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 6, 7; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 24.) Martin of Tours was elected by the people, and compelled to undertake office against his own will, and that of several bishops. (SULPIC. SEV. *Vit. S. Martini*, c. 7.) The same happened to Eustathius at Antioch (THEODOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 7); Chrysostom at Constantinople (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 2); Eradius at Hippona (AUGUST. *Ep.* 110); and Meletius at Antioch (THEODOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 31, 32.)

That the people co-operated in the election of their presbyters is evident from many examples in ecclesiastical history. (See HIERON. *Ep.* 4, *ad Rustic.*; *Comment in Ezech.* x. c. 23; POSSID. *Vit. Augustini*, c. 21; SIRICH, *Ep.* 1 *ad Himer.* c. 10.) It was ordered by the fourth council of Carthage (c. 22), that as the bishop might not ordain clerks without the advice of his clergy, so, likewise, he should require the consent, co-operation, and testimony, of the people, (*Ut episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet: ita ut civium assensum et communitatem et testimonium querat.*)

In these elections, a regular system of voting appears to have been sometimes adopted; namely, whenever several different candidates were proposed to the choice of the people. (*Concil. Arlat.* ii., A.D. 452, c. 54; *Concil. Barcin.* c. 3; PHILASTOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ix. c. 13; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 21.) But, for the most part, approbation or rejection was signified by the expressions *ἀξιός, fit*, or *ἀνάξιός, unfit*, or some other equivalent to these. (See *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 4; AMBROS. *De Dignit. Sacerdot.* c. 5; AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 110; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 29; PHILAST. lib. ix. c. 10.)

## § 2.—ELECTION BY VISITORS, &amp;c.

A MODE of election entirely popular, such as has been already described, was evidently liable to great irregularities; and care was to be taken lest the exercise of this right should occasion disturbance and confusion, or should foment a mischievous party-spirit. That abuses of this kind did actually arise and proceed to a considerable extent, appears from the following remarkable passage of Chrysostom (*De Sacerdot.* lib. iii. c. 15). “Go and witness the proceedings at our public festivals (*τὰς δημοτελεῖς ἑορτὰς*); in which, more especially, according to established rule, the elections of ecclesiastical officers (*τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχῶν αἰρέσεις*) take place. You will there find complaints raised against the priest (*τὸν ἱερέα, ἰ. ε., ἐπίσκοπον*), as numerous and as various in their character, as the multitude of those who are the subjects of church-government (*τῶν ἀρχομένων πλῆθος*). For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into different factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery. One supports one man, and one another. And the reason of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualification of the person to be elected (*τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἀρετὴν*). There are other points to which they have an eye, and whereby their choice is determined. One, for example, says that it is necessary to elect a candidate who is of a good family (*γένους λαμπροῦ*). Another would choose a wealthy individual, because such a one would not require to be supported out of the church revenues. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favour of a relative or friend. While another lends his support to some one who has won upon him by fair speeches and plausible pretensions (*κολακεύδοντα*). But scarcely any one pays due regard to that which is really useful, and able to abide the test, in a spiritual point of view.”

This representation applied more or less to popular elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria,

Antioch, and other large cities; as appears from many historical records. And in order to do away with these disorders and abuses, some celebrated bishops fell into another extreme, of claiming an independent and exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. Hereby they gave offence to the people, who were naturally jealous of their rights; and even occasioned vexatious and turbulent resistance<sup>4</sup>.

It has been asserted that the people had been deprived of the right of partaking in the election of bishops, by the fourth canon of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, in which it is said, "that the presence, or at least the consent, of all the provincial bishops, and the confirmation or ratification of the metropolitan, shall be necessary to the election and ordination of a bishop." But Bingham has shown (book iv., chap. 2, sect. 11), that by the regulation it was not intended to exclude any ancient privilege belonging to the people, but only to establish the rights of metropolitans, and provincial bishops, which Meletius, the schismatical Egyptian bishop, had particularly invaded, by presuming to ordain bishops without the authority of his metropolitan, or consent of his fellow-bishops in the province of Egypt. That nothing else was designed by that canon is evident from this, that the same council, in the synodical Epistle written to the church of Alexandria, expressly mentions the choice of the people, and requires it as the condition of a canonical election. For, speaking of such Meletian bishops as would return to the unity of the Catholic Church, it says, "that when any Catholic bishop died, Meletian bishops might succeed in their room, provided that they were worthy, and that the people chose them, and the bishop of Alexandria ratified and confirmed their choice, (*μόνον ἐὶ ἀξιοὶ φαίνονται, καὶ ὁ λαὸς αἰροῖτο, συνεπιψηφίζοντος αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπισφραγίζοντος τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπου*.) Our learned Bishop Pearson has rightly observed,

<sup>4</sup> Indecenter alios, invitis et repugnantibus civibus, ordinavit. Qui quidem, quoniam non facile ab his, qui non elegerant, recipiebantur, manum sibi contrahebat armatam . . . et ad sedem quietis pacem predicaturos per bella ducebat. VALENTINIAN III.;

Nov. XXIV, ad calcem Cod. Theodos.—Expectarentur certa vota civium, testimonia populorum; quaereretur honorarium arbitrium, electio clericorum. . . . Qui prefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur. LEO. M. Ep. 39.



that Athanasius himself was thus chosen, after the Nicene council was ended; which is a certain argument that the people's right was not abrogated in that council. . . . Two canons of the fourth council of Carthage comprise the whole practice of the church in relation to this matter. The one decreed, 'that the ordination of a bishop should always be by the consent of four parties, the clergy, the laity, the provincial bishops, and the metropolitan, whose presence or authority was principally necessary in all such cases.' The other canon orders, 'that no bishop shall ordain any clergyman without consulting with his clergy, and asking the consent, approbation, and testimony of his people.' This seems to have been the most common and ordinary practice of the church."

On the other hand, by the thirteenth canon of the Council of Laodicea, the people were directly forbidden to take any part in the election of the clergy, (*περὶ τοῦ μὴ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖον*, i. e., *concerning the not intrusting the multitude with the choice of persons to serve in sacred offices.*) But it is worthy of remark, that we here read *τοῖς ὄχλοις*, instead of the ordinary *τῷ λαῷ*; and that reference appears to be made to such disorderly elections as had occurred at Constantinople, Antioch, and elsewhere; without, perhaps, any intention to do away with a due and orderly representation of the lay-members of the church. The decrees of this council, however, and especially the canon in question, produced little effect. We read of repeated disturbances, which afterwards took place at the elections of the clergy. (See AUGUST. *Ep.* 155; SYNESII, *Ep.* 67; and other passages collected by BARONIUS, *Annal.* 303, n. 22 seqq.; and in BALUZI *Miscell.* T. 2.)

In the Latin and especially the African churches, an attempt was made to introduce better order and greater simplicity into the business of elections, without destroying the rights of the

<sup>5</sup> Cum consensu clericorum et laicorum, et conventu totius provincie episcoporum, maximeque metropolitani vel auctoritate vel presentia ordinetur episcopus. *Conc. Carth.* iv. c. 1.—Ut episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet; ita ut civium assensum, et conviventiam, et testimonium quaerat. *Ib.* can. 22.

people, by the appointment of interventores, or *visitors*. But notwithstanding the recommendations of Symmachus (*Ep.* 5. c. 6), and Gregory the Great (*Ep.* lib. ix. *Ep.* 16), this arrangement was neither universally adopted, nor long continued. A somewhat similar attempt was made by a law of Justinian; except, indeed, that by this it was proposed to vest the right of election in the lay aristocracy. By two of that emperor's Novels it is provided, "that when a bishop is to be ordained for any city, the clergy and chief men of the city shall meet and nominate three persons, drawing up an instrument, and inserting therein, upon their oath, that they choose them neither for any gift, nor promise, nor friendship, nor any other cause, but because they know them to be of the true catholic faith, and of honest life, and good learning. That out of these three, one that is best qualified may be ordained by the discretion and judgment of the ordainer," (who was usually the metropolitan or archbishop,) JUSTIN. *Novell.* 123. c. 1; and 137, c. 2; *Cod.* lib. i. tit. 3, *de Episcop. leg.* 42. But as no regulation was made determining who these chief men should be, by which means the rights of the people might have been effectually secured, while party spirit and disputes would have been avoided, the matter was left to accident or caprice; and the result was, that the right of election was taken from the people, and was vested partly in the hands of the ruling powers, and partly with the clergy, who exercised the right either by the bishops, their suffragans and vicars, or by collegiate meetings, and this very often without paying any regard to the church or diocese immediately concerned.

The church sometimes protested vehemently against this encroachment of secular power; but in vain. Remarkable is the sixth canon of the Council of Paris, A.D. 557, to this effect: "Seeing that ancient custom and the regulations of the church are neglected, we decree that no bishop be consecrated against the will of the citizens. And only such person shall be deemed eligible to this dignity, who may be appointed, not by command of the prince, but by the election of the people and clergy; which election must be confirmed by the metropolitan and the other bishops of the province. Any one who may enter upon this office by the mere authority of the king, shall not be recognised by the

other bishops; and if any bishop should recognise him, he must himself be deposed from his office.”

Such demands for the restitution of apostolical and canonical elections (as they were called; compare GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 21) were, however, but rare, and were wholly ineffectual. In the thirteenth century, Innocent III. excluded the people entirely from any share in the elections; (See THOMASSINI *Eccl. Discipl.* P. 2, lib. ii. c. 1—42.) In the Oriental church the people had lost their right at a still earlier period, (*Concil. Nic.* 2, A.D. 787, c. 3; *Concil. Œcum.* 8, A.D. 871, c. 22.)

### § 3.—EXTRAORDINARY MODES OF APPOINTMENT.

THERE were also some *extraordinary modes of designation*; as, when a bishop nominated his successor, which was a case of frequent occurrence, (See SOZOMEN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 17, 20; lib. viii. c. 2; THEODORET IV. c. 26; SOCRAT. vii. c. 46; AUGUSTIN *Ep.* 110; POSSID. *Vit. Aug.* c. 8;) or when the nomination was made by some individual unconnected with the diocese, to whom a doubtful case may have been referred for decision; or when a bishop was appointed for barbarous districts, in which no church had been formed, (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 19; THEODOR. lib. i. c. 23; RUFFIN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 9.) But in these cases the consent of the people was presupposed, or obtained. By the Council of Antioch, A.D. 441, (c. 23,) bishops were forbidden to nominate their successors<sup>6</sup>; but the practice was not wholly discontinued; and by the fourth canon of the Synodus Palmaris, held at Rome in the year 503, bishops were permitted towards the close of life to nominate successors.

### § 4.—PATRONAGE.

THE right of ecclesiastical patronage is usually supposed to have originated during the fifth century. And it is true that

<sup>6</sup> Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καθιστᾶν ἕτερον ἑαυτοῦ διαδόχον, κἄν πρὸς τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου τυγχάνῃ· εἰ δέ τι τοιοῦτον γίνωσται, ἄκυρον εἶναι τὴν κατάστασιν. Φυλάττεσθαι δὲ τὸν θεσμὸν τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικόν, περιέχοντα, μὴ δεῖν ἄλλως γίνεσθαι ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ μετὰ συνόδου, καὶ ἐπικρίσεως ἐπισκόπων, τῶν μετὰ τὴν κοίμησιν τοῦ ἀναπαυσμένου τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐχόντων τοῦ προσάγεσθαι τὸν ἄξιον. *Conc. Antioch.* A. D. 441, c. 23.

it was then for the first time formally and officially established. But we find that cases and claims of this nature had existed at an earlier period. The first Council of Orange, A. D. 441, granted to bishops the power and privilege of nominating and presenting clerks to particular churches, founded by themselves in other dioceses than their own. Chrysostom speaks of the custom of naming founders of churches in the prayers of the congregation. In the laws of Justinian, the right of presentation is granted to the laity, that is to say, to any "founders of churches and their heirs;" who were permitted to nominate their own clerks, leaving to the bishop no power to ordain any other, unless the person nominated were disqualified by virtue of the canons<sup>7</sup>.

The term *patronus*, *Patron*, which has prevailed since the fifth century, was evidently adopted from the language of civil life.

The complete development of the system of church patronage was a work of the eighth and ninth centuries<sup>8</sup>. The general

<sup>7</sup> Si quis episcoporum in alienæ civitatis territoria ecclesiam ædificare disponat, vel profundi sui negotio, aut ecclesiastica utilitate, vel pro quacunque sua opportunitate, permissa licentia ædificandi, quia hoc prohibere votum nefas est, non presumat dedicationem, quæ illi omni modis reservatur, in cuius territorio ecclesia assurgit: reservata ædificatori episcopo hæc gratia, ut, quos desiderat clericos in re sua videre, ipsos ordinet is, cuius territorium sit: vel si ordinati jam sunt, ipsos habere acquiescat. Et omnis ecclesiæ ipsius gubernatio ad eum, in cuius civitatis territorio ecclesia surrexerit, pertinebit. *Conc. Arais. i. A. D. 441, c. 10; Conf. Conc. Arelat. ii. c. 36.*—*Εἴ τι ἔχεις εἰς πένητας ἀναλώσαι, ἐκεῖ ἀνάλωσον βέλτιον ἐκεῖ ἢ ἐπαύθῃ θρέψον διδάσκων θρέψον διάκωνον καὶ ἱερατικὸν συστήμα . . . . . εὐχαὶ ἐκεῖ διηκεῖς διὰ σὲ προσφορά καθ' ἐκάστην κυριακὴν . . . Μικρὸν ἔστω, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις*

*ἀναφοραῖς ἀεὶ τὸ ὄνομα σου ἐγκέῃσθαι, καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὑπὲρ τῆς κώμης εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν;* CHRYSOST. *Hom. xviii. in Act. Apost. Conf. JUSTIN. Novell. 123, c. 18; 57, c. 2.*

<sup>8</sup> Thomassinus (*De Disciplina Ecclcs.* p. 2, lib. i. c. 29) distinguishes the following periods: I. De jure patronatus seu de presentatione per v. priora sæcula. II. De patronatu ecclesiastico laicoque sub imperio Chlodovæci usque ad Carolum M. III. Sub imperio Caroli M. et Carolinæ stirpis. IV. Post a. c. 1000. With regard to the first of these periods the author thus records the result of his inquiries:—"Illud ergo ex his concluditur, patronatum quidam *ecclesiasticum* in occidente fundamenta habuisse primum, *laicum* autem in oriente prius emersisse, antequam ejus ulla in occidente eminent vestigia, saltem quoad jus presentandi. Sed hanc patronatus laici obscuritatem inter priora hæc

standing rule is contained in these words, “Patronum faciunt dos, ædificatio, fundus ;” and the rights and duties of the patron are described in the following distich :

Patrono debetur honos, onus, utilitasque ;  
Præsentet, præsit, defendat, alatur egenus.

In most of the Lutheran, and some of the Reformed, churches, the members of the church possess a negative vote concerning the presentation of a minister, but no more.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

### RANK, RIGHTS, AND PRIVILEGES OF THE CLERGY.— PUNISHMENT OF DELINQUENTS.

#### 1. *Rank, Rights, and Privileges of the Clergy.*

BEFORE the time of Constantine the clergy were not recognised as holding any distinct rank in the state ; but, when Christianity was adopted under that emperor as the religion of the Roman empire, its ministers were considered as occupying the place of those heathen priests whose superstitions and observances had fallen into disrepute. Constantine himself, in the year 325, assumed the title of Pontifex Maximus, which had belonged to the heathen emperors before him ;—a title which contributed to exalt at once the imperial and the episcopal dignity, and served to justify the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical councils and in the nomination of bishops. Gratian was the last emperor to whom this title was ascribed.

Besides the adventitious distinction of external and secular rank, the clergy derived importance from the exercise of their real and legitimate functions, as inspectors or censors of public morals, and in the exercise of a spiritual jurisdiction. A striking example of the power of ecclesiastical authority occurs in the history of the emperor Theodosius the Great. (See *Sozom. Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 25 ; *Theodor.* v. c. 17 ; *Ruffin.* xi. c. 18.)

sæcula abunde compensabat egregia | in episcoporum aliorumque beneficia-  
illa potestas, qua fruebantur tum laici | riorum electionibus et ordinationibus.”

It was not until the Western Empire had been restored by Charlemagne, that the bishops attained the rank of barons or lords; and took part, as one of the estates of the empire, in the diets (which for the most part, were also synods), and other political affairs.

At an early period of his reign, Constantine issued edicts in favour of the Christian clergy, by which they were put on a footing, in respect of civil rights, with the heathen priests. These edicts were soon followed by others, which gave to the clergy some special and exclusive privileges. The sons of Constantine confirmed and extended these grants; and the losses which the clergy sustained under Julian the Apostate were amply repaired by his successors Valentinian III., Gratian, Theodosius the Great, and others.

The following are the chief of those immunities and privileges which were thus accorded to the clergy.

1. Exemption from all civil and municipal offices. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 7; comp. AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 68; *Cod.* THEODOS. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 1, 2.) The same exemptions had been previously granted to the heathen priests and Jewish patriarchs. (*Cod.* THEODOS. lib. xii. tit. 1, leg. 75; lib. xvi. tit. 8, leg. 3, 4; SYMMACH. lib. x. ep. 54.)

2. Exemption from the duties of contributing to the repair of highways and bridges, and of furnishing horses and carriages for conveyance of corn for the soldiers, and such other things as belonged to the emperor's exchequer. But the laws in this respect appear to have varied at different times, and in different places. Or, perhaps, the persons of the clergy were at all times free from these services; but not their property.

3. Exemption from certain taxes and imposts.—The clergy were not, indeed, exempt from the ordinary canonical tribute laid upon men's goods and possessions, or what we should call property and assessed taxes. (ATHANAS. *Apol.* 2; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 12; THEODOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 7; AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 49, *de Div.*; *Cod.* THEODOS. lib. xi. tit. 1, leg. 33; lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 15, 40.) But they were exempt;—first, from that kind of capitation or personal tribute called *census capitis*, so far as this was paid “*pro militia*,” from which the clergy were entirely

free;—secondly, from various other tributes and burdens connected with the census capitis, such as the aurum tironicum, i. e., money paid instead of furnishing new soldiers, and the equus canonicus, money instead of horses for military purposes;—thirdly, from the chrysargyrum, or lustral tax, a tax levied upon trade and commerce, collected every five years, and paid in silver and gold;—fourthly, from the metatum, or the burden and charge of giving entertainment to the emperor's court and retinue when they had occasion to travel, or to judges or soldiers as they passed from one place to another; and fifthly, from the collationes superindictæ et extraordinariæ, i. e., such impositions as the emperors laid upon the empire, or any part of it, beyond the ordinary and canonical taxes, upon great exigences or extraordinary occasions.

4. We do not find any law by which the clergy were exempted from military service; but this may be satisfactorily accounted for, by supposing that such exemption was presupposed or understood, according to the analogy of the immunities of the Jewish and heathen priests. Some of the exemptions already enumerated evidently presuppose this. And the maxim, "Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem," was always recognised by the state.

5. The clergy enjoyed important immunities with respect to the civil government, and secular courts of law.

No secular judge could compel a bishop to appear in a public court to give testimony before him; but he was directed to send one of his officers to the bishop's house to take his testimony in private; and even then the bishop was not obliged to give that testimony upon oath, as other witnesses were, but only upon his word, laying the holy gospels before him (*Cod. JUSTIN.* lib. ix. tit. 41; lib. i. tit. 3, leg. 7, 8; *Cod. THEODOS.* lib. xi. tit. 39, leg. 8, 10; *JUSTIN. Nov.* 123, c. 7).

Bishops and presbyters were privileged against being examined by scourging or torture, which was lawful with regard to other witnesses.

Besides this, all the clergy were exempt from the cognizance of the secular courts in ecclesiastical causes (*Cod. THEODOS.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 12, 23; lib. xvi. tit. 12, leg. 23; *JUSTIN. Nov.* 86;

c. 1; AMBROS. *Ep.* 32). "To have a right understanding in this matter," says Bingham, "we must distinguish the several sorts of causes in which ecclesiastical persons might be concerned. Now these were of four kinds:—first, such as related to matters purely ecclesiastical, as crimes committed against the faith, or against the canons, discipline, and good order of the church, which were to be punished with ecclesiastical censure;—secondly, such as related to mere civil and pecuniary matters between a clergyman and a layman;—thirdly, such as related to political matters, as gross and scandalous crimes committed against the laws, and to the detriment of the commonwealth, as treason, rebellion, robbery, murder, and the like, which in the laws are called *atrocia delicta*;—fourthly, such as related to lesser crimes of the same nature, which the law calls *levia delicta*, small or petty offences. Now, according to this distinction of causes, the clergy were or were not exempt from the cognizance of the civil courts by the laws of the Roman empire. In all matters that were purely ecclesiastical they were absolutely exempt.—For all causes of that nature were reserved to the hearing of bishops and their councils, not only by the canons of the church, but by the laws of the state also. . . . Gothofred is also of opinion that some of the lesser criminal causes of ecclesiastics were to be determined by the bishops and their synods likewise. . . . But, in greater criminal actions, the clergy were liable to the cognizance of the secular judges, as well as others (*Cod. THEOD.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, *de Episcop.* leg. 20, 23; *SOCRAT.* lib. iv. c. 29). . . . The case was much the same in all civil pecuniary causes which the clergy had with laymen. For though they might end all such causes, which they had with one another, in their own courts, or before a synod of bishops; and the canons obliged them so to do; yet, if their controversy happened to be with a layman, the layman was not bound to refer the hearing of his cause to the ecclesiastical court, unless he voluntarily consented, by way of compromise, to take some ecclesiastical persons for his arbitrators."

Baronius and the canonists maintained that the clergy anciently enjoyed an exemption, not only in ecclesiastical causes, but in all others. But it has been abundantly proved that the



greater civil crimes of the clergy were reserved to the hearing of the public courts and civil judges.

In the primitive church, bishops were commonly chosen as arbitrators of differences which arose between Christians, in compliance with the apostolic injunction, 1 Cor. vi. 4 (SIDON. lib. iii. *Ep.* 12; lib. vi. *Ep.* 2 and 4; SYNES. *Ep.* 105; AMBROS. *Ep.* 24, *ad Marcell.*; AUG. *Confess.* lib. vi. c. 3; *Ep.* 110, 147). And the power which the bishops thus acquired was afterwards confirmed and established by law, when the emperors became Christians (EUSEB. *de Vit. Const.* lib. iv. c. 27; SOZOM. lib. i. c. 9). But it must be remembered that “no cause was to be brought before a bishop, except both parties agreed, by way of compromise, to take him for their arbitrator. In this case the bishop’s sentence was valid, and to be executed by the secular power; but not otherwise. In the Justinian code we have two laws of the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius, by which any bishops are allowed to judge, and their judgment is ordered to be final, so as no appeal should be made from it; and the officers of the secular judges are appointed to execute the bishop’s sentence. But then there are these two limitations expressly put;—first, that they shall only have power to judge, when both parties agree by consent to refer their cause to their arbitration; and secondly, where the causes are purely civil, and not criminal, in which perhaps life and death might be concerned; for in such causes the clergy were prohibited by the canons of the church, as well as by the laws of the state, from being concerned as judges; therefore bishops never suffered any criminal causes to come before them, except such as were to be punished with ecclesiastical censures” (BINGHAM, book ii. chap. 7, sect. 1—4). Bishops, on the contrary, often interceded with magistrates on behalf of criminals, in cases wherein pardon would be for the public good, or when the crime had some alleviating circumstance; and usually with success.

Bishops were sometimes obliged to devolve this part of their duty upon the presbyters, or some other persons (AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 110; *Concil. Tarracon.* c. 4; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 37).

## II. *Punishment of Delinquents.*

IN the early church, the clergy of all degrees were subject to strict discipline. Their punishment was, in some respects, more severe than that which was inflicted upon the laity (*pœnitentia publica*); for lay penitents could be restored to their former standing in the church after submission to certain penalties and preparatory exercises, but this privilege was never accorded to a degraded or excommunicated minister. One who had suffered degradation could never recover his former rank; and the excommunicated was excluded from the clerical order entirely and for ever.

It would be difficult to enumerate particularly all the offences which subjected a clergyman to censure or punishment in the early ages of the church. They may, however, be generally stated as reducible to some or other of the following offences: namely, apostacy, heresy, simony, neglect of duty (especially departure from the prescribed forms or mode of worship); and open immorality; offences against clerical decorum were also sometimes visited with chastisement.

The punishments inflicted upon offending members of the clerical body during the first seven or eight centuries, may be reduced to the following heads: suspension; degradation; *privatio communionis*, or deprivation; corporal chastisement; excommunication.

1. *Suspension*.—This related either to the revenues of the clergyman, or to his office; and hence the distinction of *suspensio a beneficio*, and *suspensio ab officio*. Both these methods of punishment were adopted in the early church. Thus Cyprian (*Ep.* 28, *al.* 34) says concerning some clerical offenders, that their monthly portion of pay (*divisio mensurna*) should be stopped, but that they should be allowed to continue in the discharge of their duties.

Suspension from office (*suspensio ab officio*) was various. Sometimes a certain period was fixed during which the offender was not allowed to officiate; while, however, he was still regarded as a member of the clerical body, and permitted to com-

municate with his brethren. Laws to this effect were made by the councils of Nicea, Ephesus, and Agde, in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. In other cases, a delinquent clergyman was forbidden to perform some of the duties of his office, but permitted to discharge the others (*Conc. Neocæs.* A.D. 314). These punishments were only temporary.

2. *Degradation*.—This punishment consisted, as the name imports, in the deposition of an offender from a higher to a lower grade of office. It appears to have been permanent and irreversible (*Conc. Nic. c. 8; Tolet. 1, c. 4; Trull. c. 20; Chalced. c. 29*). In the case of bishops, this degradation consisted in removal from a larger or more important see, to one smaller or less considerable (AUGUSTIN, *Ep.* 36). Presbyters were degraded to the rank of deacons; and deacons to that of subdeacons. It was also a kind of degradation, sometimes practised in Africa, when a bishop was deprived of the right of succeeding to the rank of archbishop or metropolitan, which he possessed by virtue of his age or standing (*Conc. Tolet. 1, c. 1, 3, 8; Herdens. c. 1, 5; Arausiæ. 1, c. 24; Taurinens. c. 8; LEONIS Ep. 3*).

3. *Privatio communionis, or Deprivation*.—This was of two kinds; a restriction to *communio peregrina*, or to *communio laica*.

(a.) *Communio peregrina*.—Great confusion and mistake have prevailed with regard to the nature of this punishment. Some writers have confounded it with lay communion. Others understood it as denoting communion in one kind. Others, communion only at the point of death, which was regarded in the Romish church as a kind of passport to a foreign land, the future world. Perhaps the following explanation of this confessedly obscure point may be the most correct:—In the early church the term *communio* denoted not only a participation of the eucharist, but also the right of partaking in the favours of the church. When travellers or strangers came to any church, without bringing *literæ communicatoriæ*, or letters testimonial, by which they might be ascertained to be full members of some Christian church, they were liable to the suspicion that all was not right, and that they were probably under the censure of the church to which they had belonged. Until they could clear themselves from this imputation, they were not admitted to the Lord's table, but they

were allowed to derive their means of temporal maintenance from the church fund. It was in this way also that delinquent clergymen were sometimes treated in their own churches; and this is what appears to have been understood by their being reduced to the *communicatio peregriana*. They were not permitted to officiate, or to be present, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper; until they had given prescribed satisfaction to the church. Conf. SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 9; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii.; SYNES, *Ep.* 66.

On this subject, the following works may be consulted:—J. CABASSUTIUS, *De Laica et Peregriana Communionem* (in his *Notitia Conciliorum*, and *Notitia Ecclesiastica*); H. RIXNER, *De Institutis et Ritibus veterum Christianorum circa S. Eucharistiam, et de communionem Laica, peregriana, ac præsantificatorum*; J. H. BORN, *De Communionem peregriana, veteri clericorum censura*.

(b.) *Communicatio laica*.—Another, and scarcely less painful, punishment, was that of allowing a clergyman to communicate in the Lord's Supper, but only as a layman, or among the lay members of the church. This was regarded as a kind of mitigated punishment; and in case of contumacy or resistance, or want of due submission to the censure, it was followed by the still more severe sentence of excommunication. When the expression *curiæ tradi* is applied to a clergyman thus deprived of his rank, it denotes that he was not only reduced to the condition of a layman, but also obliged to perform certain services to the fraternity or society (*curia*) to which he thus belonged<sup>1</sup>. The custom of confining delinquent clergymen in monasteries appears to have taken rise during the fourth and fifth centuries.

4. *Corporal Punishment*.—This kind of punishment (imprisonment and stripes) was inflicted only on clergy of the inferior orders. (*Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, c. 30, 41; *Epaon.* A.D. 517, c. 15; *Matiscon.* I, A.D. 581, c. 5.) Augustin tells us, (*Ep.* 159,) that in his time such kind of punishment was by no means uncommon. A presbyter guilty of having given false witness in a criminal case, having been first deprived of his rank on account of the offence, could then be made subject to corporal chastisement in his quality of a layman. In large cities (as Constanti-

<sup>1</sup> With the later canonists, this phrase signifies *to deliver over to the secular arm*.

nople), prisons or houses of correction (*decanica*) were attached to the churches.

5. *Excommunication*.—This was the extreme, or final, mode of punishment. It deprived the offender of all hope of being restored to his clerical dignity, or the exercise of ministerial functions, even if he should be again received into the church; inasmuch as it was a standing rule that none could be admitted to the order of the priesthood, who may at any time have been required to perform public penance.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### REVENUES OF THE CHURCH.

THE New Testament declares it to be the duty of a church to support its own teachers, in things temporal. Our Lord himself affirmed, in general terms, that “the workman is worthy of his meat,” *τῆς τροφῆς*, (Matt. x. 10;) and St. Paul says, probably with reference to these words, “Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel,” (1 Cor. ix. 14.) The apostle appeals also in the preceding verses to proverbs and examples, taken from common life and from the Mosaic law. But he adds that, for his own part, he had not exercised his right of claiming support from the members of the church, but had given his services in preaching the Gospel gratuitously, (v. 15—18.) On other occasions also, we find St. Paul holding the same language. In his address to the elders of Ephesus, he says, “I have coveted no man’s gold, or silver, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me,” (Acts xx. 33, 34.) And with this we may compare his declaration to the same effect, in 2 Thes. iii. 8, 9, “Neither did we eat any man’s bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you; not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.” And the following, among many other passages, treat of the relation which subsists

between the ministers and the church in this respect; 2 Cor. xi. 7, 8; xii. 13; Phil. iv. 16—18; 1 Tim. vi. 5; Tit. i. 11; Acts xviii. 3; xxiv. 17. Churches are bound to provide for the maintenance of their ministers; but the ministers are admonished to act in a liberal and disinterested spirit, and to accept a provision only when it may be necessary, and without encroaching upon the rights of the poor. And these principles were carried out into practice, not only during the age of the apostles, but for some time afterwards. There could not at that period be any settled revenues, or fixed stipend, for the ministers of religion; because the church, as a body, did not possess any property, but all its expenses were met by collections and voluntary contributions.

The usual provision for the ministers of the church, in the earliest times, appears to have consisted in board or maintenance, or, at all events, a sufficient and continual supply of the necessaries of life; as we may conclude from 2 Thess. iii. 8, and perhaps also from 1 Cor. xi. 20—22, 33; Jude 12. Care may have been taken at the Agapæ, or feasts of charity, that a due portion was set apart for the supply of the minister's wants. Tertullian (*De Jejun.* c. 17) makes some sarcastic remarks, concerning the abuses which had arisen, and continued to exist, in the celebration of these Agapæ; and alludes to the fact, that the presiding ministers demanded a double portion, as due to them according to the canon of Scripture<sup>1</sup>.

That the contributions of church members for the maintenance of public worship, and the relief of the poor, were originally voluntary gifts, appears not only from the New Testament, (Acts xi. 29; Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, seqq.,) but also from the testimony of the earliest ecclesiastical writers<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ad elogium gule tue pertinet, quod duplex apud te presidentibus honor binis partibus deputatur, cum apostolus duplicem honorem dederit, ut et fratribus et prepositis. Quis sanctior inter vos, nisi convivandi frequentior, nisi obsonandi pollucibilior, nisi calcibus instructior? Merito homines solius animæ et carnis, spiritualia recusatis, talibus si placerent propheta,

mei non erant.—TERTULL. *de Jejun.* c. 17.

<sup>2</sup> President probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio, adepti, neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat. Etiam si quod aræ genus est, non de honoraria summa, quasi redemptæ religionis congregatur: modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo velit et

Such offerings and contributions continued to be voluntary; and although, in later times, certain taxes were imposed for the maintenance of public worship and the clergy, yet these were always not ecclesiastical, but purely political, regulations. Concerning the administration of the ecclesiastical revenues derived either from voluntary or fixed contributions, and the remuneration paid to the clergy out of this fund, we find some account in *Can. Apost. c. 3*; CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 28, 34, 66; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 18. The remuneration given to the clergy for their services was entitled *sportæ*, *sportellæ*, or *sportulæ*, (See DU CANGE *Glossar. s. v. Sporta.*) In Cyprian we read of “*fratres sportulantes*,” (*Ep.* 1.) This term, most probably, refers to the custom prescribed in Deuteronomy xxvi. 1—5. But neither this expression, nor any other, intimates the existence of anything like what are called *surplice-fees*. On the contrary, several laws were passed by the early church, commanding the gratuitous performance of all religious offices, (*Concil. Illiber, c. 48*; GELAS. *Ep.* 1, al. 9, c. 5; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; GRATIAN, *Decr. c. 1*, qu. i. c. 8; *Concil. Trullan. ii. c. 23*; Hieron, *Quæst. Hebr. in Gen.* 23.) The private administration of sacred offices, perhaps, led the way to a departure from this rule. And exceptions from the old laws were first made in the matter of penance, in favour of the ecclesiastical treasury; which soon occasioned a further extension of the practice thus introduced. In these cases, however, the fees were not paid to the officiating minister, but were put into the church chest. The practice of paying the minister in this way is one of later origin.

The payment of the ministers and the poor was proportioned to the extent of the common fund, out of which it was made. The management of this fund was committed to the Bishop; who, however, usefully conducted it by his deacons, or by *œconomi* or *stewards*, appointed for the purpose. It was divided into

si modo possit, apponit; nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt, nam inde non epulis, nec potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur, sed egenis alienis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus, item naufragis, et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis, vel in custodiis, duntaxat ex causa Dei sectæ, alumnæ confessionis suæ sunt. TERTULL. *Apolog.* c. 39.

certain portions for its different purposes, according to established rule<sup>3</sup>.

After the beginning of the fourth century, the church and clergy came into the possession of real and permanent property. By a law of Constantine, in the year 321, the clergy were entitled to the right of receiving donations and testamentary bequests. (*Cod. THEOD.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 4; *Cod. JUSTIN.* lib. i. tit. 2, leg. 1. This right was afterwards confirmed and defined, in order to prevent abuses. Liberal grants were made by Constantine for the support of the clergy, (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 6; *Vit. CONST.* lib. iv. c. 28, 38, 39; lib. iii. c. 21, 58; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 5; *THEOD. Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 4.) A law of Julian recalling the grant of state lands, is inserted in *Cod. THEOD.* (lib. x. tit. 3, leg. 1); but this law was soon repealed or modified, and produced no permanent effect, (*Cod. JUSTIN.* lib. i. tit. 2. leg. 12.)

Besides the liberal grants in favour of the clergy and the church, which were made by Gratian, Theodosius the Great, and other emperors, from the revenues of the state, other regulations were made for the augmentation of the patrimony of the church. Such were the following:—

1. Upon the abolition of the heathen rites, under Theodosius the Great and his sons, the property of the heathen temples and priests, which fell to the state, was delivered over to the Christian clergy, or at least was appropriated to ecclesiastical uses, (*Cod. THEODOS.* lib. xvi. tit. 10, 1. 19—21; *Conf. SOZOM. Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 7, 16.)

2. On the same principle, the ecclesiastical property of heretics was confiscated, and made over to the catholic church; as, for instance, in the case of the Novatians, (*Cod. THEODOS.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, leg. 52; *SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 7.)

<sup>3</sup> The principles upon which the distribution was made, are described in *Conc. Bracar.* i. c. 25; ii. c. 7; GELASII *Ep.* i. al. 9, c. 57; SIMPLIC. *Ep.* 3, *ad Florent*; GREGOR. M. *Ep.* lib. iii. *Ep.* 11. According to *Conc. Bracar.* i. c. 25, the whole was divided into three equal portions:—Placuit, ut de rebus ecclesiasticis fiant tres aequae

portiones; id est, una episcopi, alia clericorum, tertia in reparatione vel in luminariis ecclesiae. — According to Gelas. (*Ep.* i. c. 27), the division was fourfold:—Quatuor tam de rebitu, quam de oblatione fidelium,—convenit fieri portiones, quarum sit una pontificis, altera clericorum, pauperum tertia, quarta fabricis applicanda.



3. It was also enacted, that the property of such of the clergy as died without heirs, and of those who had relinquished their duties without sufficient cause, should lapse to the church funds, (*Cod. THEODOS.* lib. v. tit. 3, leg. 1; *Cod. JUSTIN.* lib. 1. tit. 3, leg. 20, 53; *Nov.* 5, c. 4; 123, c. 42.)

4. The church was also made the heir of all martyrs and confessors who died without leaving any near relatives, (*EUSEB.* *Vit. Const.* lib. ii. c. 36.)

5. The payment of tithes (*decimæ*), and first fruits (*primitiæ*), would, perhaps, in the absence of accurate information, be supposed to have been amongst the earliest institutions of the Christian Church, inasmuch as it may be evidently traced to a Jewish origin. But the fact is, that this custom is of no earlier date in the church than the fourth or fifth century. Some persons, indeed, have thought that they discover an indication of the payment of first fruits in the writings of Irenæus, (*IREN. Adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 17, 18. al. 32, 34.) But the expression to which they refer occurs only in the old Latin translation of that author, and is of doubtful authority; and besides this, it really relates only to the bread and wine presented as an offering in the eucharist. Irenæus indeed says, that Christians should pay tithes, in order not to be behind the Jews in works of piety and liberality, (*IREN. adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 8, 13, 18;) and the same sentiment is repeated by Chrysostom, (*Hom. 4. in Ep. ad Ephes.; Hom. 14, in Act. Apost; conf. Hom. 74, in Matth.*) Gregory of Nazianzum, (*Orat. 5,*) Hilary, (*in Ps. 118, et Matth. 24,*) Augustin, (*in Ps. 146; Serm de Temp. 166, 219,*) and other ecclesiastical writers. But there exists no proof that tithes were actually paid, or exacted as universally due. Many Christians appear to have given both first fruits and tithes to the clergy and the poor; but the gift was purely voluntary; nor was any such payment demanded by law during the first five centuries. It is a mistake to suppose that such a law was made as early as the time of Constantine the Great. "There is no law of Constantine's now extant that makes express mention of any such thing. That which comes nearest to it seems to be the law about an annual allowance of corn to the clergy, in all cities, out of the public treasuries; but this was not so much as the tenth of the

yearly product, for the whole tribute itself seems to have been no more. For in some laws of the Theodosian code the emperor's tribute is called *decimæ*, *tithes*. Unless, therefore, we can suppose, that Constantine settled the whole tribute of the empire upon the church, which it is evident he did not, we cannot take that law for a settlement of tithes upon the clergy." BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book v. chap. 5. § 3.

Augustin and Chrysostom speak of tithes; and there can be no doubt that they were paid to the church, although not demanded by law, before the end of the fourth century. (See SELDEN'S *History of Tithes*.)

Towards the end of the sixth century, we meet with laws respecting tithes; but even then only *ecclesiastical* laws. In these no reference is made to any law of the empire on the same subject; and the penalty threatened for nonpayment is purely ecclesiastical, namely, excommunication<sup>4</sup>.

Charlemagne appears to have been the first who established the universal payment of tithes by a civil law, and rendered it compulsory. (*Capitul. Caroli M.* a. 779, c. 7; *Capit. de part. Saxon.* a. 789, c. 17; *Capit. Francof.* a. 794, c. 23.) That emperor himself paid tithes from his private property and his Saxon possessions. And his successors confirmed and completed the system of tithe law, which was subsequently introduced into England and Sweden. (*Capit. 6 Ludov.* a. 819, c. 9; a. 823, c. 21; a. 829, sect. 1. c. 7, 10.)

In the Oriental (Greek) church tithes were never established by law; but they were paid as a voluntary offering or religious duty in conformity with the principles laid down by the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, (lib. viii. c. 40,) by Irenæus, Origen,

<sup>4</sup> Leges itaque divinæ—omni populo præceperunt decimam fructuum suorum locis sacris præstare.—Quas leges Christianorum congeries longis temporibus custodivit intemeratas.—Unde statimus, ut mos antiquus a fidelibus reparetur, et decimas ecclesiasticis famulantibus cerimoniis populus omnis inferat, quas sacerdotes aut in pauperum usum, aut in captivorum redemptionem prærogantes, suis orationibus

pacem populo et salutem impetrent. Si quis autem contumax nostris statutis saluberrimis fuerit, a membris ecclesiæ omni tempore separetur. *Conc. Matiscon.* ii. A. D. 585, c. 5.—Here is no mention of any enactment of the state, and the penalty threatened is entirely ecclesiastical. The same ordinance is repeated, *Conc. Cabilon.* ii. c. 19; *Mogunt.* c. 3; *Rothomag.* c. 7.

Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, and others. But it was forbidden by law to extort this payment under the threatening of ecclesiastical penalties.

Besides tithes and first fruits, the ancient oblations or offerings continued in the church. These consisted in money, provisions, and live animals. And they were devoted either to the support of the fabric, or the use of the ministers of the church.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### HABIT AND VESTMENTS OF THE CLERGY.

THE origin of a peculiar or professional dress among the clergy has been traced by most writers, as well Romish as Protestant, to the fourth century. "Every one knows," says Pelliccia, "that during the first three centuries of the Christian era the dress of the clergy was not in any respect different from that of the laity; and, in fact, it was then important that the clergy should not be made in any manner conspicuous to the observation of their heathen adversaries. It has been debated whether or not the clergy began to assume a peculiar habit in the course of the fourth century. But the documents of ecclesiastical history clearly prove that the clergy *generally* wore the common dress of the laity until the sixth century. . . . But they *began* gradually to make a distinction at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries. . . . From the sixth century, the clergy were distinguished by a peculiar dress." (*De Christ. Eccl. Polit.* lib. i. sect. 4, cap. 7, Appendix 2.) The decided character which the clerical habit assumed about that period appears to have been occasioned by the innovations or new fashions in dress which had been introduced by the barbarians who had overrun the Western Empire. The clergy adhered to the older and more simple fashion, and hence their dress became peculiar.

All that has been here said relates properly to the civil or ordinary habit; for it is probable that from much earlier times ecclesiastical vestments were worn by the ministers of religion during the celebration of divine service.

We do not indeed find any allusion to such vestments in the New Testament, (for 2 Tim. iv. 13 does not seem to bear upon this point;) but it is remarkable that there are records of some very early traditions respecting certain ornaments and vestments supposed to have belonged to some of the apostles, and to have been worn by them in the celebration of divine offices. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23; EPIPHAN. *Hæres.* 29, n. 4; 78, n. 14; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 24; HIERON. *de Scriptor. Eccl.* c. 45.)

It is not likely that the clergy appeared in public, during the times of persecution, in any other than the ordinary habit of the age; nor does it at all follow that they wore no peculiar vestments in the congregation, because they were never seen abroad in them. But in reading the accounts concerning the ceremonies of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are given by the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and by Cyril of Jerusalem, it is difficult to suppose that the officiating minister appeared on these occasions in his ordinary dress. When the candidates for Baptism were all clothed in white garments, it can hardly be thought that the minister who was to baptize them was not at least equally distinguished by an appropriate vestment. Two verses by Gregory of Nazianzum speak of the white habits of ministers in such a manner as implies that the custom of wearing them was in his time no novelty, and that their significancy was generally understood<sup>1</sup>.

It can hardly be supposed that ministers of the different degrees or orders in the hierarchy which existed in the second and third centuries, were not distinguished by different vestments in the discharge of their offices in the congregation. Ecclesiastical laws of the fourth century are extant which relate to the appropriation of vestments to the different orders<sup>2</sup>.

Those admonitions of the early church, by which the clergy

<sup>1</sup> Οἱ δ' ἀρ' ἰποδρηστῆρες ἐν εἴμασι παμφανώωσιν Ἔστασαν, ἀγγελικῆς εἰκό-  
νες ἀγλαΐης. GREGOR. NAZ.

<sup>2</sup> To this belong *Conc. Laodic.* c. 22,  
—ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρετήν ὠράριον φορεῖν.  
c. 23,—ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἀγαγνώστας ἢ ψάλτας  
ὠράριον φορεῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν  
ἢ ψάλλειν. On which Balsamon re-

marks,—τὸ ὠράριον μόνον ἐστὶν τῶν  
διακόνων. The fourth council of Car-  
thage (c. 41) forbids deacons to wear  
the alba, "nisi in sacro ministerio."  
Similar prohibitions occur, *Conc. Nar-  
bon.* A.D. 599, c. 12; *Conc. Bracar.* i.  
c. 27. *Conf. Conc. Tolet.* iv. c. 28.

are required to appear in a becoming and simple dress, relate to the habits of common life; and prove, not that they had not already been accustomed to wear appropriate vestments during the celebration of divine service, but that, out of the church assemblies, they dressed according to the fashion of common life. It was from the excesses and follies of this fashion that they were required to abstain. Jerome expressly asserts that one dress was worn in sacred ministrations, and another in ordinary life<sup>3</sup>.

On the whole, it does not appear probable that clerical vestments are the invention of the fourth century, or a later period, as some suppose. There is, however, reason to believe that a considerable change was introduced in the style and fashion of these vestments about the sixth century. This change probably consisted in the appropriation of the old Grecian and Roman habit (which had then begun to be banished from the use of ordinary or private life), combined with the insignia and ornaments of the Jewish priests.

Monks were the first who introduced a distinction between the ordinary dress of spiritual persons and others; a practice which was strongly reprobated by the Roman bishop Cœlestinus, and by others of his age<sup>4</sup>.

The colour which was originally used, and has for the most

<sup>3</sup> Religio alterum habitum habet in ministerio, alterum in usu vitæque communi. . . . Per quæ discimus, non quotidianis et quibuslibet pro usu vitæ communis pollutis vestibus nos ingredi debere in sancta sanctorum; sed munda conscientia et mundis vestibus tenere Domini sacramenta. HIERON. *Comment. in Ezek.* c. 44. *Conf. HIERON. contr. Pelag.* lib. i.; *Ep.* 3, *ad Heliod.*; *Ep.* 127, *ad Rabiol.*—In BARONII *Annal.* A. D. 260, n. 6, it is said concerning the Roman bishop Stephanus III.,—"Hic constituit, sacerdotes et Levitas vestibus sacratis in usu quotidiano non uti et nisi in ecclesia."

<sup>4</sup> The following is an extract from an epistle addressed by the Roman bishop Cœlestinus to certain bishops, in the year 428:—"Didicimus, quos-

dam Domini sacerdotes supersticioso potius cultui inservire, quam mentis vel fidei puritati. Amicti pallio et lumbis præcineti credunt se Scripturæ fidem, non per spiritum, sed per literam, completuros. . . . Discernendi a plebe vel ceteris sumus, doctrina, non veste. . . . Unde hic habitus in ecclesiis Gallicanis, ut tot annorum tantorumque Pontificum in alterum habitum consuetudo vertatur. . . . Nam si incipimus studere novitati, traditum nobis a patribus ordinem calcabimus, ut locum supervacuis superstitionibus faciamus." *Opp. Leonis ed. Quesnel.* t. ii. p. 133; *Labbei Concil.* t. ii. p. 1817.—Similar expressions of sentiment occur in the writings of Salvianus, Paulinus Nol., and other authors of that age.

part prevailed, in ecclesiastical vestments, is *white*. (GREGOR. NAZ. *Somn. Athan.*; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 82 (al. 83), in *Matt.*; *Hom.* 37, *de Fil. Prod.*; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 21; HIERON. *Ep. ad Præsid.*; *Ep.* 3, *ad Heliød.*; *contr. Pelag.* lib. i.)

It appears that at Constantinople, in the fourth century, the Catholic bishops and superior clergy wore black, and the Novatians white; but it is likely that this relates to the dress of private life; the Novatians having introduced the novel custom of wearing white on ordinary occasions, while the Catholics adhered to the old practice of wearing black. (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 20.)

Mention is made of red, blue, and green, as having been used in clerical vestments or insignia as early as the seventh and eighth centuries. No colour appears to have been prescribed by a general law of the church until the twelfth century.

The clerical tonsure was introduced during the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries; and was afterwards recognised as indispensable.

In later times, and in the western church alone, wigs were adopted by the clergy of all confessions; and the fashion of wearing them was retained, notwithstanding repeated prohibitions, until it gradually died away of its own accord.

Concerning episcopal insignia, see book iii. chap. 3, sect. 3.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### REMARKS OF CHRYSOSTOM, JEROME, AND GREGORY NAZIANZEN, RELATING TO THE CHARACTER AND DUTIES OF CHRISTIAN MINISTERS.

THE writings of the ancients contain many excellent observations respecting the disposition and character suited to Christian ministers, and many pleasing descriptions of the actual exercise of the virtues thus recommended and extolled. There are several treatises of the Fathers which treat expressly of this subject: such are Chrysostom's treatise *On the priesthood*, Jerome's second epistle to Nepotian, *On the life of the clergy*, and Gregory Nazianzen's

*Apology for declining the priesthood.* “Or if,” as Bingham observes, “any one desires rather to see the duties of the clergy exemplified in some living instances and great patterns of perfection, which commonly make deeper impressions than bare rules, he must consult those excellent characters of the most eminent primitive bishops, which are drawn to the life by the best pens of the age; such as the Life of Ignatius, by Chrysostom; the Life of St. Basil and Athanasius, by Gregory Nazianzen; the Life of St. Austin by Possidius; the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Meletius, by Gregory Nyssen; in all which the true character and idea of a Christian bishop is set forth and described with this advantage, that a man does not barely read of rules, but sees them as it were exemplified in practice.”

Bingham has inserted in his *Antiquities* a large collection of quotations from the Fathers, especially Chrysostom, Jerome, and Gregory Nazianzen, relating to the character and duties of Christian ministers; from which I make the following selection. The subject is one of more than ordinary interest; and many of the observations of these pious writers of former times will be found to possess an uncommon degree of intrinsic weight and value. It may also be a seasonable relief to us, in the midst of this collection of testimonies from the early writers concerning the external constitution and practices of the church, to hear the evidence of the same writers concerning something of a more internal character;—to learn what was their standard of moral and spiritual excellence in the character of a Christian minister, as well as to consider their institutions concerning the different orders of clergy, their appointments, the offices assigned to them, their revenues, and dress.

“Some,” says Gregory Nazianzen, “do, with unwashen hands and profane minds, press to handle the holy mysteries, and affect to be at the altar before they are fit to be initiated to any sacred service: they look upon the holy order and function, not as designed for an example of virtue, but only as a way of supporting themselves; not as a trust, of which they are to give an account, but a state of absolute authority and exemption. And these men’s examples corrupt the people’s morals, faster than any cloth can imbibe a colour, or a plague infect the air; since men are

more disposed to receive the tincture of vice than virtue from the example of their rulers." In opposition to this, he declares it to be incumbent upon all spiritual physicians,<sup>1</sup> "that they should draw the picture of all manner of virtues in their own lives, and set themselves as examples to the people; that it might not be proverbially said of them, that they set about curing others, while they themselves are full of sores and ulcers." He urges, also, the necessity of purity in the life and conversation of the clergy, from the consideration of the dignity and sacredness of their office.

"A minister's office places him in the same rank and order with angels themselves; he celebrates God with archangels, transmits the church's sacrifice to the altar in heaven, and performs the priest's office with Christ himself<sup>1</sup>; he reforms the work of God's hands, and presents the image to his Maker; his workmanship is for the world above; and therefore he should be exalted to a divine and heavenly nature, whose business is to be as a God himself, and make others gods also." (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 1, *Apologet. de Fuga.*) And Chrysostom makes use of the same argument, "that the priesthood, though it be exercised upon earth, is occupied wholly about heavenly things; that it is the ministry of angels put by the Holy Ghost into the hands of mortal men; and therefore a priest ought to be pure and holy, as being placed in heaven itself, in the midst of those heavenly powers." (CHRYSOSTOM, *De Sacerdot.* lib. 3, c. 4.) He dwells, also, upon the dangerous influence of bad example. "Subjects commonly form their manners by the patterns of their princes. How then should a proud man be able to assuage the swelling tumours of others? or an angry ruler hope to make his people in love with moderation and meekness? Bishops are exposed, like combatants in the theatre, to the view and observation of all men; and their faults, though never so small, cannot be hid;

<sup>1</sup> This mistaken view of the ministerial office is one of the errors of the times in which Gregory wrote. Misrepresentations concerning the real nature of the Christian ministry are not peculiar to the Church of Rome: they arose as early as the third and

fourth centuries. But while we discard the errors of the men of those times, let us not throw aside their reverent regard for that which constitutes the real dignity and usefulness of the sacred office of a minister in holy things.



and therefore, as their virtuous actions profit many by provoking them to the like zeal, so their vices will render others unfit to attempt or prosecute anything that is noble and good. For which reason, their souls ought to shine all over with the purest brightness, that they may both enlighten and stimulate the souls of others, who have their eyes upon them. A priest should arm himself all over with purity of life, as with adamantine armour; for if he leave any part naked and unguarded, he is surrounded both with open enemies and pretended friends, who will be ready to wound and supplant him. So long as his life is all of a piece, he needs not fear their assaults; but if he be caught in a fault, though but a small one, it will be laid hold of, and improved, to the prejudice of all his former virtues. For all men are most severe judges in his case, and treat him not with any allowance for being encompassed with flesh, or as having an human nature; but expect that he should be an angel, and free from all infirmities." (*Ibid.* lib. iii. c. 14.) "He cannot, indeed, with any tolerable decency and freedom discharge his office in punishing and reproofing others, unless he himself be blameless and without rebuke." (*Ibid.* lib. v. c. 3.)

The particular virtues of the external life and conversation of the clergy, which these pious writers most frequently commend, are the following:—hospitality and kindness to the poor,—frugality, and a holy contempt of the world,—harmless and inoffensive discourse;—and care to avoid all suspicion of evil.—Jerome says, "It is one of the glories of a bishop to provide for the poor; but a disgrace to the sacred function, to seek only to enrich himself." (*HIERON. Ep. 2 ad Nepotian.*) Chrysostom highly extols his Bishop Flavian upon account of this virtue. He says that "his house was always open to strangers, and to such as were obliged to have recourse to flight for the sake of religion; where they were received and entertained with such liberality and kindness, that his house might as properly be called 'The house of strangers,' as 'The house of Flavian.' Yea, it was so much the more his own, for being common to strangers; for whatever we possess is so much the more our property for being communicated to our poor brethren; there being no place where we may so safely lay up our treasure, as in the hands of

the poor." (CHRYSOST. *Serm. 1 in Gen.*) On the other hand, Jerome observes, in his instruction to Nepotian, "You must avoid giving great entertainments to secular men, and especially to those who are high in office. For it is not very reputable to have the lictors and guards of a consul stand waiting at the doors of a priest of Christ, who himself was crucified and poor; nor that the judge of a province should dine more sumptuously with you, than in the palace. If it be pretended that you do this only to be able to intercede with him for poor criminals; there is no judge but will pay a greater deference and respect to a poor clergyman than to a rich one, and show greater reverence to your sanctity than to your riches. Or if he be such an one as will hear a clergyman's intercession only at his table, I should willingly be without this benefit, and rather beseech Christ for the judge himself, who can more speedily and powerfully help than any judge." (HIERON. *Ep. 2 ad Nepotian.*) Again, "The laity should rather find us to be comforters in their mournings, than companions in their feasts. That clergyman will soon be despised, who never refuses any entertainments when he is frequently invited to them." (*Ibid.*)—The virtues of the tongue were also considered of great importance in the life of a clergyman, in the times of which we are treating. Jerome gives a particular caution to ministers, against the sin of detraction and calumny, and especially against giving encouragement to evil speaking, by a patient hearing. "No slanderer," says he, "tells his story to one who is not willing to hear him. An arrow never fixes in a stone, but often recoils, and wounds him that shoots it. Therefore, let the detractor be less forward and busy, by your unwillingness to hear his detraction." (HIERON. *Ep. 2 ad Nepotian.*)

The same writer recommends another virtue of the tongue to clergymen; namely, the habit of keeping secrets, and of observing a becoming silence, especially about the affairs of public persons. "Your office," says he, "requires you to visit the sick, and thereby you become acquainted with the families of matrons and their children, and are entrusted with the secrets of noble men. You ought, therefore, to keep not only a chaste eye, but a chaste tongue. . . . You ought not to

let one house know from you what may have been done in another." (*Ibid.*)—Chrysostom gives some excellent advice respecting the great duty of avoiding all appearance of evil,—a duty especially incumbent upon Christian ministers. "If," says he, "the holy apostle St. Paul was afraid lest he should have been suspected of theft by the Corinthians; and upon that account took others into the administration of their charity with himself, that no one might have the least pretence to blame him; how much more careful should we be to cut off all occasions of sinister opinions and suspicions, however false or unreasonable they might be, or disagreeable to our character. For none of us can be so far removed from any sin, as St. Paul was from theft; yet he did not think fit to condemn the suspicions of the vulgar; he did not trust to the reputation which both his miracles, and the integrity of his life, had generally procured for him; but, on the contrary, he imagined that such suspicions and jealousies might arise in the hearts of some men, and therefore he took care to prevent them; not suffering them to arise at all, but timely foreseeing them and prudently forestalling them; providing, as he says, for honest things, not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of men. The same care, and much greater, should we take, not only to dissipate and destroy the ill opinions men may have entertained of us, but to foresee afar off from what causes they may spring, and to cut off beforehand the occasions and pretences from which they may arise. And it is much easier to do this, than to extinguish them when they are risen, which will then be very difficult, and perhaps impossible; besides that their being raised will give great scandal and offence, and wound the conscience of many." (CHRYSOST. *de Sacerdot.* lib. vi. c. 9.) Jerome, in like manner, represents it as the duty of a minister to avoid all suspicions; and to take care beforehand that there should be no probable grounds for fictitious stories to the disadvantage of his moral character. (HIERON. *Ep.* 2 *ad Nepotian.*) But it might happen, as Bingham truly observes, that a man, after the utmost human caution and prudence that could be used, might not be able to avoid the malevolent suspicions of ill-disposed persons; for our blessed Lord, whose innocence and conduct were both equally divine, could not in his converse with men

wholly escape them. Now, in this case, the church could prescribe no other rule than that of patience and Christian consolation, given by our Saviour to his apostles, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake; rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven." (Matt. v. 11.) "When we have done," says Augustine, "all that in justice and prudence we could, to preserve our good name, if, after that, some men will notwithstanding endeavour to blemish our reputation, and blacken our character, either by false suggestions or unreasonable suspicions, let conscience be our comfort, and even our joy, that great is our reward in heaven." AUGUSTIN. *De Bono Viduitat.* c. 22.)

From these observations respecting the general life and conversation of the clergy, let us pass to others more immediately relating to the exercise of the duties and offices of their sacred function.

The Fathers frequently insist upon the necessity of due *study and application*, in order to the right discharge of the ministerial office. For since, as Gregory Nazianzen observes, (*Orat.* 1. *De Fuga*,) a man could not become master of the meanest arts without the cost of much time and pains, it were absurd to think that the art of wisdom, which comprehends the knowledge of things human and divine, and comprises everything that is noble and excellent, was so light and vulgar a thing, as that a man needed no more than a wish or a will to obtain it. Some indeed, he complains, (*Ibid.*) were of this fond opinion; and, therefore, before they had well passed the time of their childhood, or knew the names of the books of the Old and New Testament, or how well to read them, if they had learnt but two or three pious words by heart, or had read a few of the Psalms of David, and put on a grave habit, which made some outward show of piety, they had the vanity to think themselves qualified for the government of the church. They then talked of nothing but the sanctification of Samuel from his cradle, and thought themselves profound scribes, great rabbies and teachers, sublime in the knowledge of divine things; and were for interpreting the Scripture, not by the letter, but after a spiritual way, propounding their own dreams

and fancies, instead of the divine oracles, to the people. This, he complains, was for want of that study and labour which ought to give continual employment to those persons who take upon them the offices of the sacred function. Chrysostom pursues this matter a little further; and shows the necessity of continual labour and study in a clergyman, from the nature of the work which he has upon hand, each part of which requires great and sedulous application. For, says he, first, he ought to be qualified to minister suitable remedies to the several maladies and disorders of men's souls; the cure of which requires greater skill and labour than the cure of their bodily distempers. And this can be done only by the doctrine of the Gospel; with which, therefore, it is necessary that he should be intimately acquainted. Then again, secondly, he must be able to stop the mouths of all gainsayers, Jews, gentiles, and heretics, who employ different arts and different weapons in their attacks upon the truth; and unless he exactly understands all their fallacies and sophisms, and knows the true art of making a proper defence, he will be in danger not only of suffering each of them to make havoc of the church, but of encouraging one error while combating another. For nothing was more common, in Chrysostom's time, than for ignorant and unskilful disputants to run from one extreme to another; as he shows in the controversies which the church had with the Marcionites and Valentinians on the one hand, and the Jews on the other, about the law of Moses; and the dispute about the Trinity, between the Arians and the Sabellians. Now, unless a man were well skilled and exercised in the word of God, and the true art and rules of disputation, which could not be attained without continual study and labour, he concludes that "it would be impossible for him to maintain his ground, and the truth, as he ought, against so many subtle and wily opposers." He then inculcates that instruction of St. Paul to Timothy, "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine: meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all men." Thirdly, he shows "how difficult and laborious a work it was to make continual homilies and regular discourses to the people, who were become very severe judges of the preacher's compositions, and would not

allow him to rehearse any part of another man's work, nor so much as to repeat his own upon a second occasion. Here his task was something the more difficult, because men had generally nice and delicate palates, and were inclined to hear sermons as they heard plays, more for pleasure than profit. Which added to the preacher's study and labour; who, though he was to condemn both popular applause and censure, yet was also to have such a regard to his auditory, as that they might hear him with pleasure, to their edification and advantage." Some persons having been ready to plead the apostle's authority for their ignorance, and even to pride themselves upon their want of learning, to this Chrysostom very properly replies, that "this was a misrepresentation of St. Paul's meaning, and was vainly urged in excuse for any man's sloth and negligence in not attaining to those necessary parts of knowledge which the clerical life required. If the utmost heights and perfections of foreign eloquence had been rigidly exacted of the clergy;—if they had been required to speak always with the smoothness of Isocrates, or the loftiness of Demosthenes, or the majesty of Thucydides, or the sublimity of Plato,—then indeed it might be pertinent to allege this testimony of the apostle. But rudeness of style, in comparison with such eloquence, may be allowed; provided men be otherwise qualified with knowledge, and furnished with ability to preach and dispute accurately concerning the doctrines of faith and religion, as St. Paul was; whose talents in that kind have made him the wonder and admiration of the whole world; and it would be unjust to accuse him of rudeness of speech, who by his discourses confounded both Jews and Greeks, and wrought many into the opinion that he was the Mercury of the gentiles. Such proofs of his power of persuasion were sufficient evidence that he had bestowed some pains upon this matter; and therefore his authority was vainly abused to patronize ignorance and sloth, whose example was so great a reproach to them." The same writer afterwards proceeds to show, that a good life alone is not a sufficient qualification for a minister, nor ought to be regarded as any valid ground of excuse for want of knowledge and study, and the art of preaching and disputing. "Both these qualifications," says he, "are required in a priest; he must not only do, but

teach, the commands of Christ, and must guide others by his word and doctrine, as well as by his practice; each of these have their part in his office, and are necessary to assist one another, in order to complete men's edification. For otherwise, when any controversy may arise about the doctrines of religion, and Scripture may be pleaded in behalf of error; what will a good life avail in this case? What will it signify to have been diligent in the practice of virtue, if, after all, a man through gross ignorance and unskilfulness in the word of truth, fall into heresy, and cut himself off from the body of the church? And I know many that have done so. But, suppose that a man should stand firm himself, and not be drawn away by the adversaries; yet, when the plain and simple people who are under his care shall observe their leader to be baffled, and that he has nothing to say to the arguments of a subtle opponent, they will be ready to impute this not so much to the weakness of the advocate, as to the badness of his cause; and so, by one man's ignorance, a whole people will be carried headlong to utter destruction; or, at least, will be so shaken in their faith, that they will not stand firm for the future." (CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. iv. 5.) And, in like manner, Jerome observes in his *Epistle to Nepotian*, "that the plain rustic brother should not value himself upon his sanctity, and despise knowledge; neither should the skilful and eloquent speaker measure his holiness by his tongue. For, though of two imperfections it was better to have a holy ignorance than a vicious eloquence; yet both qualifications were necessary to complete a priest, and he ought to have knowledge as well as sanctity to fit him for the several duties of his function." (HERON. *Ep.* 2 *ad Nepotian.*)

But it was *the study of the Holy Scriptures* which was especially enjoined upon Christian ministers by these pious writers. Chrysostom says, "In administering spiritual remedies to the souls of men, the word of God is instead of everything that is used in the cure of bodily distempers. It is instrument, and diet, and air; it is instead of medicine, and fire, and knife; if caustics and incisions are necessary, they are to be done by this; and if this do not succeed, it were in vain to try other means. This is it which is to raise and comfort the dejected soul; and to take

down and suppress the swelling humours and presumptions of the confident. By this they are both to cut off what is superfluous, to supply what is wanting, and to do everything that is necessary to be done in the cure of souls. By this all heretics and unbelievers are to be convinced, and all the plots of Satan to be countermined: and therefore it is necessary that the ministers of God be very diligent in studying the Scriptures, that the word of Christ might dwell richly in them." (CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. iv. c. 3, 4.) Jerome commends his friend Nepotian for this, "that at all feasts it was his practice to propound something out of the Holy Scriptures, and entertain the company with some useful disquisition upon it. And, next to the Scriptures, he employed his time upon the study of the best ecclesiastical authors, whom by continual reading and frequent meditations he had so treasured up in the library of his heart, that he could repeat their words upon any proper occasion; saying, thus spake Tertullian, thus Cyprian, so Lactantius, after this manner Hilary, so Minucius Felix, so Victorinus, these were the words of Arnobius, and the like." (HIERON. *Epitaph. Nepot.*, Ep. 3, ad *Heliodor.*)

We find the following observations, among many others, respecting the *public discharge of ministerial duties*:—"With what exact care," says Chrysostom, "ought he to behave himself, who goes in the name of a whole city, nay, in the name of the whole world, as their orator and ambassador, to intercede with God for the sins of all<sup>2</sup>? But especially when he invokes the Holy Ghost, and offers up the tremendous sacrifice of the altar<sup>3</sup>; with what purity, with what reverence and piety, should his tongue utter forth those words; whilst the angels stand by him, and the whole order of heavenly powers cries aloud, and fills the sanctuary in honour of him who is represented as dead and lying upon the altar." (CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. vi. c. 4.)

<sup>2</sup> There is great danger in the use of such language as this. Doubtless there is a sense in which it may be rightly employed; but it must be carefully remembered that the only mediator between God and man,—the only intercessor on behalf of the church,—is

the Lord Jesus Christ. Many practical errors, however, were interwoven with the Christian faith during the third and fourth centuries.

<sup>3</sup> That is, celebrates; the Lord's Supper in the congregation.



Concerning *preaching*, the following rules are laid down by Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Jerome.—First, that the preacher be careful to make choice of an useful subject. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat. 1 de Fuga*), specifies some particular and leading subjects,—such as the doctrine of the world's creation, and the soul of man; the doctrine of providence, and the restoration of man; the two covenants; the first and second comings of Christ; his incarnation, sufferings, and death; the resurrection, the end of the world, and the future judgment; the different rewards of heaven and hell; together with the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, which is the principal article of the Christian faith. Such subjects as these are fit for edification, to build up men in faith and holiness, and the practice of all piety and virtue.

But then, secondly, these subjects must be treated in a suitable way; not with too much art or loftiness of style, but with great condescension to men's capacities, who must be fed with the word as they are able to bear it. This is what Gregory Nazianzen so much commends in Athanasius, when he says, "He condescended and accommodated himself to mean capacities, whilst to the acute his notions and words were more sublime," (GREG. NAZ. *Orat. 21, de Laud. Athan.*) Jerome also observes, upon this head, "that a preacher's discourse should always be plain, intelligible, and affecting; and rather adapted to excite men's groans and tears by a sense of their sins, than their admiration and applause by speaking to them what neither they, nor he himself perhaps, do truly understand. For they are chiefly ignorant and unlearned men who affect to be admired for their speaking above the capacities of the vulgar. A bold man often interprets what he himself does not understand; and yet he has no sooner persuaded others to they know not what, than he assumes to himself the title of learning upon it. While yet there is nothing so easy as to deceive the ignorant multitude, who are always most prone to admire what they do not understand." (HIERON. *Ep. 2 ad Nepotian.*) Chrysostom spends almost a whole book (*De Sacerdot. lib. v.*) in cautioning the Christian orator against the fault of courting popular applause; and points out the necessity of his despising both the applauses and censures of men, and all other things which might tempt him to flatter

his hearers, rather than edify them. "In a word," says he, "his chief end in all his compositions should be to please God: and then, if he also gained the praise of men, he might receive it; if not, he needed not to court it, nor torment himself because it was denied him. For it would be consolation enough for all his labours, that in the application of his doctrine and eloquence he had always sought to please his God." (*De Sacerdot.* lib. v. c. 7.)

A third rule was, that preachers should carefully adapt their doctrine to the actual wants and necessities of their hearers. Chrysostom, in describing this part of a minister's duty, says, that "he should be watchful and clear-sighted, and have a thousand eyes about him, as living not for himself alone, but for a multitude of people. To live retired in a cell is the part of a monk; but the duty of a watchman is to converse among men of all degrees and callings; to take care of the body of Christ, the church, and have regard both to its health and beauty; carefully observing lest any spot, or wrinkle, or other defilement, should sully its grace and comeliness. Now this obliges spiritual physicians to apply their medicines, that is, their doctrines, as the maladies of their patients chiefly require; to be most earnest and frequent in encountering those errors and vices which are most predominant, or by which men are most in danger of being infected. (CHRYSOST. *De Sacerdot.* lib. iii. c. 12; lib. iv. c. 2, 3.)

In *private addresses* to the persons under their charge, the clergy were enjoined to exercise prudence, as well as fidelity and diligence. "Man," says Gregory Nazianzen, "is so various and uncertain a creature that it requires great art and skill to manage him. For the tempers of men's minds differ more than the features and lineaments of their bodies; and, as all meats and medicines are not proper for all bodies, so neither is the same treatment and discipline proper for all souls. Some are best moved by words, others by examples; some are of a dull and heavy temper, and so have need of the spur to stimulate them; others that are brisk and fiery have more need of the curb to restrain them. Praise works best upon some, and reproof upon others, provided that each of them be ministered in a suitable and seasonable way, otherwise they do more harm than good. Some men

are drawn by gentle exhortations to their duty; others by rebukes and hard words must be driven to it. And even in this business of reproof some men are affected most with open rebuke, others with private. For some men never regard a secret reproof, who yet are easily corrected, if chastised in public: others again cannot bear a public disgrace, but grow either morose, or impudent and implacable, under it; who, perhaps, would have hearkened to a secret admonition, and repaid their monitor with their conversion, as presuming him to have accosted them out of mere pity and love. Some men are to be so nicely watched and observed, that not the least of their faults are to be dissembled; because they seek to hide their sins from men, and arrogate to themselves thereupon the praise of being politic and crafty: in others it is better to wink at some faults, so that seeing we will not see, and hearing we will not hear, lest by too frequent chidings we bring them to despair, and so make them cast off modesty, and grow bolder in their sins. To some men we must put on an angry countenance, and seem to deplore their condition, and to despair of them as lost and pitiable wretches, when their nature so requires it: others again must be treated with meekness and humility, and be recovered to a better hope by more promising and encouraging prospects. Some men must be always conquered and never yielded to; whilst to others it will be better sometimes to concede a little. For all men's distempers are not to be cured the same way; but proper medicines are to be applied, as the matter itself, or occasion, or the temper of the patient will allow. And this is the most difficult part of the pastoral office, to know how to distinguish these things nicely, with an exact judgment, and with as exact a hand to administer suitable remedies to every distemper. It is a master-piece of art, which is not to be obtained but by good observation, joined with experience and practice." (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 1, *de Fuga; Conf. Orat.* 21, *de Laud. Athan.*) In like manner, Chrysostom, speaking of the qualifications of a Christian minister, observes, that "he ought to be wise, as well as holy; a man of great experience, and that understands the world; and because his business is with all sorts of men, he should be *ποικίλος*, one that can appear with different aspects, and act with great variety of skill. But when I

say this, I do not mean," says he, "that he should be a man of craft or servile flattery, or a dissembling hypocrite; but a man of great freedom and boldness, who knows, notwithstanding, how to condescend and accommodate himself to men's advantage, when occasion requires, and who can be mild as well as austere. For all men are not to be treated in the same way; no physician uses the same method with all his patients." (CHRYSOST. *de Sacerdot.* lib. iii. c. 16.)

*Zeal and courage in defending the truth* is another quality which the ancients correctly represent as requisite in a Christian minister. "In other cases," says Gregory Nazianzen, "there is nothing so peaceable, so moderate, as Christian bishops; but in this case they cannot bear the name of moderation to betray their God by silence and sitting still; here they are exceedingly eager warriors and fighting champions, that are not to be overcome." (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 21, *De Laud. Athan.: Conf. Orat.* 20, *De Laud. Basil.*) But in speaking thus, they made it to be, at the same time, distinctly understood that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

Such are among the truly excellent remarks of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome, concerning the character and duties of a Christian minister. These specimens of practical piety and wisdom from the writings of the Fathers, while they convey important instruction on the particular subject to which they relate, may also serve to direct our attention, in general, to the true value and use of those precious records of the early church. Let us not be unwilling to avail ourselves of the piety, learning, and experience of ancient Christian teachers; nor be disposed to overlook what is really important in their writings, merely because they were subject to human infirmity, and were involved in some of those errors which gradually gathered round the church from the second century, until the days of the blessed Reformation.

Having already made use of the labours of the learned Bingham in representing the views of the Fathers concerning ministerial qualifications, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of subjoining his own excellent "conclusion, by way of address to the clergy of the present church;" to which I shall take leave to

append another short, but valuable, passage, from the pen of Bishop Reynolds.

The greatest ornament and best distinction of the clergy in the earliest and purest ages of the church, undoubtedly consisted in the simplicity of their faith and teaching, the sobriety and holiness of their lives, their patience, zeal, and devotedness to the work of their ministry. In these respects, they deserve the imitation of all who may succeed them in the office of Christian pastors or teachers. And, as it is highly gratifying and refreshing to the mind to advert to patristical delineations and examples of the ministerial character, after having been so long employed in considering dry historical details relating to the practices of the early church, so also it may afford us peculiar pleasure and advantage to observe the pious sentiments of early writers transfused into the language of two well-known divines of our own church.

“We all profess, as it is our duty to do, a great zeal for the honour and welfare of the present church. Now, if indeed we have that zeal which we profess, we shall be careful to demonstrate it in all our actions; observing those necessary rules and measures which raised the primitive church to its glory. We are obliged, in this respect, first, to be strict and exemplary in our lives; to set others a pattern of sobriety, humility, meekness, charity, self-denial, and contempt of the world, and all such common graces, as are required of Christians in general to adorn their profession; and then to add to these the peculiar graces and ornaments of our function, diligence, prudence, fidelity, and piety in the whole course of our ministry; imitating those excellencies of the ancients, which have been described; confining ourselves to the proper business of our calling, and not intermeddling or distracting ourselves with other cares; employing our thoughts and time in useful studies, and directing them to their proper end, the edification of the church; performing all divine offices with assiduity and constancy, and in that rational, decent, and becoming way, which suits the nature of the action; making our addresses to God with a serious reverence, and an affecting fervency of devotion; and in our discourses to men, speaking always as the oracles of God, with Scripture eloquence, which is the most persuasive; in our doctrine showing uncorruptness,

gravity, sincerity, sound speech that cannot be condemned; in our reproofs, and the exercise of public and private discipline, using great wisdom and prudence, both to discern the temper of men, and to time the application to its proper season, mixing charity and compassion with a just severity, and endeavouring to restore fallen brethren in the spirit of meekness; showing gentleness and patience to them that are in error, and giving them good arguments with good usage, in order to regain them; avoiding all bitter and contumelious language, and never bringing against any man a railing accusation; treating those of our own order, whether superiors, inferiors, or equals, with all the decency and respect that is due to them, since nothing is more scandalous among clergymen than the abuses and contempt of one another; endeavouring here, as well as in all other cases, 'to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;' showing ourselves candid and ingenuous in moderating disputes among good catholics, as well as resolute and prudent in opposing the malicious designs of the professed enemies of truth; briefly, employing our thoughts day and night upon these things, turning our designs this way, and always acting with a pure intention for the benefit and edification of the church; even neglecting our own honour, and despising our own interest, when it is needful for the advantage of the public.

“Such actions will proclaim our zeal indeed, and draw every eye to take notice of it. Such qualities, joined with probity and integrity of life, will equal our character to that of the primitive saints; and either give happy success to our labours, or at least crown our endeavours with the comfort and satisfaction of having discharged a good conscience in the sight of God. The best designs, indeed, may be frustrated, and the most pious and zealous endeavours be disappointed. It was so with our Lord and Master himself, and no one of his household then is to think it strange if it happen to be his own case. For, though He ‘spake as never man spake,’ though He had done so many miracles among the Jews, yet they believed not on Him. This seems to be written for our comfort, that we should not be wholly dejected, though our endeavours fail of success, since our Lord himself was first pleased to take his share of the disappointment. It will still

be our comfort, that we can be able to say with the prophet in this case, 'Though we have laboured in vain, and spent our strength for nought, yet surely our judgment is with the Lord, and our work with our God. And then, though Israel be not gathered, yet shall we be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and our God shall be our strength' Isa. xlix. 4, 5."—(BINGHAM.)

"We are stewards of no meaner a gift than the grace of God, and the wisdom of God: that grace which by St. Peter is called 'manifold grace,' 1 Pet. iv. 10; and that wisdom, which by St. Paul is called 'the manifold wisdom of God,' Eph. iii. 10. We are the depositaries and dispensers of the most precious treasures which were ever opened unto the sons of men: the incorruptible and precious blood of Christ, the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel, the word of the grace of God, and of the unsearchable riches of Christ. Now, it is required of stewards, that a man be found faithful, 1 Cor. iv. 2; that he defraud not Christ of his purchase, which is the souls of men, nor men of their price and privilege, which is the blood of Christ; that he neither favour the sins of men, nor dissemble the truth of God; that he watch, because he is a seer; that he speak, because he is an oracle; that he feed, because he is a shepherd; that he labour, because he is a husbandman; that he be tender, because he is a mother; that he be careful, because he is a father; that he be faithful, because he is a servant to God and his church; in one word, that he be instant in season and out of season, to exhort, rebuke, instruct, to do the work of an evangelist, to accomplish and make full proof of his ministry; because he hath an account to make, because he hath the presence of Christ to assist him, the promises of Christ to reward him, the example of Christ, his apostles, prophets, evangelists, bishops, and martyrs of the purest time, who have now their palms in their hands, to encourage him."—(REYNOLDS.)

## BOOK IV.

## OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

## CHAPTER I.

## OF PUBLIC PRAYER, PSALMODY, AND INSTRUCTION.

## § 1.—USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

THE first form of Christian prayer on record, is that which our blessed Lord himself prescribed for the use of his disciples, commonly called the Lord's Prayer, (Matt. vi. 9—13, and Luke xi. 2—4.)

No account of the use of this prayer in the apostles' times has come down to us. We find no trace of it in any of those passages in the Acts which speak of public prayer, nor does any allusion to it occur in the apostolical epistles. But the omission, it must be remembered, does not prove that the prayer was not in general use during those times: because it may have been referred to by implication in some or all of those passages which mention public prayer in general terms.

It is more remarkable, however, that no reference to this prayer in particular is made by the earliest ecclesiastical writers after the apostles; in whose works we might naturally have expected some allusion to this prescribed form, as well as to other of our Saviour's institutions. Justin Martyr says (*Apol.* 1), that in the Christian assemblies, the presiding minister (*ὁ προεστὼς*) offered up prayer and thanksgiving, as far as he was able (*ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ*), and that hereupon the people answered Amen! The words *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ* may mean, *with as loud a voice as he could command*, and this the old Latin translation may have intended by "*totis viribus*," which is its rendering; or the expression may perhaps mean, as some interpreters suppose, *as well as he could, to the best of his ability*, relating either to the fervour of the minister's devotion, or to the



substance or form of an extempore prayer, “*ex proprio ingenio*,” as Tertullian says<sup>1</sup>. If the latter be the true meaning of the expression, it would lead to the conclusion that public prayers were not confined to any precomposed forms; but it would not prove that the Lord’s Prayer was not used in addition to the extempore addresses of the officiating minister. In describing the ceremony of baptism, Justin speaks of the use made of “the name of the universal Father” (τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων), which words may perhaps refer to the introductory clause of the Lord’s Prayer; as well as the εὐχὴ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀρξάμενος mentioned in the Philopatris of Lucian the younger.

Nor is Irenæus much more explicit respecting the use of the Lord’s Prayer. He says, however, (*adv. Hæres.* lib. v. c. 17.) “Quapropter et in oratione dicere nos docuit (Christus), *Et remitte nobis debita nostra; utique quoniam hic est Pater noster, ejus eramus debitores, transgressi ejus præcepta*,” i. e., “*Wherefore, also, he (Christ) has taught us to say in prayer, ‘And forgive us our debts;’ for he is our Father, whose debtors we were, having transgressed his precepts.*”—The same may be said with respect to Clement of Alexandria, who makes evident allusion to the Lord’s Prayer, in several passages; especially *Pædag.* lib. iii.

The earliest and most express testimony to the use of the Lord’s Prayer would be that which is furnished by the *Apostolical Constitutions*, if the assumed date of that composition were the real one. But as that work cannot be supposed to have been compiled before the third century, no appeal can be made to it for the establishment of any fact during the first and second centuries, not recorded by some other contemporary

<sup>1</sup> “Some misconstrue this passage, and interpret the abilities of the minister officiating so, as if they meant no more but his invention, expression, or the like; making it by such a gloss to become an argument against the antiquity of public liturgies, or set forms of prayer; whereas indeed, it signifies here a quite different thing, namely, that spiritual vigour, or intenseness and ardency of devotion, with which the minister offered up the sacrifices of

the church to God; being such qualifications as are necessary to make our prayer and praises acceptable unto Him, who requires them to be presented with all our soul and might; which may be done in set forms as well as any other way. And so Gregory Nazianzen and Justin Martyr himself use the phrase, ὁση δύναμις, where they speak of set forms of praising and serving God.” BINGHAM, *Antiq.* b. vi. c. 3, § 5. See Appendix A.

writer. Its testimony on this subject will therefore be inserted below.

The testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, fully establish the fact of the public use of the Lord's Prayer in the church during the second and third centuries.

Tertullian not only quotes the Lord's Prayer in various parts of his writings, but has left a treatise *De Oratione*, "On Prayer," which consists of an exposition of this prayer, with some remarks appended concerning customs observed in prayer. In this treatise (which he is supposed to have written before he went over to Montanism, *i. e.*, before the year 200), Tertullian represents the Lord's Prayer, not merely as a pattern or exemplar of Christian petitions, but as the quintessence and ground of all prayer, and as a summary of the gospel (*breviarium totius evangelii*<sup>2</sup>). He calls this form the "*Oratio legitima et ordinaria*," *the legitimate and ordinary prayer*; and says that the use of other prayers ought not to supersede this, which is rather to be regarded as the groundwork or foundation (*fundamentum*) of all. In chapter 19 (or 25), Tertullian recommends the use of (private) prayer three times a day, namely, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, *i. e.*, nine, twelve, and three o'clock<sup>3</sup>. This

<sup>2</sup> Dei Spiritus, et Dei Sermo, et Dei ratio, sermo rationis et ratio sermonis et spiritus. Utrumque Jesus Christus Dominus noster, novis discipulis novi Testamenti *novam orationis formam determinavit*. . . Et quid non cœleste, quod Domini Christi est, ut hæc quoque orandi disciplina? . . . Neque enim propria tantum orationis officia complexa est, venerationem Dei, aut hominis petitionem; sed omnem pene sermonem Domini, omnem commemorationem disciplinæ, ut *revera in oratione breviarium totius evangelii comprehendatur*. TERTULL. *De Orat.* c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> De tempore vero non erit otiosa extrinsecus *observatio etiam horarum quarundam*. Istarum dico communium, quæ diei interspatia signant, tertia, sexta, nona, quas solemniores in Scrip-

turis invenire est. . . . Etsi simpliciter se habeant sine illius observationis præcepto, bonum tamen sit aliquam constituere præsumtionem, qua et orandi admonitionem constringat, et quasi lege ad tale munus extorqueat a negotiis interdum, ut quod Danieli quoque legimus observatum utique ex Israelis disciplina, ne minus ter die saltem adoremus, debitores Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Exceptis utique legitimis orationibus, quæ sine ulla admonitione debentur ingressu lucis et noctis. Sed et cibum non prius sumere, et lavaerum non prius adire, quam interposita oratione, fideles decet. Priora enim habenda sunt spiritus refrigeria et pabula, quam carnis, et priora ecclestia, quam terrenæ. TERTULL. *De Orat.* c. 19 (al. 25).

writer does not mention the doxology at the end; indeed, he speaks of the words "deliver us from evil," as being the end (clausula) of the prayer.

Cyprian repeats the sentiments of Tertullian, whom he recognised to a great extent as his guide, in his treatise *De Oratione Dominica*, "On the Lord's Prayer." In this book, which is composed on nearly the same plan as that of Tertullian, Cyprian is more copious than his predecessor, and serves sometimes to complete and explain his meaning. He calls the Lord's Prayer "Publica nobis et communis oratio," "Our public and common prayer."

His celebrated contemporary, Origen, composed a treatise *On Prayer* (περὶ Εὐχῆς) about the beginning of the third century; the second part of which is devoted to an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. This writer takes notice of the slight difference which subsists between the two forms recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke; and is inclined to regard them as two separate prayers, bearing however a general resemblance to each other, and substantially the same (βελτίον ἢ διαφόρους νομίζεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς κοινὰ τινα ἐχούσας μέρη). He regards this prayer as a form prescribed for the use of all Christians (ὑποτετυπωμένην πρὸς τὸ δεῖν οὕτως προσεύχεσθαι προσευχήν); containing the substance of every petition which a Christian can find occasion to offer to God.

In writers of the fourth and fifth centuries we find frequent allusion to the Lord's Prayer, as a form appropriate for public use (AUGUSTIN, *Ep.* 89, *ad Hilar.*; *Retract.* lib. i. c. 19; CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* 42, 44; *Conf.* CYRILL. *HIEROSOL. Catech. Mystag.* 5).

During the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, the use of the Lord's Prayer was restricted to the faithful, or members in full communion with the church; whence it is called by Chrysostom εὐχὴ τῶν πιστῶν, it being adopted as a maxim that no unbaptized person possesses the privilege of calling God his Father (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 11, in 2 *Cor.*; *Hom.* 62; THEODORET. *Heret. Fabul.* c. 28; AUGUSTIN. *Cerm.* 42; *Conf. Enchirid.* 7, 71). We must not, however, suppose that the contents of this prayer

were kept secret from the catechumens; for this prayer is contained in the gospels, which were in the hands, not only of these persons, but even of the heathen: but it is probable that the church did not impart to the catechumens the doctrinal and mystical interpretation of this prayer which it had in its possession,—the *Sacramenta Orationis Dominicæ*, of which Cyprian and other writers speak. And here it may be interesting to trace the connexion which subsists between the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer and the celebrated system of secret traditional teaching (*disciplina arcani*).

All expositors of the first five centuries agree that the words "Our Father, which art in heaven," are to be taken in a full and mysterious sense, peculiar to Christianity (TERTULL. *de Orat.* c. 2, 3; CYPRIAN, *de Orat. Domin.*; ORIG. *de Orat.*; GREGOR. NYSS. *Hom.* 10, *in Ep. ad Coloss.*). The doctrine of adoption (*υιοθεσία*), and of boldness or confidence of access to God (*παρρησία*), were explained as a benefit peculiar to the Christian church, unknown alike to Jews and heathens. Attention was called especially to the liberty and equality of all men before God, so that those who in their social capacity are no higher than slaves, have attained to the privileges of children in the kingdom of God; and it was observed that, in this sense, the Gospel is rightly termed a "law of liberty" by St. James, while St. Paul also truly declares, that "there is neither bond nor free, but we are all one in Christ Jesus." But this high and consolatory doctrine was not explained to the members of the church until after their baptism.

The fourth petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," was understood by the ancients, almost without exception, in a mystical sense, and was directly applied to the spiritual food of the soul in the Lord's supper (IREN. *adv. Hær.* iv. c. 18; TERTULL. *de Orat.* c. 6; CYPRIAN, *de Orat. Domin.*; ORIG. *de Orat.*; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* v. c. 15). And it is probable that to each of the petitions in the Lord's Prayer some meaning was attached bearing reference to the Christian mysteries, or the esoteric doctrines of the church, which were carefully concealed from the catechumens.

The doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, which is now found in the Gospel of St. Matthew, is generally supposed by critics not to have formed part of the original text of that evangelist. Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, and Cyril of Jerusalem, appear to have been entirely unacquainted with it; and it is wanting in the earliest and best manuscripts of St. Matthew's Gospel, according to the testimony of Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, and Griesbach. It is the opinion of the two last-mentioned critics, that it appeared first about the middle of the fourth century, and that it is of Byzantine origin. It is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and it is not improbable that it may have been incorporated from that work into the text of the Gospel. It is found, also, in the earliest liturgies which have come down to us; but with slight variations of form.

The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* enjoins the use of the Lord's prayer three times a day (book vii. chap. 24); a practice afterwards established by the laws of the church (*Conc. Gerund.* A.D. 517, c. 10; *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, c. 9). The *Constitutions* also require every newly-baptized person to repeat the Lord's Prayer immediately after coming up from the water (*ἔστως προσευχέσθω τὴν εὐχὴν, ἣν ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος*: *Const. Apost.* lib. vii. c. 44; *Conf. Chrysost.* *Hom.* 6, *in Ep. ad Coloss.*). After this, the baptized repeated the creed (symbolum, regula fidei), in which they had been previously instructed; and this is the "traditio et redditio symboli" so often mentioned by ecclesiastical writers. In the case of infant baptism, the sponsors at first repeated the Lord's Prayer and Creed on behalf of the child for whom they answered; but afterwards, in the middle ages, the church began to dispense with this requirement, and to satisfy herself with the repetition of these formularies by the officiating minister. This lax practice has remained even in the Protestant churches; but a regulation which exists in some countries, of subjecting sponsors to a catechetical examination by the minister previously to admission to their office, is a vestige of the ancient and better practice.

Cyril of Jerusalem is the first writer who expressly mentions the use of the Lord's Prayer at the administration of the holy Eucharist. (*Catech. Mystag.* v. 5.) Augustin also has alluded

to its use on this solemn occasion<sup>4</sup>. It is remarkable that this practice is not recognised in the *Apostolical Constitutions*.

The *Ordo Romanus*, ii. (n. 12), prefixes a preface to the Lord's Prayer, the date of which is uncertain. It contains a brief exposition of the prayer.

All the Roman breviaries insist upon beginning divine service with the Lord's Prayer; but it has been shown that this custom was introduced as late as the thirteenth century by the Cistercian monks; and that it passed from the monastery to the church. (MERATUS, *ad Gavanti Thesaur.* t. 2, p. 103, 104.)

The ancient homiletical writings do not afford any trace of the use of the Lord's Prayer before sermons.

#### § 2.—OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF PUBLIC PRAYER AND LITURGICAL FORMULARIES.

It does not appear that, at any period of the Christian church, the use of the Lord's Prayer prevailed to the exclusion of other forms.

In the earliest records of Christian worship,—the accounts given in the New Testament,—we find some intimation of the general purport and contents of public prayer, but no form presented. A passage in the Acts of the Apostles, (chap. i. 24, 25,) which contains (probably) an outline of an *occasional* prayer, can hardly be deemed an exception to this remark. The testimony of Justin Martyr on this subject (*Apol.* i. c. 61, seq.) has been already considered. Tertullian tells us that the Christians in their assemblies prayed for the welfare of all mankind, the peace of the world, the empire, and persons in authority (*Apol.* c. 39); but he does not relate any precise set of words, or formulary, containing these supplications.

The earliest formularies on record are certain short addresses or responses still in use:—namely, Amen; Hallelujah, or Praise ye the Lord; Hosannah; Kyrie Elecison,—Lord, have mercy

<sup>4</sup> Precationes facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud, comminuitur, quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia Dominica oratione quod est in Domini [mensa, incipiat concludit.—AUGUSTIN. *Ep. ad Paulin.* benedici; orationes, quam benedicatur 59. et sanctificatur et ad distribuendum

upon us; Glory to God in the highest; The Lord be with you; Peace be with you; Let us pray; Lift up your hearts!

1. *Amen.* Justin Martyr describes the use of this word in the Christian church at the close of prayers and the Eucharist<sup>5</sup>. It is mentioned also by Tertullian (*De Spectaculis*, c. 25); and Augustin (*Serm. ad Pop. contra Pelag.*; *Serm. de Fer.* 4).

Great importance was attached to the use of this word by communicants upon receiving the consecrated elements<sup>6</sup>. At first, also, the congregation made this response after the consecration of the elements by the officiating minister: this practice fell into general disuse in the western churches about the sixth century; but it was retained in the eastern churches, and in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic liturgies.

It was the custom, also, for sponsors at baptism to answer Amen, when the minister had pronounced the sacramental words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

2. *Hallelujah, Praise ye the Lord.*—This doxology, as well as the former response, was derived from the Old Testament. Gregory the Great (*Epist.* lib. ix. ep. 12) affirms that it was used first by Christians in the church at Jerusalem, where it was appointed for Easter, and the interval succeeding until Whitsuntide. The custom of confining the use of this doxology in the church to those stated times long prevailed<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Οὐ συντέλεσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπειφημεῖ λέγων Ἄμην τὸ δὲ Ἄμην τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ φωνῇ τὸ γένοιτο σημαίνει.—JUSTIN. M. *Apol.* i. sect. 65, 67.

<sup>6</sup> Ergo non otiose, quum accipis, tu dicis Amen! Jam in spiritu confiteris, quod accipias carnem Christi. Dicit tibi sacerdos, *Corpus Christi*; et tu dicis Amen; hoc est, verum; quod confite-tur lingua, tenet affectus. AMBROS. in *Sacr.* lib. iv. c. 5; *Conf. De Initiandis*, c. 9.—Habet magnam vocem Christi sanguis in terra, quum eo accepto ab omnibus gentibus respondetur Amen. AUGUSTIN, *cont. Faust.* lib. xii. c. 10. *Conf. Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 13; CYRIL. *Microsol. Catcch.* 23; HIERON.

*Ep.* 39; LEON. M. *Serm.* 91. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 43.

<sup>7</sup> Laudes nostre Alleluja sunt. Quid autem est Alleluja? Verbum est Hebraicum: Alleluja, Laudate Dominum. Canemus, et invicem nos excitemus ad laudandum Deum, nec non corde melius quam cithara dicimus, laudes Deo canamus Alleluja, et quum cantaverimus, propter infirmitatem recedimus, ut corpora reficiamus. AUGUSTIN. *Expos. in Ev. S. Joan.*; *Conf. Serm. de Temp.* s. 151.—Quae duo verba, Amen et Alleluja, nec Graecis, nec Latinis, nec Barbaris licet in suam linguam omnino transferre, vel alia lingua annuntiare. Nam quamvis interpretari possint, propter sanctiorem

Since Alexander II. (in the eleventh century), there has been a formal suppression of the Hallelujah during Lent in the Roman church.

3. *Hosannah*.—This word, הַלְלוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, occurs but once in the Old Testament, namely, in Psalm cxviii. 25, where the Septuagint rightly translate it *σῶσον δὴ*, i. e., save now. It appears to have been very commonly adopted in the church, as a doxology equivalent to Hallelujah, or an exclamation of triumph or rejoicing. It must be remembered, that the Psalm in which it occurs is the last of those which compose the Great Hallel; and hence it is that we may best account for the use of it, on occasion of the triumphant entry of our Saviour into Jerusalem. (Matt. xxi. 9, 15; Mark xi. 9, 10; John xii. 13.) Origen is the first ecclesiastical writer who affixes the true meaning to the word, *σῶσον δὴ*. Jerome also rightly interprets it, *Salvum fac, obsecro, or salutem præsta*. Theophylact mentions the two interpretations, but gives the preference to the right one. It is singular that Suidas rejects this, and makes the word equivalent to *δόξα*, *glory*, falsely assuming that *ὠσαννά* in one evangelist corresponds to *δόξα* in another<sup>a</sup>.

The earliest trace of the use of this word in the Christian church occurs in Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23.) The first liturgical use of it is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book viii. c. 13), where it is connected with a doxology. It is found also in the Liturgy of Chrysostom; and here, as well as in the early Western Liturgies, it is used as a doxology, or exclamation of triumph.

tamen auctoritatem servata est ab Apostolis in iis propriae linguæ antiquitas. Tanto enim sacra sunt nomina, ut etiam Joannes in Apocalypsi referrat, se Spiritu revelante vidisse et audivisse vocem aquarum multarum et tonitruum validorum, dicentium, *Amen* et *Alleluja*: ac per hoc sic oportet in terris utrumque dici, sicut in cælo resonat. ISIDORUS HISPAL. *Orig.* lib. vi. c. 19; *De Div. Off.* p. 142.—Ut Halleluja per solos dies quinquaginta cantetur in ecclesia, non usquequaque observatur. AUGUST. *Ep.* 119, ad

*Jan.* c. 17.—Alleluja etiam in aliis diebus cantatur alibi atque alibi, ipsis autem quinquaginta diebus ubique. *Jbid.* *Ep.* 86, ad *Casul.*

<sup>a</sup> Τὸ ὠσαννά κατὰ μὲν τινὰς σημαίνει σῶσον δὴ, κατὰ δὲ τινὰς σημαίνει ὕμνον πλὴν κρείττον τοῦ πρώτου. THEOPHYL. *Comment. in Marc.* c. xi.; *Conf. in Matth.* xxi.—Ὄσαννά δόξαν σημαίνει. Καὶ γὰρ ἄλλος εὐαγγελιστῆς λέγει· εἰρήνη τῷ νίῳ Δαβίδ, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος· δόξα τῷ νίῳ Δαβίδ· ὥστε το ὠσαννά δόξαν σημαίνει. Παρὰ τοῖσι δὲ σῶσον δὴ, οὐκ ὀρθῶς.—SUIDAS, *Lea.*



4. *Kyrie eleison*, (Κύριε ἐλέησον,) *Lord have mercy*.—This expression is sometimes found in profano writers<sup>9</sup>; but it is on all accounts most reasonable to suppose, that it was adopted into the use of the church from the phrasology of the Old and New Testament, in which it frequently occurs. (Ps. li. 1; exxiii. 3; Matt. xv. 22; ix. 27; xx. 30, &c.) Little credit can be attached to an account given by Nicephorus, (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. xiv. c. 46,) concerning the first introduction of this form of prayer into the services of the church, during the reign of Theodosius the younger. The fact is, that this formulary appears to have been in common use long before that time; it is found in the Liturgy ascribed to St. James in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. Perhaps Nicephorus means to say, that at that period, on occasion of an earthquake felt at Constantinople, the Kyrie eleison was first united to the Trisagium.

It has been the practice in almost all churches, in using this formulary, to retain the original Greek<sup>10</sup>. Our church translates it:—Lord, have mercy upon us. Gregory the Great appears to have introduced the “Christe eleison;” which we retain, in the form, “Christ, have mercy upon us.”

5. *Glory to God in the highest*, (Gloria in excelsis).—The introduction of this doxology into the service of the church has been attributed to Telesphorus, bishop of Rome, who is supposed to have ordered its use in the celebration of the eucharist, about the year 126. It is certain that the pope Symmachus, at the

<sup>9</sup> According to Epictet. (*Enchirid.* lib. ii. c. 7.) Arrianus, a priest of Ceres and Proserpine, used these words:—Τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλούμενοι δεόμεθα αὐτοῦ· Κύριε ἐλέησον, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἐξελεῖν. And in Virg. (*Æn.* 12, v. 777), we find Faune, precor, miserere mei.

<sup>10</sup> Non est autem mirum, si Græco, nec non Hebræo idiomate, utatur Latina ecclesia in sacris mysteriis peragendis, sicut facit proferendo has voces Hebraicas, Amen, Alleluja, Sabaoth, Osanna: id enim ita institutum est, ut ostendatur, unam esse ecclesiam, quæ ex Hebræis et Græcis primum, deinde ex Latinis coadunata est: vel quia

mysteria nostræ fidei et sacra liturgia tribus hisce linguis ab Apostolis eorumque immediatis successoribus conscripta vel saltem celebrata fuerit: quæ quidem linguæ in titulo crucis quemadmodum consecratæ sunt; et sicut eruentum Christi sacrificium tribus hisce principalioribus linguis omnibus nationibus fuit manifestatum: ita congruum omnino est, ut etiam in ejusdem salvatoris sacrificio incruento celebrando easdem tres principales linguas adhibeat ecclesia. GAVANTI *Thesaur. Sacr. Rit.* t. 1, p. 80, (ed. Merati,) *Bona Rev. Lit.* lib. ii. c. 4.

beginning of the sixth century, enjoined the use of it on all Sundays and holidays, except Advent, the Feast of the Innocents, and the season of Lent. In the seventh century, the angelical doxology was used with additions. (*Conc. Tolet.* 4, A.D. 633, can. 12.)

6. *Peace be with you*; (*Pax vobiscum.*)—*The Lord be with you*; (*Dominus vobiscum.*)—During the prevalence of the system of secret instruction, this salutation was imparted only to the faithful; to the exclusion of the catechumens, as well as of the penitents and excommunicated. One charge which Tertullian brings against the reputed heretics of his day is, that they wished peace to all alike, (*pacem quoque passim cum omnibus miscunt*; *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 41.) In the fourth and fifth centuries the strictness of this observance was relaxed. (*CHRYSOST.* *Hom.* 3, *in Ep. ad Coloss.*)

When the *missa catechumenorum* was united with the *missa fidelium* in the Latin church, it was established as a rule in many places that the bishop alone should use the form, “Peace be with you,” while the presbyter was restricted to the use of “The Lord be with you.” A canon of the first Council of Braga, in Portugal, was directed against this distinction, in the year 561, (*Conc. Bracar.* i. can. 21;) and the practice was afterwards modified<sup>11</sup>.

7. *Let us pray.*—This form of exhortation, which, according to the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, was usually pronounced by the deacon, (*δεηθῶμεν*;) had a peculiar reference to the *disciplina arcani*, during the prevalence of which the church contained not only different classes of supplicants, but practised various kinds of prayer in public, namely, silent prayer, (*προσευχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς*;) and prayer *viva voce*, (*ἐνχαῖ προσφωνήσεως*, or

<sup>11</sup> Pontifex vel episcopus, ut mox innumus, in ecclesia occidentali, quum populum salutatur prima vice, ante primam orationem, non dicit, *Dominus vobiscum!* sed *Pax vobis!* quia Christus Dominus his verbis locutus est ad discipulos post suam resurrectionem (ut legitur apud Joann. c. xx.), cujus typum gerunt pontifex et episcopus.

Verum, ut postea demonstret episcopus, se esse de numero cæterorum sacerdotum, dicit, ut alii sacerdotes, *Dominus vobiscum!* quum alias populum salutatur: ita Innocentius III. (lib. ii. *De Mysteriis Missæ*, c. 42), et hic ritus est conformis canoni superius allegati Concilii I Braecarenensis. GAVANTI *Thesaur. Sacr. Rit.* t. 1, p. 77.

προσφώνησις.) This admonition was usually followed by another, *Let us kneel!* pronounced by the deacon or subdeacon; and, lastly, when prayer was ended, by *Let us rise!* Hence the expressions, dare orationem, and attendero ad preces. The ancients used a variety of expressions, nearly equivalent to those now mentioned, which occur in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and in the works of Chrysostom and other writers.

8. *Lift up your hearts! We lift them up unto the Lord.* (Sursum corda! Habemus ad Dominum.)—Cyprian is the earliest writer who mentions the use of this formulary in public worship, and on this account it has been commonly attributed to him as its author. But the manner in which he speaks of it (in his treatise *On the Lord's Prayer*) shows plainly that it had been introduced long before his time, and was in general and well-known use when he wrote. It is mentioned in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book viii. c. 12;) but it has been remarked as something singular, that Justin Martyr does not speak of it in his description of the celebration of the Eucharist. The meaning of this exhortation and response is well explained by Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Catech. Mystag.* v. § 4;)—"Hereupon," says he, "the presbyter says, 'Lift up your hearts!' For in this most solemn hour we ought indeed to have our hearts truly lifted up to God, and not bent downwards upon the earth and earthly things. This is, therefore, as if the presbyter should exhort every man to lay aside, at this time, all the cares of life and of domestic matters, and to direct his heart towards heaven, to the God of mercy. Then you answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord,' hereby giving your assent to the demand. Let not any one have his heart occupied with earthly things, while with his mouth he declares that his heart has been lifted up to the Lord! We cannot, indeed, have God in our minds at all times; but as this is impossible unto human frailty, we ought at least at this time to direct our hearts to him with especial attention." Similar explanations occur in CHRYSOST. *Hom.* xxiv. in 1 Cor. x.; THEOPHYLACT. *Comment. in Coloss.* iii.; ISIDOR. PELUS. *Epist.* lib. i. ep. 77; AUGUSTIN, *De vera Relig.* c. iii.; *De dono perseverantia*, c. xiii.

## § 3.—OF PSALMODY.

THERE can be no doubt that Christian psalmody is of Jewish origin. In the synagogues, the Law and the Prophets were read and expounded; and the Psalms, which stood at the head of the Hagiographa, or third class of the sacred Scriptures, were in the place of the psalters or hymn-books of modern congregations.

In the first ages of the Christian church the psalms were always chanted or sung. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book ii. 57), we find it laid down as a rule that one of the officiating ministers should chant or sing (*ψαλλέτω*) the psalms (*ᾠμους*) of David, and that the people should join by repeating the ends of the verses. And this regulation is repeated and explained by other writers<sup>12</sup>.

It was the ancient practice to recite the psalms between the reading of the several appointed portions of Scripture. The Council of Laodicea enacted that the psalms should not be sung one after another, but at intervals, after the reading of Scripture; and this custom is referred to by Augustin<sup>13</sup>.

Frequent mention is made by early writers of *Psalmi Responsorii*, or (in the neuter) *Responsoria*. Opinions differ as to the meaning of these terms; but it appears that they must refer either to a repetition of the verses by the people; or to the repetition of the last words of a psalm, with the addition of Amen, or the Doxology; or, lastly, to the circumstance that the

<sup>12</sup> Ἐτερός τις (sc. ἀναγνώσκων) τοὺς τοῦ Δαβὶδ ψαλλέτω ᾠμους, καὶ ὁ λαὸς τὰ ἀκροστίχια ὑποψαλλέτω. *Const. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 57.—Καὶ νῦν μὲν διχῆ διαμεμηθέντες, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις· ἔπειτα πάλιν ἐπιτίψαντες ἐνὶ κατάρχειν τοῦ μέλους, οἱ λοιποὶ ἰσηχοῦσι. ΒΑΣΙΛ. *M. Ep.* 63.—Ἐξήρχον δὲ τῶν ψαλμῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἱ τοῦτους ἀκριβοῦντες, καὶ ξυνεπήχει τὸ πλῆθος ἐν συμφωνίᾳ. SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 19.—Ὁ ἱερέρχης ἀπάρχεται τῆς ἱερᾶς τῶν ψαλμῶν μελωδίας, συνφοδούσης αὐτῷ τὴν ψαλμικὴν ἱερολογίαν ἀπάσης τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διακοσμίσεως. ΔΙΟΝΥΣ. ΑΛΕΟΥ. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Μὴ δεῖν συνάπτειν ἐν ταῖς συνάξεσι τοὺς ψαλμοὺς, ἀλλὰ διὰ μέσον καθ' ἕκαστον ψαλμὸν γίνεσθαι ἀνάγνωσιν. Non oportere Psalmos in conventibus contextere, sed in uno quoque Psalmo interjecto spatio lectionem fieri. *Conc. Laod.* c. 17.—Hoc de Apostolica lectione percepimus. Deinde cantavimus Psalmum, exhortantes nos invicem una voce, uno corde dicentes, Venite, adoremus, et prosternamur ei, et fleamus coram Domino, qui fecit nos. Posthæc evangelica lectio. AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 10, *de verbis Apost.* Conf. *Serm.* 33, *de verbis Domini*.

psalms were selected so as to correspond to the subject of the Lessons which had been read. Bingham is disposed to adopt the latter interpretation.

We find many traces of the custom of selecting what we should call 'Proper Psalms' for certain days; that is, psalms adapted by their contents to the subjects of particular Sundays or other festivals. (CHRYSOST. *Comment. in Psalm.*; ATHANAS. *Epist. ad Marcell.*; CASSIAN. *Instit. lib. iii. c. 3.*) Chrysostom refers to ancient prescription in this matter. According to Augustin, (in Ps. xxi. (xxii.), Sermon, 2,) it was in his time a very ancient practice in Africa, to sing Ps. xxii. in the service of Good Friday. A presbyter named Musæus compiled a lectionary for the use of the Gallican church, concerning which it is said by Gennadius (*De Script.* 79), "Responsoria etiam Psalmorum capitula temporis et lectionibus congruentia excerptit," "*he selected portions of the psalms adapted to the seasons and the lessons.*"

The bishop sometimes appointed psalms to be sung on particular occasions. Athanasius tells us that when the Arian troops surrounded his church, he ordered the deacon to sing the thirty-sixth psalm, (*Apolog. 2 contra Arian.*) Augustin relates that on one occasion, the reader, by some mistake, read another psalm, instead of the one which he had appointed, and on which he intended to preach; and he piously adds, that he chose to follow what appeared to be the will of God, in the mistake which the reader had made, rather than persist in his original design: his words to this effect are, "Psalmum nobis brevem paraveramus, quem *mandaveramus cantari* a Lectore; sed ad horam, quantum videtur, perturbatus alterum pro altero legit. Malumus nos in errore Lectoris sequi voluntatem Dei, quam nostram in nostro proposito." (AUGUST. *in Ps.* 138.) Sulpicius Severus relates an instance in which the recitation of a psalm chosen for the occasion by a bishop produced a remarkable effect. (*Vit. S. Martini*, c. 7.) "He says, when St. Martin was to be elected bishop, one whose name was Defensor, among the bishops, was a great stickler against him. Now it happened, that in the tumult, the reader, whose course it was to sing the psalm that day, could not come at his place in due time, and therefore another read the first psalm that he lighted upon when he opened the book, which

happened to be the eighth psalm, wherein were these words, ‘Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise because of thine enemies, *that thou mightest destroy the enemy and the defensor,*’ as the Gallican version then read it,—‘*Ut destruas inimicum et defensorem.*’ And this, though it seemingly were but a chance thing, was looked upon as providential by the people, to overthrow the machinations of Defensor.”

“Some psalms were of constant use in the church, as being appropriated to particular services. The sixty-third Psalm, ‘O God, my God, early will I seek thee,’ was peculiarly styled the Morning Psalm, because it was always sung at morning service, as the ninety-fifth is now in our Liturgy. And the hundred and forty-first Psalm, ‘Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense, and the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice,’ was always sung at evening service. They had also some proper psalms adapted to the nature of their communion-service, and their funeral offices. . . . The other psalms were sung in the ordinary course of reading from end to end, in the same order as they lay in the book, without being appropriated to any times, or lessons, or days, except those particular psalms which were appointed as proper for each canonical hour. CASSIAN. *Instit.* lib. ii. 2, 4; iii. 13.”—BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xiv. c. 1, § 4, 5, 6.

The only express testimony which the New Testament affords to the use of psalmody in the earliest Christian worship, is to be found in the parallel passages, Eph. v. 19, and Col. iii. 16, in which the apostles direct the converts to make use of “psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs;” where we may either suppose the apostle to refer to the psalms of David under the name of “psalms and hymns,” and to the compositions of Christians themselves under the title of “spiritual songs” (see 1 Cor. xiv. 15—19), or, as some suppose, the three words are used to denote the same thing, and the epithet “spiritual” applies equally to all,—“spiritual psalms, hymns, and songs.”

But some critics are of opinion that the New Testament contains various fragments of the early Christian hymns. Thus Grotius and Michaelis would regard Acts iv. 24—30 as the first Christian psalm, which, say they, may easily be reduced to

metre. Michaelis and others think that they detect fragments of psalms or hymns in Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 16; 2 Tim. ii. 11. And others maintain that many specimens of the psalms and hymns of the early church occur in the Apocalypse; e. g., in i. 4—8; v. 9, seq.; xi. 15—19; xv. 3, 4; xxi. 1—8; xxii. 10—18.

On the whole, the following conclusions may be drawn concerning the practice of the apostolic age in this particular.

1. The first churches made use of psalms and hymns in public worship.

2. And also at their religious feasts (the Agapæ).

3. These psalms were accompanied by music.

4. It is probable that the Christians did not confine themselves to the use of David's psalms, but composed spiritual songs or hymns for their own use, as the Essæans did, according to Philo. (*De Vit. Contemplat.*)

We learn from Pliny that the Christians of his day were accustomed to sing together a hymn to Christ, as God (*carmen Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem, Epist. lib. x. ep. 97*). But the information which early ecclesiastical writers give on this subject is exceedingly limited. Perhaps this may be in some measure explained, if we suppose that psalmody is included by them under the general titles of *εὐχὴ* and *εὐχαριστία*, prayer and thanksgiving. No mention is made of the words *ὕμνος*, *ὑμνολογεῖν*, or the like, by Justin Martyr, or by any of the apostolical Fathers; nor is any to be found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. We learn from Origen that psalms and hymns were addressed to God and Christ; and a passage quoted by Eusebius speaks of psalms and hymns (or songs, *ὄδαι*,) as furnishing historical evidence of the constant belief of the church in the doctrine of our Lord's divinity<sup>14</sup>. Augustin explains the word *hymnus* as denoting "a song containing the praise of God"<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> Ὑμνοὺς εἰς μόνον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι λέγομεν Θεόν, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ [λόγον καὶ Θεόν]. ORIGEN. *contra Cels.* lib. viii. c. 67.—Καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τίς ἀγνοεῖ βιβλία, Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον καταγγέλλοντα τὸν Χριστόν; Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὄσοι καὶ ὄδαι ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ

πιστῶν γραφεῖσιν, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστόν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες. (CAIUS) *ap. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 28.

<sup>15</sup> Hymnus scitis quid est; cantus est cum laude Dei. Si laudas Deum, et non cantas, non dicis hymnum. Si

It is remarkable, that not only have no hymns of the first and second centuries come down to us, but not even the name of any hymn-writer belonging to that period has been recorded. Basil the Great indeed speaks of one Athenogenes as the author of a doxological hymn (BASIL. M. *De Spirit. Sancto ad Amphil.* c. 29); but we know nothing more concerning him, and therefore cannot say precisely at what time he lived. It has been supposed that he was a contemporary of Clement of Alexandria; and since Basil speaks of him as a martyr, it is certain that he must have lived some time before the time of Constantine the Great. We have no certain account of the authors of hymns in the Christian church before the middle of the fourth century.

We read that Paul of Samosata banished from the church of Antioch certain psalms or hymns, addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ, which had been formerly sung there; in the place of which he probably retained only the Psalms of David<sup>16</sup>. This took place during the latter half of the third century. About the middle of the fourth century, the Council of Laodicea prohibited the use of hymns composed by private individuals, in public worship<sup>17</sup>. Bingham adopts the supposition that these hymns were objected to for some particular or local reason; but it must be remembered, that this canon was afterwards (A. D. 451) confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon as a general law; and we may, perhaps, be more correct in supposing

cantas, et non laudas Deum, non dicis hymnum. Si laudas aliquid, quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, etsi cantando laudes, non dicis hymnum. AUGUST. in *Ps.* 148.

<sup>16</sup> Ψαλμοὺς δὲ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν παύσας, ὡς δὴ νεωτέρους καὶ νεωτέρων ἀνδρῶν συγγράμματα. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 30.—Nil cause est, cur, an hoc factum sit ab eo, dubitemus. Ille vero rationem attendi velim, quare istos hymnos tolerare nollet. Non dicunt episcopi, a quibus arguitur, eum ideo hymnos istos rejecisse, quod errores continerent, sed quod novi essent et a recentioribus hominibus compositi. Plura non addunt; sed intelligo, quid hoc rei

sit. Paulus consuetis Christianorum carminibus repudiatis, tanquam recentioribus, veteres Davidis Psalmos in eorum locum substituebat, aut hos solos cani volebat. Astutus nempe homo et moris aulici gnarus, Zenobiæ Reginae, patronæ suæ, quam Judæorum sacris deditam fuisse ex Athanasio et aliis novimus, hæc etiam in re gratificari volebat. MOSHEIM, *Commentar. de rebus Christianis ante Constant. M.* 1753-4, p. 703-4.

<sup>17</sup> Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἕκατόνιστα βιβλία, ἄλλα μόνον τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. *Conc. Laodic.* can. 59.



that a general suppression of hymns was resorted to, as a means of taking one formidable weapon out of the hands of heterodox sects. It is well known that the hymns of Arius were great favourites with the people, and materially contributed to the spread of his peculiar doctrines. (ATHANAS. *Synod. Nic. decr.* ; PHILOSTORGIUS. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 2.) Chrysostom found these hymns of the Arian worship so attractive and influential at Constantinople, that he took care to counteract the effect of them, as far as possible, by providing the worship of the catholic church with similar compositions. (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 8 ; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* 8, 8.) Ephraim the Syrian, in like manner, resorted to the expedient of composing new hymns and cultivating church psalmody, as one means of counteracting the pernicious influence of the Gnostic Bardesanes<sup>18</sup>. Augustin also composed a hymn, in order to check the errors of the Donatists; whom he represents as making great use of newly-composed hymns, for the propagation of their opinions<sup>19</sup>. And such was, undoubtedly, the best way of destroying the charm of hymns adapted to convey false doctrines into the minds of the people; but those governors of the church who had either no such means, or no inclination to adopt this line of conduct, would naturally resort, in the next place, to the use of their authority in prohibiting the composition and use of new hymns altogether. The orthodox Fathers strongly recommend the use of David's

<sup>18</sup> Composuit (Bardesanes) carmina, et ea modulationibus aptavit, et finxit Psalmos induxitque metra, et mensuris ponderibusque distribuit voces. Ita propinavit simplicibus venenum dulcedine temperatum; ægroti quippe cibum recusabant salubrem. Davidem imitatus est, ut ejus pulchritudine ornaretur, ejusque similitudine commendaretur. Centum et quinquaginta composuit hic quoque Psalmos. EPHRAEM SYRUS in *Hymn* 53; *Conf.* SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 16; THEODOR. iv. c. 29; i. c. 22.

<sup>19</sup> AUGUST. *Retract.* lib. i. c. 20.—Sine dubitatione faciendum est, maxime illud, quod etiam de scripturis defendi potest, sicut de *Hymnis et Psalmis canendis*, cum et ipsius Domini

et apostolorum habeamus documenta et exempla et præcepta. De hac re tam utili, ad movendum pie animum et accendendum divinæ dilectionis affectum varia consuetudo est; et pleraque in Africa ecclesiæ membra pigriora sunt: ita ut *Donatistæ* nos reprehendant, quod *sobrie psallimus in ecclesia divina cantica prophetarum*, cum ipsi ebrietates suas ad canticum psalmarum humano ingenio compositorum, quasi tubas exhortationis inflamment. Quando autem non est tempus, cum in ecclesia fratres congregantur sancta cantandi, nisi cum legitur aut antistites clara voce deprecantur, aut communis oratio voce Diaconi indicitur? AUGUSTIN, *Ep.* 119. ad *Januar.* c. 18.

Psalms; in preference to the new and enthusiastic effusions of the sectarians of their day. But we find that, at the beginning of the seventh century, a diversity of opinion existed in the church, respecting the use of hymns composed by uninspired writers, as appears from a canon of the fourth Council of Toledo<sup>20</sup>.

The practice of alternate or choral singing originated in the East, perhaps with the celebrated Ignatius of Antioch. (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 8; THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 24; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 20; PHILOSTORG. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 13.) It was first introduced into the West by Ambrose, bishop of Milan; and when the practice of the Milanese church had become general, this method of singing was still distinguished by the epithet of Ambrosian. Originally the whole congregation joined in this alternate psalmody; but afterwards it was confined to the choir. The Reformation restored to the people their right of partaking in this ancient and important part of public worship.

The Latin church possesses no hymns of a higher date than the middle of the fourth century. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, who died in the year 368, is supposed to have been the first who composed hymns for public worship in the West; and this author, as well as Ambrose, was probably indebted for the idea to the Greek church. But the Latins soon acquired and maintained a decided superiority over the Oriental churches, with respect alike to the number, contents, and composition of their hymns. The earliest of the hymns now in use in the Greek church is not older than the eighth century. The first Greek Father in whose works any hymns are found is Clement of Alexandria, who flourished at the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries. (CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* lib. iii. *ad fin.*) Gregory of Nazianzum, who died in the year 390, is celebrated as a writer

<sup>20</sup> Quia a nonnullis *hymni humano studio compositi* esse noscuntur in laudem Dei et Apostolorum ac Martyrum triumphos, sicut hi, quos beatissimi doctores Hilarius atque Ambrosius ediderunt, quos tamen quidam specialiter reprobant, *pro eo quod de Scripturis, sanctorum canonum vel apostolica traditione non existunt.* Respuant ergo et illum hymnum, quem quotidie pub-

lico privatoque officio in fine omnium Psalmorum dicimus, Gloria et honor Patri, etc. Sicut ergo orationes, ita et hymnos in laudem Dei compositos nullus nostrum ulterius improbet, sed pari modo in Gallia Hispaniaque celebrent, excommunicatione plectendi, qui hymnos rejicere fuerint ausi. *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, can. 12.

of hymns. And it has been remarked as singular, that none of the compositions of these two fathers have been adopted and continued in use by the Greek church, although several of them are excellently adapted to public worship. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, in the beginning of the fifth century, composed some hymns; but these are not adapted to congregational purposes, nor were they ever publicly used in the church. The eighth and ninth centuries produced those sacred poets, of whose compositions the Greek church has chiefly availed itself; namely, Kosmas, John of Damascus, Theophanes, Joseph of Constantinople, Andreas, bishop of Crete, and Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople.

The Syrian church is the one which perhaps, on the whole, may lay the greatest claim to antiquity in the matter of psalmody, or the composition and use of hymns in public worship; as appears from what has been already stated. (See *ASSEMANI Bibl. Or.* t. 3.)

#### § 4.—RITES AND CEREMONIES CONNECTED WITH PUBLIC PRAYER AND PSALMODY.

THE earliest writer who makes any reference to the rites and ceremonies of the ancient church, in connexion with public prayer and psalmody, is Tertullian (*De Orat.* c. 11—23). Their rules relating to this matter, so far as they have come down to us, may be reduced to the following heads.

1. The custom of *standing* at prayer, in general, is peculiar to the East. No rule respecting posture is laid down in Scripture; but the examples recorded in Gen. xviii. 22; xix. 27; 2 Chron. xx. 13; 1 Sam. i. 26; Job xxx. 20, compared with Luke xviii. 11, 13; Matt. vi. 5, show that the Jews for the most part prayed standing,—a fact which is illustrated by the more modern practice of that people, and the testimony of rabbinical writers. Such is, indeed, the custom of other Oriental nations also. Our Saviour recognised it, at least, in saying to his disciples, “When ye *stand* praying,” (Mark xi. 25;) and hence Cyprian observes that we comply with the will of our Lord, “quando stamus ad orationem,” “when we stand at prayer,” (Conf. GROTI. *Annotat. ad Matt.* vi. 5.) And from the Liturgy

in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, as well as from those of Basil and Chrysostom, it plainly appears that, during the early centuries of Christianity, standing at prayer was the rule, and kneeling the exception.

We learn from Tertullian and other early writers, that it was the practice of the church in their times not to kneel at prayer on Sundays, and during the interval between Easter and Whitsuntide; and it was enacted by the Council of Nicæa, that on those occasions prayer should always be offered by members of the church in a standing posture, and no other. (TERTULL. *de Corona Mil.* c. 3; *Conc. Nicæn.* A.D. 325, c. 20.)

According to Origen, it was deemed proper *to stretch forth the hands, and to raise the eyes* in prayer, in order that the gestures of the body may indicate the elevation of the soul to God, except in cases of necessity. But kneeling (*γονυκλισία*) was considered necessary when prayer was made for forgiveness of sin. (*De Orat.* c. 31.) These remarks, however, are applied by that author to private prayer.

The author of the treatise entitled, *Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, (which was formerly attributed to Justin Martyr, but is evidently of a much later date,) explains the custom of abstaining from kneeling on Sundays as emblematic of our Lord's resurrection from the dead, and the forgiveness of sins: he supposes the custom to have descended from the apostles' age, and appeals to the testimony of Irenæus, in his *Treatise on the Paschal Feast*. Epiphanius, Jerome, and Augustin, agree with him in this view of the matter; but Basil the Great, thinking the custom not sufficiently explained by an allusion to the resurrection, and that such allusion was not generally understood, interpreted it as being at the same time a sign of a Christian's hope and expectation of another world, (*ὅτι δοκεῖ πως τοῦ προσδοκωμένου αἰῶνος εἶναι εἰκὼν*, *De Spirit. Sanct.* c. 27.)

Penitents were forbidden to stand in prayer; whence we may understand that the practice was regarded as a privilege by those in full communion with the church, and highly valued on that account. On this principle, Ambrose held that it ought not to be conceded to catechumens.

Standing was also regarded as the only right posture in

singing psalms, (AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 3 in *Ps.* 36; JO. CASSIAN. *De Instit. Ren.* lib. ii. c. 12.

*Kneeling*, likewise, is a posture derived from the Old Testament (Gen. xvii. 3, 17; Numb. xvi. 22; Josh. v. 14; 2 Chron. xx. 18; Ps. xcv. 6); and recommended by examples recorded in the New, (Luke xxii. 41; Acts vii. 59, 60; ix. 40; xxi. 5; Ephes. iii. 14.) The principal passages of early ecclesiastical writers which contain allusions to this practice in the Christian church, are the following:—CLEM. ROM. *Ep. ad Cor.* § 48; TERTULL. *ad Scapul.* c. 4; ORIGEN. *de Orat.* c. 31; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23; v. 5; *De vita Constant. M.* lib. iv. c. 61; *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 9, 10; *Hermæ Pastor*, part i. vis. 1; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 18 in 2 *Ep. ad Corinth.*; AUGUSTIN. *de Civit. Dei*, xxii. c. 8; CÆSAR ARELAT. *Hom.* 4; PRUDENT. *Cathemer. Hymn* 2.) This posture was understood to denote humility of mind before God, and to be a token that man had fallen from God, and was in need of divine grace and compassion. Hence it was especially required in actions of penance. Basil the Great calls it the lesser penance (*μετάνοια μικρά*), by way of distinction from the greater penance (*μετάνοια μεγάλη*), by which was understood prostration on the ground.

Standing and kneeling appear to have been practised indifferently in public worship, except at the times and on the occasions before mentioned.

*Bowing of the head*, and especially *bowing of the whole body*, may be regarded as an intermediate posture between standing and kneeling. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book viii. c. 6), the Catechumens are represented sometimes as kneeling down, sometimes as standing up, sometimes as bowing themselves. And mention is made of bowing the head in the baptism of adults; and generally in cases of intercession and benediction. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 28, 29.)

*Prostration on the ground* is sometimes spoken of; not, however, as a usual practice, but only on particular occasions, and as a sign of deep and extraordinary humiliation. (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 13, 37; THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 18, 19.)

Ecclesiastical writers make mention also of the custom of *stretching out the arms in the form of a cross* during prayer, in

memory of the crucifixion of our blessed Lord. (ORIGEN. *De Orat.* c. 20; CHRYSOST. *in Ps.* 140; EUSEB. *Vit. Constant.* lib. iv. c. 15.)

The *folding of the hands* in prayer is explained by Pope Nicholas I. (*Respons. ad Bulgaros*) as a token that Christians are the servants of Jesus Christ, and as it were his captives and prisoners. But there is no allusion to this custom in any ancient writer.

The early church, in compliance with the injunctions of the apostle in 1 Cor. xi., made it a rule that *men* should pray *with the head uncovered*, but *women* with it *covered*. In the former case, the custom appears to have been regarded as a token of subjection to Christ, and humble dependence upon him; and, in the latter, it was, perhaps, chiefly intended as a provision in favour of female modesty and decorum; (TERTULL. *De Virginibus Velandis*, c. 7—17; *Apolog.* c. 30; CHRYSOSTOM *in 1 Ep. ad Corinth. Hom.* 26.)

The Jewish religion required all persons in praying to turn towards the west, because the Holy of Holies was situate in that direction; (compare 1 Kings viii. 48; 2 Chron. xxix. 6; Dan. vi. 10;) and, in Ezek. viii. 16, 17, praying with the face towards the east, is spoken of as “an abomination,” but perhaps not otherwise than as including the idea of worshipping the sun. On the other hand, the Christian church adopted the practice of praying *with the face towards the east*; and, although the New Testament is silent on the subject, we find that such was the universal practice alike of the Eastern and the Western churches from the second century downwards,—and that to this practice no small degree of importance was attached. Bingham derives this custom from the practice of turning towards the east in baptism, after having renounced the devil and his works with the face toward the west. But it is equally probable that the practice in baptism may have been derived from the position observed during prayer in general; and we must, perhaps, look for the origin of the whole practice in the allusion intended to be conveyed to our Lord Jesus Christ, as the sun of righteousness,—the morning star,—the light of the world. “Clemens Alexandrinus tells us,” says Dr. Cave, “that herein they had

respect to Christ, for as the east is the birth and womb of the natural day, from whence the sun (the fountain of all sensible light) does arise and spring; so Christ, the true sun of righteousness, who arose upon the world with the light of truth, when it sat in the darkness of error and ignorance, is in Scripture styled the East, and therefore our prayers are directed thither. (CLEM. ALEX. *Stromat.* lib. vii.) For which reason Tertullian (*Contra Valent.* c. 3) calls the east ‘the figure or type of Christ.’ But, whatever the true reason was, I am sure it is a sober account which Athanasius (*Ad Antioch. Quæst.* 37) gives of it; ‘We, do not,’ says he, ‘worship towards the east, as if we thought God anyways shut up in those parts of the world, but because God is in himself, and is so styled in Scripture, the true light. In turning therefore towards that created light we do not worship it, but the great Creator of it; taking occasion from that most excellent element to adore that God, who was before all elements and ages in the world.’” (CAVE, *Primitive Christianity*, part i. c. 9.)—See APPENDIX B.

Neither our Saviour nor the Apostles prescribed any rules concerning particular times or hours of prayer, but rather enjoined men to pray “always and in every place.” In the course of the second and third centuries, it became usual among Christians to pray (*in private*) *three times a day*, namely, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, in imitation of the Jews, and in supposed compliance with the examples and exhortations of Scripture; *e. g.*, Gen. xix. 27; xxiv. 63; xxviii. 11; Dan. vi. 10; Ps. lv. 18; Acts iii. 1; x. 3, 9, 30. (TERTULLIAN, *De Orat.* c. 19; *De Jejun.* c. 10; CYPRIAN, *De Orat. Dom.*; CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* 4 *de S. Anna*.) To these were added, also, a morning and evening prayer, as we learn from Tertullian and Cyprian. And the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* gives us to understand that five, six, or even seven periods of daily prayer were observed when he wrote (*Constit. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 59; viii. 34). At the Reformation, as is well known, the Protestant churches discontinued the observance of these canonical hours, as a burden unnecessarily imposed upon men’s consciences, and as having been the occasion of much abuse and misconception on the subject of a Christian’s addresses to the throne of grace.

It appears that there was a daily celebration of divine worship in the time of Cyprian; and it has been supposed that the practice of offering *public prayer every morning and evening* was established during the third century. The order of the daily morning and evening services, as they undoubtedly obtained in the fourth century, was as follows:—The morning service began with the sixty-third Psalm; this was followed by prayers for the catechumens, energumens, competentes, and penitents; for the faithful, the peace of the world, and the state of the church; a bidding prayer for preservation during the ensuing day; a commendatory prayer, or thanksgiving, offered by the bishop; and his benediction of the assembly, before its dismissal by the deacon. The evening service corresponded to that of the morning, *mutatis mutandis*. The Psalm appointed for the opening of the service was the hundred and forty-first. In some churches the Lord's Prayer was used at the conclusion of the morning and evening daily service.

It may here be remarked, that we find no trace of processions, pilgrimages, or the like, during the first three centuries. This fact may be accounted for partly from the circumstances in which the early Christians were placed, and partly from the nature of their religious principles. Public religious processions appear to have been introduced during the fourth century, (BASIL. M. *Ep.* 63; *ad Neocæsar.*) In the course of that century, the Arians made great use of them at Constantinople; and Chrysostom recommended the orthodox to adopt their customs in this respect. (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. . 8; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 8.)—See Book vii. chap. 5.—Concerning the introduction and nature of solemn Litanies or Rogations, see Book v. chap. 2. sect 2.

#### § 5.—ANCIENT FORMS OF COMMON PRAYER.

THE Liturgy, or collection of public prayers<sup>21</sup>, contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, is the oldest composition of its kind now extant. It was probably composed about the beginning of

<sup>21</sup> The word liturgy (*λεϊτουργία*) is sometimes employed by early writers to denote merely a service used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and some critics contend that this is its only true and proper sense. RESAUR.



the fourth century, or a little earlier; and although it does not appear to have been used in its present form by any church, yet it seems to have been the basis upon which other liturgies were successively constructed. This Liturgy is, therefore, highly interesting and important, both on account of its great antiquity, and as being the model by which the public devotions of the church were afterwards, in a great measure, regulated. The Liturgy of Antioch, in particular, closely resembles this pattern. Its assumed derivation from Clement of Rome is, of course, fictitious.

I proceed now to give a translation of the greater part of these formularies, with some remarks; reserving for its proper place the Prayer for the Dead, which also occurs in the *Constitutions*. It will be seen that these prayers are distinguished, for the most part, by an enlightened piety, and a tone of genuine devotion. It will be our loss, through our own fault, if we do not find our hearts disposed to holy feelings and heavenly aspirations while we contemplate these ancient and simple addresses to the throne of grace:—but it will be the best result of our consideration of this subject, as well as of all our inquiries into the history and customs of the early church, if, by the divine blessing, we become more deeply imbued with the spirit of primitive piety, simplicity, and faith.

#### I. PRAYER FOR THE CATECHUMENS.

IN the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 6) it is ordered, that when the Scriptures have been read, and the bishop has delivered his word of exhortation and instruction, *the deacon, having from his place proclaimed silence and attention, shall say:—*

Pray, Catechumens! Let all the faithful pray for them earnestly and seriously (*κατὰ διάνοιαν*), and say, Lord, have mercy upon them! (*Κύριε ἐλέησον.*)

*And the deacon shall pray for them, and say:—*

Let us all call upon God for the Catechumens, that He, who

DOT, *Liturg. Orient. Collect.* t. i. p. 169.) But it was used also in its more general signification. (SUIZER, *The-* | *saur, Eccl. s. v. λειτουργία*; ASSEMANI, | *Cod. Liturg. Univ. Eccl.* P. 1.)

is good and gracious unto all men, may mercifully hear their prayers and supplications. May he accept their petitions, and vouchsafe unto them his aid. May he fulfil their desires and petitions, as may be most expedient for them (*πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*). May he reveal to them the Gospel of his Christ. May he enlighten and cheer their souls. May he instruct them in divine knowledge. May he teach them his commandments and his judgments. May he inspire them with his holy and wholesome fear. May he open the ears of their hearts, that they may occupy themselves in his statutes day and night. May he confirm them in godliness. May he cause them to be reckoned among his holy flock. May he count them worthy of the laver of regeneration, the garment of immortality, the true life. May he keep them free from all wickedness, and grant that the enemy may have no advantage over them. May he keep them clean from all pollution of flesh and spirit. May he dwell in them, and walk in them, by his Christ. May he bless their coming in and their going out, and guide them in all their undertakings for their good.

And we do also heartily pray for them, that they may obtain remission of their sins by the initiation, (*διὰ τῆς μυστήσεως*, i. e., baptism,) and become worthy partakers of the holy mysteries, (*τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων*, i. e., the Lord's supper,) and the communion of saints.

Lift up yourselves, Catechumens, and pray for the peace of God through his Christ. Pray for the day of peace, and for deliverance from sins through the whole course of your life, for a Christian end (*χριστιανὰ ὑμῶν τὰ τέλη*), for a good and merciful God, and for forgiveness of sins. Give up yourselves to God, the only unbegotten, through his Christ. Bow down, and receive the blessing!

*And the people shall answer to all that the deacon says,—* Kyrie eleeson. Especially the children (shall make this response<sup>22</sup>).

<sup>22</sup> We learn from Basil and Chrysostom that, in their time, children, and especially boys, were stationed about the altar, for the purposes of singing, and otherwise taking part in the offices of divine worship. These were afterwards the regularly-trained choristers.

*When they have bowed their heads, the bishop shall pronounce over them the following benediction:—*

O almighty, unbegotten, and immortal God, the only true God, who art the God and Father of thy Christ, and thine only-begotten Son, thou God of the Comforter, (ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Παρακλήτου, i. e., of the Holy Spirit,) and Lord of all things, who, through Christ, didst make the disciples teachers of righteousness, look now, we beseech thee, on thy servants who have been instructed in the Gospel of thy Christ. Give unto them a new heart, and renew within their souls the spirit of pure trust and confidence, that they may both know and obey thy will with all their heart, (ἐν καρδίᾳ πλήρει,) and with a willing mind. Grant that they may be worthy of the sacred initiation, (τῆς ἁγίας μυστήσεως, i. e., baptism,) and incorporate them into thy holy church. Grant that they may be partakers of the divine mysteries (i. e., the Lord's supper) through Christ, our hope, who died for them. Through whom be unto thee all glory and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

*Then shall the deacon say,—*Catechumens, depart in peace!

In one of the Homilies of Chrysostom (*Hom.* 2, in 2 Ep. ad Cor.), we find a commentary, in many respects highly valuable, on the prayer for Catechumens as it was used in the liturgy of his church (either of Antioch or Constantinople) in his time;—a formulary which corresponds, for the most part, to that which has been here translated out of the *Constitutions*.

## II. PRAYER FOR THE ENERGETUMENS.

*The Catechumens having withdrawn, let the deacon say,—* Pray, ye who are possessed with evil spirits! Let us all earnestly pray on their behalf, that the merciful God, through Christ, would drive away the unclean and evil spirits, and deliver his pious suppliants [or servants] from the power of the enemy (τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου). May he who drove out a legion of evil spirits and the wicked one (ἀρχεκάκω), now drive away these apostate spirits (ἀποστάταις τῆς εὐσεβείας), and deliver his creatures from the power of the wicked one, and purify those whom he has wonderfully made.

Let us continue earnestly to pray for them. Deliver them, and raise them up, by thy power, O God! Bow down, ye possessed, and receive the blessing!

*And the bishop shall pray over them, saying these words:—*

O thou who hast bound the strong one, and spoiled him of all his arms; who hast vouchsafed unto us power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and all the might of the enemy; who hast given captive into our hands that serpent, the destroyer of mankind (*τὸν ἀνθρωποκτόνον ὄφιν*), as a sparrow is given into the hands of children; thou who didst cast from thy presence like lightning him before whom all fear and tremble, and didst hurl him from heaven to earth, not only by removing him from his place, but by turning his glory into shame, because of his great wickedness; thou, who with a look driest up the deep, and before whose terrible voice the mountains do melt away, whose truth remaineth from generation to generation, who out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast ordained praise, whom angels adore and glorify; thou, at whose look the earth trembles, and at whose touch the mountains smoke; who removest and driest up the sea, and turnest the floods into dry ground; thou, unto whom the clouds are as the dust of thy feet, and who walkest upon the sea as upon dry ground,—O thou only-begotten God, Son of the great Father, do thou drive away these evil spirits, and deliver the works of thine own hands from the power of the enemy. Unto thee be glory, praise, and honour, and through thee unto the Father, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

*Then let the deacon say,—*Depart, ye Energumens. (*Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 6, 7.*)

We do not find another entire copy of this formulary in any early writer; but there are several evident allusions to it in CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* 18, in 2 Ep. ad Cor.; *Hom.* 3, 4, *de Incomprehens. Nat. Dei*; *Hom.* 71, in Matt.; and other places.

### III. PRAYER FOR THE COMPETENTES, OR CANDIDATES FOR BAPTISM.

*The Energumens having retired, the deacon shall say,—*Pray, ye candidates for baptism! And let us, all the faithful, pray

heartily for them, that the Lord would make them worthy, having been baptized (*μνηθέντας*) into the death of Christ, to be raised up together with him, and to be partakers of his kingdom and sharers of his mysteries; that he may elect them and incorporate them with those who are redeemed in his holy church. Redeem them, and raise them up, by thy grace!

*Those who are about to be dedicated to God through Christ, shall here bow themselves, and receive the blessing of the bishop in words which follow:—*

O thou, who by thy holy prophets hath said to those who are about to be dedicated to thee, “Wash you, make you clean,” and who hast appointed a spiritual regeneration through Christ; look now, we beseech thee, upon these persons soon to be baptized; bless them, and sanctify them, and make them worthy to partake of thy spiritual gifts, the true adoption, thy spiritual mysteries, and to be received into the body of thy redeemed, through Christ our Saviour; through whom be unto thee all glory, honour, and worship, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

*Then shall the deacon say,—*Depart ye candidates for baptism. (*Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 7, 8.*)

No further trace of this prayer is found in the works of Chrysostom, or any other early ecclesiastical writer; a circumstance which perhaps admits of an easy explanation, when we consider the variations which took place in the administration of baptism in consequence of the gradual extension of the church, and especially the changes which arose in consequence of the continually increasing prevalence of infant-baptism.

#### IV. PRAYER FOR THE PENITENTS<sup>24</sup>.

*When the candidates for baptism have retired, then let the deacon say:—*

Pray, ye penitents! And let us all heartily pray for our

<sup>24</sup> These were classed among the hearers (*ἀκροώμενοι*, audientes), inasmuch as they were permitted to be present at the public reading of Scripture, the sermon, and the common prayers. They are also called *γονυκλίνοντες*, genua flectentes, and *ἑποπίπτοντες*, prostrati, because they were obliged to kneel during the prayers.

penitent brethren (τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἀδελφῶν), that the merciful God would show them the way to true repentance, accept their retraction and confession of sins, tread Satan shortly under their feet, deliver them from the snares of the devil, and from the attacks of all evil spirits, and preserve them from all unlawful words, all unrighteous deeds, and all wicked thoughts. May he forgive them all their sins, whether wilful or unintentional; may he blot out the hand-writing that testifies against them, and write their names in the book of life. May he cleanse them from all pollution of flesh and spirit, and restore them to union with his holy flock. He knoweth what weak creatures we are; for who can boast that his heart is clean, or who can declare boldly that he is pure from all sin? We do all deserve punishment. Let us, therefore, the more fervently pray for them; for there will be joy over one sinner that repenteth. Let us pray for them, that they may turn from sinful deeds, and exercise themselves in all good works; that the merciful God may soon graciously accept their prayers, restore to them the joy of his salvation, and strengthen them by his guiding Spirit (πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ), that they may not fall again, that they may be partakers of his holy things (τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἱερῶν), and have their part in the sacred mysteries; that they may be worthy of the adoption, and may attain unto everlasting life.

Let us all pray fervently for them,—O Lord, have mercy! Deliver them, O God, and restore them, by thy grace!

Ye, who desire to be restored by God through Christ, bow yourselves and receive the blessing.

*Then shall the bishop, with the imposition of his hands, pronounce over them the following benediction:—*

O, Almighty and eternal God, Lord of the whole world, maker and governor of all things, thou, through Christ, hast made man the ornament of the world, and hast given unto him both an innate (ἔμφυτον) and a written law, that he may live agreeably thereto as a rational being; and, since he hath sinned, thou hast of thy goodness called him, with sure pledges of thy favour, to repentance (ὑποθήκην δούς πρὸς μετάνοιαν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότητα); look now, we beseech thee, upon those who here bend before thee the necks of their souls and bodies! Thou

willest not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should repent, and turn from his evil ways, and live. Thou didst accept the repentance of the men of Nineveh; and thou willest that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Thou didst receive again with fatherly compassion the son who had squandered away his property, when he repented and returned. O do thou now likewise accept the repentance (τὴν μετάνοωσιν) of these who here offer up their prayers. For there is no man that hath not sinned against thee; and if thou shouldest be extreme to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee. Restore these persons, we beseech thee, to thy holy church, to their former dignity and honours, through Christ, our God and Saviour; through whom be unto thee all praise and glory, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

Then shall the deacon say, Ye are dismissed, (ἀπολύεσθε,) penitents! (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 8 9.)

Traces of this formulary occur in the works of Chrysostom (e. g. *Hom.* 18 in 2 *Ep. ad. Cor.*; *Hom.* 61 in *Matth.*); and in the canons of the councils of Laodicea (can. 19), Nicæa (can. 11), Ancyra (can. 4).

#### V. PRAYER FOR THE FAITHFUL.

UNDER this title (προσφώνησις ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστῶν), we find a form of prayer in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, lib. viii. c. 9, 10; and, in close connexion with it, one entitled ἐπὶ κλήσις τῶν πιστῶν, in the following chapter. Whether we regard προσφώνησις and ἐπὶ κλήσις as synonymous, or attribute to each of these words a peculiar signification, (bidding prayer, and invocation,) it is certain, at all events, that they are both opposed to silent prayer, (εὐχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς), and denote public prayer pronounced with a loud voice; which is entitled εὐχὴ διὰ προσφωνήσεως, *Conc. Laodic.* c. 19; and is probably denoted by Basil (*Ep.* 241), under the words τῶν κηρυγμάτων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν. According to the rules of the *Constitutions*, this prayer was to be repeated by the faithful alone. But it contains no reference to the holy eucharist, or to the doctrine of the Trinity, and therefore (says Augusti), we must not regard it as a part of the *Missa*

*Fidelium*, with Bingham and others. It appears to have been used at an early period as a form of Common Prayer in the church. Chrysostom makes mention of it (*Hom. 8 in Ep. ad Cor.*; *Hom. 61 in Matth.*), and observes that children ought to join in it, because it may be supposed that God would have respect to their innocence and humility. The same father, in another of his homilies (*Hom. 2 de Obscuritat. Prophet.*), cites several passages of the prayer of the faithful, which agree almost word for word with the formulary preserved in the *Constitutions*. Clear references to the same formulary occur also in the writings of Basil, Augustin, and other fathers. It is evident also that this prayer forms the groundwork of the Litanies of the Greek and Latin churches.

The following are the rules and forms preserved in the *Apostolical Constitutions*.

*When the deacon has dismissed the penitents, he shall say, Let none, of those who ought not, go away! [or, perhaps, if we read προσελθέτω for προελθέτω, Let none, of those who ought not, draw near.] But let us all, the faithful, kneel down. Let us all pray unto God through his Christ, and with one voice (συντόνως) call upon God through his Christ.*

Let us pray for the peace and welfare of the world and the holy churches, that the God of all the world would bestow upon us his everlasting and unchangeable peace, and preserve us to the end in all godliness and virtue.

Let us pray for the holy, catholic, and apostolic church from one end (of the earth) to the other, that the Lord would preserve and keep it firm and unshaken, as founded upon a rock, unto the end of the world.

Let us pray for the holy church of this parish (*ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐνθάδε ἁγίας παρουκίας*, parish-church), that the Lord of the world would deem us worthy to strive without ceasing after his heavenly hope, and to pay unto him the continual debt of our prayers.

Let us pray for the whole episcopal office under heaven, and for all those who rightly divide (*ὀρθοτομούντων*) the word of truth.

Let us pray for our bishop James, and his parishes.



Let us pray for our bishop Clement, and his parishes.

Let us pray for our bishop Euodius, and his parishes<sup>24</sup>.

That the merciful God would preserve them to his holy churches, in wealth, honour, and long life, and grant unto them an honoured old age in all godliness and righteousness.

Let us pray for our presbyters, that God would preserve them from all that is unrighteous and evil, and enable them to fulfil their duties with happiness and honour.

Let us pray for the Christian office of deacons, that the Lord would keep them unblamable in their service.

Let us pray for the readers, singers, virgins, widows, and orphans.

Let us pray for all those who live in the estate of matrimony, and bring up children, that the Lord would have mercy upon them all.

Let us pray for the eunuchs of holy conversation.

Let us pray for all those who lead sober and godly lives.

Let us pray for those who do good (*καρποφορούντων*) to the holy church, and maintain poor widows.

Let us pray for those who bring their offerings and first-fruits to the Lord our God, that God of his bountiful goodness would reward them with heavenly gifts, that he would repay them in this present world a hundred fold, and grant them in the world to come everlasting life, giving them things eternal for things temporal, and heavenly goods for earthly.

Let us pray for our brethren lately enlightened (*νεοφωτίστων*, *i. e.*, lately baptized), that the Lord would strengthen and confirm them.

Let us pray for our sick brethren, that the Lord would deliver them from all sickness and infirmity, and restore them to his holy assembly in good health.

Let us pray for those who travel by water and by land.

Let us pray for those who suffer for the Lord's sake, in the mines, in banishment, in prison, and in bonds.

Let us pray for those who endure the hardships of slavery.

Let us pray for our enemies, and those who hate us.

<sup>24</sup> This allusion to the churches of Jerusalem, Rome, and Antioch, looks like an interpolation (AUGUSTI).

Let us pray for those who persecute us for the Lord's name's sake, that the Lord would appease their fury, and set bounds to their rage against us.

Let us pray for those who are without (*τῶν ἕξω ὄντων*, *i. e.*, without the pale of the church), who err and are deceived.

Let us remember the young children of the church, that the Lord would bring them to perfection, and the measure of a full age.

Let us pray for one another, that the Lord would preserve and defend us by his grace unto the end, protect us from evil and from all offences, and keep us safe unto his heavenly kingdom.

Let us pray for every Christian soul.

Bless us, and deliver us, O God, by thy mercy!

*Then let the deacon say,* Let us stand up!

Let us commit ourselves, in fervent prayer, to the living God by his Christ!

*Then the chief priest (ἀρχιερεὺς) shall pronounce the following benediction:—*

*(Prayer for the Faithful.)*

O, Almighty and most high God, who dwellest in the high and lofty place! O thou holy One, who inhabitest the holy place! O thou without beginning, the only potentate! Thou who through Christ hath vouchsafed unto us the preaching of knowledge (*κήρυγμα γνώσεως*, *i. e.* the preaching of the Gospel), for the acknowledging of thy glory and thy name, and hast thereby revealed thyself to our understanding; we beseech thee to look now, through him, upon thy flock, and deliver it from all ignorance, and from every evil deed; grant that we may fear thee in thy fear, and love thee in thy love; and that we may humble ourselves before the presence of thy glory. Be gracious and merciful unto thy people, and receive their prayers. Preserve them unchanged, blameless, and unrebukable, that they may be holy in body and soul, without spot or blemish or any such thing, that they all may be perfect, and that none may be found among them maimed or imperfect.

O thou our Almighty defender, with whom is no respect of

persons! Help this people, whom thou hast redeemed with the precious blood of Christ!

O thou our advocate, supporter, defender, our guardian, bulwark, stronghold, and confidence, we know that none can pluck us out of thine hand. For there is none other God beside thee, and in thee is our hope.

The saints are in thy truth; for thy word is truth.

O thou, whom no one can corrupt (*ἀπροσχάριστε*) and no one can deceive! Deliver us from all sickness and infirmity, from all sin, from all unrighteousness and deceit, from all fear of the enemy, from the arrows which fly by day, and from the works of darkness. Make us worthy of eternal life through Christ, thine only begotten Son, our God and Saviour; through whom be unto thee honour and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.

*Then shall the deacon say, Attention!*

*The bishop shall salute the congregation, and say, The peace of God be with you all!*

*And the people shall answer, And with thy spirit!*

*Then the deacon shall say to all, Salute ye one another with the holy kiss!*

Then the clergy shall kiss the bishop, and the laity each other, the men kissing the men, and the women the women. The boys shall stand round about the Bema; and another deacon shall pay attention to them, that they make no disturbance. Other deacons shall go round, and watch the men and women, that no noise be made, that no one nod, whisper or sleep. The remaining deacons shall stand at the men's door, and the subdeacons at the women's door, to take care that no one go out, and that, at the time of the offering (*κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀναφορᾶς*, *i. e.*, during the celebration of the Lord's supper), the doors be not opened to any one, even of the faithful. One of the subdeacons shall bring water to the priests for the purpose of washing their hands, in token of the purity of their souls.

## VI. A PRAYER FOR THE LORD'S DAY.

THE following is the oldest prayer which contains any mention of the Lord's day, as a sacred season set apart for divine worship; it occurs in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, lib. vii. c. 36<sup>25</sup>.

O almighty Lord! Thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast ordained the Sabbath for a memorial of the same. Thou hast appointed festival days, for the refreshment of our souls, in order that we may commemorate Thy Created Wisdom; how, for our sakes, he suffered himself to be born of a woman; how he appeared in the life of men, and at his baptism showed himself as God and man (ὡς Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἄνθρωπος, i. e., God-man); how, with Thy permission, he for our sakes suffered and died, and rose again by thy power. Hence do we celebrate the festival of the resurrection on the Lord's day (τῇ κυριακῇ), and rejoice on account of Him who has overcome death, and brought life and immortality to light. Yea, through Him hast Thou brought the nations to thyself, that they may be a peculiar people, the true Israel, the people that love and see God<sup>26</sup>.

Thou, O Lord, didst deliver our fathers from the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, from the clay, and from the making of bricks. Thou didst deliver them from the hand of Pharaoh and his servants. Thou didst lead them through the sea, as over dry land, and didst satisfy them in the wilderness by manifold benefits. Thou didst give unto them thy law, even the ten commandments, which were spoken by thy mouth, and written by thine hand.

Thou hast appointed the Sabbath, not as an excuse for idleness, but as an occasion for piety, and in order to promote the knowledge of thy power. In order to preserve them from

<sup>25</sup> Under the following title;—Προσευχὴ ὑπομνήσκουσα τὴν γενομένην Χριστοῦ ἐνανθρώπησιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους διάφοραν πρόνοιαν.

<sup>26</sup> This expression (τὸν ὁρῶντα Θεόν) refers to the etymology of the name Israel adopted by Philo; namely,  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  vir,  $\text{יָרָא}$  vidit, and  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  Deus;

i. e., homo aut mens cernens Deum. Thus we read, in OPTAT. MILEVIT. *De Schismate Donatist.*, lib. ii. c. 26; Israel, id est, qui mente Deum Videat. It may be almost needless to add, that the name  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  is really derived from  $\text{יָרָא}$  to wrestle, and  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ . See Gen. xxxii. 29; Hos. xii. 4.

evil, and to teach them, thou hast surrounded them with a sacred fence, that the number of seven (*ἑβδομάς*) may be a delight to them. Hence have been appointed, a week of seven days, seven weeks, a seventh month, a seventh year, and its seventh return, which is the fiftieth year, the year of jubilee and release. In order then that men may have no pretext, wherewith to excuse their ignorance, He commanded on every Sabbath rest from all labours, so that on the Sabbath none should even speak a word in anger. For the Sabbath is the rest from the creation of the world, the finishing of the world, the examining of the law, the praise of God for that which he has given unto men.

But above all the Lord's day has the pre-eminence. For this sets before us the Mediator, the advocate, the law-giver, the author of the resurrection, the first-born of all creatures, God the Word, the man who was born of the Virgin Mary alone, led a holy life, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, died, and rose again from the dead.

How does the Lord's day admonish us to give thanks unto thee, O Lord, for all these things! For this thy grace vouchsafed unto us, is that which eclipses by its greatness all thy other benefits!

## VII. MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS.

IN the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. vii. c. 47, 48) we find two prayers entitled, A Morning Prayer—An Evening Prayer; but these are rather to be regarded as Doxologies, with which, according to Athanasius (*de Virgin.*) the morning service was opened, and the evening service concluded. They are the following:—

### *Morning Prayer.*

Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men. (Luke ii. 14.)

We praise thee, we magnify thee, we give thanks unto thee, we celebrate thy glory; we worship thee, through the great High Priest; thee, the true God, the one, unbegotten, immortal, for thy great glory. O Lord, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty, O Lord, the God and Father of Christ, the spotless

Lamb, that taketh away the sins of the world. O thou that sittest upon the cherubim, receive our prayer. For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord, O Jesus, the Christ of God for all created nature, our King; through whom be unto thee honour, praise, and adoration.

*Evening Prayer.*

Praise the Lord, ye servants; praise the name of the Lord. (Ps. cxii. 1.)

We praise thee, we glorify thee, we give thee thanks for thy great glory, O Lord, our King, the Father of Christ, that spotless Lamb, who taketh away the sins of the world. Praise belongeth unto thee; to thee belong thanksgiving and glory, O God and Father, through the Son, in the Holy (*παναγίῳ*) Spirit, from everlasting to everlasting. Amen.

Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation; which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel. (Luke ii. 29—32.)

In another part of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, (lib. viii. c. 35—39,) we find daily Morning and Evening prayers, which are prescribed as the institution of the apostle James, and concerning which some more precise instructions are given in lib. ii. c. 59, These are more peculiarly appropriate to their use than the foregoing, which are doxologies suited alike to any office of divine worship, and to any portion of the day. It may be remarked, concerning the passage now to be translated, that the Evening Prayer stands before that for the Morning, quite in the manner of the Jewish Christians;—a circumstance which contributes to stamp upon these formularies the mark of a very early origin.

The first prayer is entitled *Προσφώνησις ἐπιλύχνιος* and *εὐχαριστία ἐπιλύχνιος*, (*An Evening Prayer and Thanksgiving*), and is appointed to be said after the reading of the Evening Psalm, i. e., the hundred and forty-first, according to *Const. Ap.* ii. 59.

*This Psalm having been said, the deacon shall say:—*

Help us, and raise us up, O God, through thy Christ. Having been raised up, (*ἀναστάντες*;) let us entreat the grace and mercy of the Lord, and pray for the angel of peace, (*τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης*<sup>27</sup>;) for all things which are good and convenient for us, and that we may make a Christian end. Let us pray that this evening and night may pass in peace and without sin; and that the whole course of our life may be blameless. Let us commend one another to the living God through his Christ.

*Then the bishop shall pronounce this prayer:*

O God, who art without beginning and without end, the maker and governor of all things through Christ, the God and Father of him before all things, the Lord of the Spirit, and key of all things visible and invisible, [*lit.* things sensible and transcendental,] thou hast made the day for works of light, and the night to give rest to our weakness. The day is thine, and the night is thine; thou hast prepared the light and the sun. Do thou now, O most merciful and loving Lord, graciously accept this our evening thanksgiving. Thou hast led us through the day, and hast brought us to the beginning of the night; O do thou preserve us by thy Christ! Grant that this evening may be passed in peace, and that the night may be without sin; and make us worthy of eternal life, through Christ; through whom be unto thee glory, honour, and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

After this, the deacon having bidden the people to bow down and receive the benediction with imposition of hands, the bishop pronounces over them the following prayer:—

O God of our fathers, and Lord of mercy, who by thy wisdom hast created man a rational being, of all thy creatures upon earth most dear unto thee, who hast given him dominion over the earth, and of thy good pleasure hast made us to be kings and priests; the one to secure our lives, and the other to secure thy lawful worship:—Be pleased now, O Lord Almighty, to bow

<sup>27</sup> This expression is remarkable, as containing an allusion to the supposed distribution of the offices of angels into different departments or provinces.

The petition for the angel of peace was common to many forms of prayer in the ancient church.

down and show the light of thy countenance upon this people, who bow the neck of their heart before thee; and bless them by Christ, by whom thou hast vouchsafed unto us the light of knowledge, and hast revealed thyself unto us; with whom is due unto thee and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, all adoration from every rational and holy nature for ever. Amen.

At *morning prayer*, the proper Psalm (Ps. LXIV.) having been read, and the deacon having repeated a bidding prayer, the same (*mutatis mutandis*) as in the evening service, the bishop is directed to pray in the following form:—

O God, the God of spirits and of all flesh, thou with whom no one can compare, and who art exalted far above all need; thou hast made the sun to govern the day, the moon and the stars to govern the night; look down upon us now, we beseech thee, with the eyes of thy mercy; graciously accept our morning thanksgiving, and be merciful unto us. For we do not spread forth our hands unto any strange god. We have not chosen unto ourselves any new god, (*Θεὸν πρόσφατον*,) but thou, the eternal and immortal God. O thou who hast given us our being, and our well-being, (*τὸ εἶ εἶναι*,) through Christ, do thou make us worthy of eternal life through him, with whom be unto thee glory, honour, and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

The deacon having then bidden the people to bow down and receive the benediction with imposition of hands, the bishop is directed to pronounce the benediction in the following form:—

O God, faithful and true, who dost show mercy unto thousands and tens of thousands of those that love thee, who art a friend of the humble and a defender of the poor, thou who canst command all things, since all things must serve thee; look down, we beseech thee, upon this people who here bow their heads before thee, and bless them with spiritual benediction. Keep them as the apple of an eye; preserve them in piety and righteousness, and make them worthy of everlasting life, through thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ; with whom unto thee be glory, honour, and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.

The deacon then dismissed the congregation with the usual form, Depart in peace!



## § 6.—HISTORY OF ANCIENT LITURGIES.

THE liturgies formed upon the model of that contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which were used in different churches, have been conveniently divided into several families or classes. Mr. Palmer, in his valuable work on this subject<sup>26</sup>, to which I acknowledge myself indebted for much of the information contained in the subsequent part of this section, reduces all the primitive liturgies to four; namely, 1. *The Great Oriental Liturgy*, which seems to have prevailed in all churches from the Euphrates to the Hellespont, and thence to the southern extremity of Greece. 2. *The Alexandrian*, or the ancient liturgy of Egypt, Abyssinia, and the country extending along the Mediterranean Sea to the west. 3. *The Roman*, which prevailed throughout the whole of Italy, Sicily, and the civil diocese of Africa. 4. *The Gallican*, which was used throughout Gaul and Spain, and probably in the exarchate of Ephesus until the fourth century.

## I. THE ORIENTAL LITURGY.

THE *Great Oriental Liturgy* includes, as its variations, the *Liturgy of Antioch*, which prevailed (probably) in the fourth century, from Arabia to Cappadocia, and from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates;—the *Liturgy of Basil of Casarea*, which prevailed in the fourth century, through the greater part of Asia Minor; and that of *Chrysostom or Constantinople*, which was used in Thrace (probably) in the fourth century, and was adopted also in Macedonia and Greece. Mr. Palmer *supposes* that this liturgy may have originated with the apostles themselves; but he cannot *trace* it beyond the writings of Justin Martyr;

<sup>26</sup> *Origines Liturgicæ; or Antiquities of the English Ritual, and a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A. Oxford, 1832.—For full information concerning the ancient liturgies, as far as the subject has been investigated, see J. S. ASSEMANNI *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universæ*; MARTENE *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*; MURATORI *Liturgia Romana Vetus*; GOAR *Euchologium Græcum*; RENAUDOT *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*; and the writings of Gavanti, Bona, Le Brun, Thomasius, and Mabillon. The English reader may profitably consult Dr. BRETT'S *Collection of Ancient Liturgies*, which has been lately republished.

and even in the words of that author the allusion is extremely remote and uncertain. It should be remembered, that the works of the earliest writers of the church were in the hands of the compilers of liturgies; and that they would naturally regulate their compositions according to any hints or apparent outlines which those venerable records might contain. This appears to be a much more satisfactory mode of tracing the resemblance between ancient liturgies and the prayers mentioned in primitive writings, than that of supposing both the one and the other to have originated in some apostolical institution, and that "there were set, prescribed, offices and forms of prayer and praise, and professions of faith, delivered to all the churches of Christ by the apostles, or their immediate successors<sup>29</sup>." The liturgy of Basil can be traced with some degree of certainty to the fourth century; but *we have no proof of the existence of any other of these ancient formularies earlier than the fifth century.*

I. *Liturgy of Antioch.*—In the patriarchate of Antioch an ancient orthodox liturgy was used, which was ascribed to the Apostle James, and bears a striking resemblance to the liturgy presented in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. "We cannot trace back the appellation of St. James's liturgy," says Mr. Palmer, "as given to that of Jerusalem and Antioch, beyond the fifth century. I am persuaded that this appellation began after the time of Basil, exarch of Cæsarea, about A. D. 380."

The Monophysites or Jacobites in the patriarchate of Antioch also used a liturgy ascribed to the same apostle, which they still retain. Both these liturgies were probably derived from a common source. The orthodox have adopted the Greek or Constantinopolitan liturgy; and they now read their ancient liturgy, attributed to St. James, only on the annual festival of that apostle. This Greek liturgy, as now extant, appears to have received many additions from the rites of the church of Constantinople before the tenth century.

2. *Liturgy of Basil or of Cæsarea.*—Basil wrote a liturgy, or rather enlarged and improved certain existing formularies: but, as several different texts now extant bear his name, it is difficult to say which of them may be rightly regarded as having pro-

<sup>29</sup> BISHOP BULL, *Serm. XIII.*, quoted in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 64.

ceeded from his pen. Probably, that of Constantinople may be correctly attributed to him. The Constantinopolitan liturgy contains, indeed, some passages inserted after the time of Basil; but as to its general form and substance, it may be supposed to be that which prevailed at Cæsarea in Cappadocia during the latter part of the fourth century. When this liturgy was introduced into the patriarchate of Alexandria, it appears to have been subjected to various alterations; and to have been accommodated in a great measure to the ancient Alexandrian or Egyptian liturgy, which bore the name of St. Mark.

“From a period antecedent to the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, the patriarch of Constantinople became possessed of the jurisdiction which had anciently belonged to the exarch of Cæsarea; and the liturgy of Basil was (probably at an early period) received by the patriarchs of Constantinople, and the churches under their jurisdiction, so that to the present day it is used by those churches<sup>30</sup>.”

“This was the form which soon prevailed throughout the whole exarchate of Cæsarea, and the patriarchate of Constantinople, where it has remained in use ever since. This was the form which was received by all the patriarchate of Antioch, translated into Coptic, revised by the patriarchs of Alexandria, and admitted into their church, used alike by orthodox and heretics. At this day, after the lapse of near fifteen hundred years, the liturgy of Basil prevails without any substantial variety from the northern shore of Russia to the extremities of Abyssinia, and from the Adriatic and Baltic seas to the farthest coast of Asia. In one respect, this liturgy must be considered as the most valuable that we possess. We can trace back the words and expressions of the greater portion, to about the year 370 or 380. This is not the case with any other liturgy. The expressions of all other liturgies we cannot certainly trace, *in general*, beyond the fifth century.”

3. *Liturgy of Chrysostom, or of Constantinople.* “Besides the liturgy of Basil, the churches subject to the patriarch of

<sup>30</sup> This quotation, and others which follow in this section are from Mr. PALMER'S *Dissertation*.

Constantinople have, from a remote period, used another liturgy, which bears the name of Chrysostom." The order of the part of Chrysostom's liturgy which follows the dismissal of the catechumens is identical with that of Basil. "We may justly consider, the main substance and order to be as old as the fourth century."

## II. ALEXANDRIAN LITURGY.

THE patriarchate of Alexandria possessed an ancient liturgy, which was attributed to St. Mark, probably for the first time, about the end of the fourth century, or beginning of the fifth. In the early part of the fifth century, this liturgy was enlarged by Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria; and hence it was afterwards called Cyril's by the Monophysites, whilst the orthodox continued to distinguish it by the older appellation of St. Mark's.

"The difference between this liturgy and the great Oriental liturgy of Antioch, Cæsarea, and Constantinople, is in the order of the parts. The general and solemn prayers for men and things occurred in the middle of the Egyptian Eucharistia or thanksgiving, and before the hymn Tersanctus. In the Oriental liturgy, the general prayers are deferred till after the end of the benediction of the gifts. Another peculiarity of this rite was the direction of the deacon to the people, during the course of the thanksgiving, 'to arise,' 'look towards the east,' and 'attend' or 'sing' the hymn Tersanctus. Of this, there is nothing to be found in any other rite."

## III. ROMAN LITURGY.

It has been supposed that the Roman liturgy was composed by Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, in the latter part of the sixth century; but some writers are of opinion that Gregory merely revised or improved a liturgy which he found already in use. Vigilius, a predecessor of Gregory, in an epistle written in the year 538, speaks of the text of the canon then existing as having been received from apostolical tradition. "This liturgy was substantially the same in the time of Gelasius, A.D. 492, as it was in that of Gregory: it appears to have been the same in the time of Innocentius at the beginning of the fifth century;

and was esteemed, at that time, and in the subsequent age, to be of apostolical antiquity." Traces of higher antiquity than the early part of the fifth century are, however, merely conjectural.

In this liturgy, the kiss of peace is not presented until after the consecration of the elements; which constitutes a remarkable variation from the liturgies of Antioch, Cæsarea, Constantinople, and all the East.

*Milanese Liturgy.* The Liturgy of Milan, commonly attributed to Ambrose, is substantially the same as that of Rome until the time of Gregory the Great; and appears to have been derived from the same origin. "In the time of Gregory, the church of Milan did not adopt the chief alteration made by him. From that time, if not previously, the liturgy of Milan began to be considered a peculiar rite; and, as the Romans gave their Sacramentaries the names of Gelasius and Gregory, so the Milanese gave theirs the name of Ambrose; who, in fact, may have composed some parts of it. After the time of Gregory, the Milan liturgy doubtless received several additions. The earliest ecclesiastical writer who has been cited as speaking of the Ambrosian rite is Walafred Strabo, who died A. D. 849."

*The African Liturgy* agreed substantially with the ancient Roman; except that it contained an invocation of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the elements, conforming in this respect to the Oriental forms. It is probable that the first African bishops were ordained at Rome; and that they made their congregations acquainted with the liturgy and ritual of the mother-church.

#### IV. GALlicAN LITURGY.

AN ancient liturgy, differing materially in many respects from those of Rome and Milan, was used in Gaul until the time of Charlemagne, when it was exchanged for the Roman by a decree of that prince. Mr. Palmer regards the church of Lyons as the source from which this peculiar liturgy was derived; and, from the original connexion of that church with the East, he deems it probable that the ancient Gallican liturgy and rites were derived from the churches of Asia and Phrygia. Indeed, he seems disposed, by the aid of tradition and conjecture, to

refer it to the apostle St. John. But the writer of a work on Christian Antiquities may be excused from following any of his guides into the regions of ecclesiastical mythology; and it may be thought more than sufficient even to have alluded to this profound speculation of a learned author.

This liturgy bore a strong resemblance to the Oriental form. "The chief difference between the Gallican and Oriental liturgies consisted in this, that the prayer for the living and departed members of the church occurred after the thanksgiving and consecration in the Oriental liturgy; while, in the Gallican, they preceded the salutation of peace and thanksgiving. There is another difference; namely, that the Gallican had not the three prayers of the faithful, which seem to have been introduced into the Oriental liturgy, about the early part of the fourth century."

*The Mozarabic, or Spanish Liturgy,* appears to have agreed very nearly with the ancient Gallican, in its general substance, and as to the number and order of its parts. From the writings of Isidore of Seville, and Vigilius of Rome, it appears that the liturgy of the Spanish churches was distinct from that of the Roman, in the sixth century. The original model and substance of the Spanish liturgy was probably derived from the Gallican church; and the form thus received was doubtless modified by the alterations and additions of Isidore, Leander, and other Spanish bishops. Isidore attributes the origin of this liturgy to St. Peter (ISIDOR. HISPAL. *De Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 15).

*Liturgy of Ephesus.* Mr. Palmer thinks it highly probable that a liturgy resembling the ancient Gallican prevailed in the exarchate of Ephesus until the fourth century, when it may have been altered by the Council of Laodicea, in order to make it conformable to the great Oriental rite, which has been used there ever since.

*British Liturgy.* The ancient Gallican form may have been adopted in Britain at first. From the time of Patrick (A. D. 432), the Irish probably used the Roman liturgy. The ancient British liturgy may have been introduced into Ireland about a century after; and both forms may have been used at the same time in different parts of the island.

The Anglo-Saxon Liturgy was formed from the Sacramentary

of Gregory the Great, which was brought to England by Augustine and his companions at the end of the sixth, or beginning of the seventh, century. "As, however, each bishop had the power of making some improvements in the liturgy of his church, in process of time different customs arose, and several became so established as to receive the names of their respective churches. Thus gradually the 'Uses' or customs of York, Sarum, Hereford, Bangor, Lincoln, Aberdeen, &c., came to be distinguished from each other."

---

These ancient liturgies, or services appointed to be used at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, "resemble one another in the following points<sup>31</sup>.

1. All of them direct that, previous to communion, those who intend to communicate shall exchange 'the kiss of peace.'

2. In all of them, the more particularly solemn part of the service commences with words exactly answering to the English 'Lift up your hearts,' &c., as far as 'HOLY FATHER, almighty, everlasting God.'

3. All contain the hymn, 'Therefore with angels and archangels,' &c., with very trifling varieties of expression.

4. Also, they all contain a prayer, answering in substance to ours, 'for the whole state of Christ's church militant.'

5. And, likewise, another prayer (which has been excluded from the English ritual), 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear;' concluding with a prayer for communion with them.

6. Also, a commemoration of our Lord's words and actions in the institution of the Eucharist, which is the same, almost word for word, in every liturgy, but is not taken from any of the four Scripture accounts.

7. A sacrificial oblation of the Eucharistic bread and wine.

<sup>31</sup> The following synopsis, constructed from Mr. PALMER's *Origines Liturgicæ*, is extracted from *Tracts for the Times*, No. 63. But I have taken the liberty of discarding the assumed titles of St. James's Liturgy, St. Peter's Liturgy, &c.; thinking it better to avoid, as much as possible, even the repetition of an acknowledged falsehood, when it is possible that it may tend to perpetuate error.

8. A prayer of consecration, that God will ‘make the bread and wine the body and blood of CHRIST.’

9. Directions to the priest for breaking the consecrated bread.

10. The Lord’s prayer.

11. Communion.

These parts are always arranged in one of the four following orders:—

*Roman Liturgy.*

1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.
3. Prayers for the church on earth.
4. Consecration prayer.
5. Commemoration of our Lord’s words.
6. The Oblation.
7. Prayers for the dead.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord’s prayer.
10. The kiss of peace.
11. Communion.

*Alexandrian Liturgy.*

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
3. Prayers for the church on earth.
7. Prayers for the dead.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord’s words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord’s prayer.
11. Communion.

*Oriental Liturgy.*

10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with angels.
5. Commemoration of our Lord’s words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration prayer.
3. Prayers for the church on earth.
7. Prayers for the dead.
9. The Lord’s prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
11. Communion.

*Gallican Liturgy.*

3. Prayers for the church on earth.
7. Prayers for the dead.
10. The kiss of peace.
1. Lift up your hearts, &c.
2. Therefore with angels, &c.
5. Commemoration of our Lord’s words.
6. The Oblation.
4. Consecration prayer.
8. Breaking of bread.
9. The Lord’s prayer.
11. Communion.

Thus it appears that the four original forms from which all the liturgies in the world have been taken, resemble one another



too much to have grown up independently, and too little to have been copied from one another.”—They were probably all constructed upon the basis of the form prescribed in the *Apostolical Constitutions*; or, at all events, were composed in conformity with some model of the third or fourth century. The prayers for the dead, which they all contain, are unscriptural, and therefore unwarranted and vain; some expressions in the consecration of the elements are obvious departures from primitive doctrine; and the appropriation of false titles, introduced after the composition and first use of the forms themselves, is as plainly opposed to Christian simplicity and truth. But, together with these defects, we recognise in these ancient formularies much that is truly pious and devotional. It has been the wisdom of our church to retain what is excellent in these forms, while she has rejected what is spurious and wrong. May all the members of that church make a devout and thankful use of these venerable addresses to the throne of grace, purified as they now are from base alloy, and admirably adapted to assist the aspirations of the pious Christian in the most solemn offices of religion. While we “hold fast,” every “form of sound words,” let us “pray with the spirit,” and “pray with the understanding also.”

#### § 7.—OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

WE have been assured by a late learned and candid writer (Dr. Burton) that the early Christians, in offering prayer for the dead, only besought Almighty God to hasten their admission into his heavenly kingdom. But this remark can hardly apply to Christians of a later period than the beginning of the third century; and even with regard to the church of the second century, such an assertion cannot, I believe, be more than conjectural. Tertullian, who wrote a little after the year 200, gives us reason to suppose that the custom of praying for the dead had prevailed in the church antecedently to that date; but I am not aware that we possess any minute descriptions of the substance or character of those ancient prayers. It is certain, however,—that during the third and fourth centuries, prayers were offered for the dead with a belief that they might contribute to their benefit in

various ways;—that many Fathers of that date concur in speaking highly of the advantage of such prayers;—and that this mistaken and mischievous practice, which, in some form or other, had crept into the church at a *very early* period, was conducted with the consent of those Christian teachers, upon false and unscriptural principles. It does, I think, appear, that, during the third and fourth centuries, this custom was observed, partly, perhaps, in imitation of some heathen ceremonies, and partly in compliance with the unenlightened dictates of natural feeling, without reference to the word of divine truth, yet with the entire approbation of pious, but mistaken Fathers.

In order to exhibit a full view of this subject, I propose, first, to quote a passage in which the author above-mentioned acquaints us with the result of his inquiries, and another containing the learned judgment of Archbishop Usher;—then to detail, in chronological order, various testimonies of the ancients, collected from the writings of Usher, Taylor, and Bingham<sup>32</sup>, on the subject;—and, lastly, to state the entire amount of inference which these authorities appear to warrant or require.

“Christians,” says Dr. Burton, “were at this time (namely, in the middle of the third century) generally agreed in supposing that the soul in its separate or disembodied state enjoyed a kind of consciousness, and was not insensible or asleep. They seem, also, to have considered that the souls of good and bad men were in a different state, or rather in a different place; for we have little means of judging of the opinion of the early Christians, as to the actual condition of the souls of bad men: but with respect to the souls of the righteous, they conceived them to be in a place by themselves, where they enjoyed a kind of foretaste of the happiness which awaited them hereafter. It was also believed by a large portion of Christians, that the resurrection of the righteous would take place before the final resurrection of all mankind at the day of judgment. . . . When they spoke of

<sup>32</sup> ARCHBISHOP USHER'S *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*; BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR, *Dissuasive from Popery*, part ii. book 2, § 2; BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, book xv. c. 3, § 15, seq.; see also, JEWELL'S *Defence of his Apology*.

the first resurrection, they meant that the righteous would rise and reign with Christ upon earth for a thousand years, at the end of which period the general resurrection would take place. It was natural for them to add to this belief, that the souls of the righteous, while they were in their separate abode, were anxiously looking forward to the time of the first resurrection, when they would be released from their confinement; and their surviving friends did not think it improper to make it a subject of their own prayers to God, that he would be pleased to hasten the period when those who had departed in his faith and fear might enter into his heavenly kingdom.

“This was the only sense in which prayers were offered for the dead by the early Christians. They did not think that their prayers could affect the present or future condition of those who were departed. They believed them to be in a state of happiness immediately after death, and to be certain of enjoying still greater happiness hereafter. It was only the period of their entering upon this final state which was supposed to be affected by the prayers of the living; and it afforded a melancholy satisfaction to the latter to meet at the graves of their friends, or on the anniversary of their death, and to remember them in their prayers to God<sup>33</sup>.”

The primary intention of prayers for the dead, such as were made by the ancient church, is thus described by Archbishop Usher in his *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*. “First, prayers of praise and thanksgiving were presented unto God, for the blessed estate that the party now deceased was entered upon; whereunto were afterwards added prayers of deprecation and petition, that God would be pleased to forgive him his sins, and to place him in the kingdom of heaven; which kind of intercessions, however at first they were well meant, yet in process of time they proved an occasion of confirming men in divers errors; especially when they began once to be applied not only to the good but to evil livers also, unto whom, by the first institution, they never were intended.” And again, a little after, the same author says,—“The primary intention of the church in her

<sup>33</sup> BURTON, *History of the Christian Church to the Conversion of Constantine*, chap. 14.

supplication for the dead was, that the whole man (not the soul separated only) might receive public remission of sins, and a solemn acquittal, in the judgment of the great day; and so obtain both a full escape from all the consequences of sin, (the last enemy being now destroyed, and death swallowed up in victory, 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54,) and a perfect consummation of bliss and happiness; all which are comprised in that short prayer of St. Paul for Onesiphorus, (though made for him while he was alive,) ‘the Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day,’ 2 Tim. i. 18.” And yet more expressly “the church, in her commemorations and prayers for the dead, had no relation at all unto those that had led their lives lewdly and dissolutely, (as appeareth plainly, both by the author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*,—DIONYS. *Eccles. Hierarch.* cap. 7— and by divers other evidences,) but unto those that did end their lives in such a godly manner as gave pregnant hope unto the living that their souls were at rest with God, and to such as these alone, did it wish the accomplishment of that which remained of their redemption; to wit, their public justification and solemn acquittal at the last day, and their perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in the kingdom of heaven for ever after. Not that the event of these things was conceived to be any ways doubtful, (for we have been told that things may be prayed for the event whereof is known to be most certain,) but because the commemoration thereof was thought to serve a special use, not only in regard of the manifestation of the affection of the living towards the dead, . . . but also in respect of the consolation and instruction which the living might receive thereby.”

Such is a general description of the nature of prayers for the dead among the early Christians, as given by two of our most learned divines. We shall obtain, however, a more close and accurate acquaintance with the subject by inspecting the testimonies of ancient writers, with a due attention to the different dates at which they lived, and their varieties of opinion.

*Tertullian* (died 220), in his treatise on the *Soldier's Chaplet*, speaks of prayer for the dead as a custom of the church at the time of his writing that treatise, which was probably not long

after the year 200:—"We make anniversary oblations for the dead, for their birthdays," meaning, the days of their death<sup>34</sup>. In another of his works the same author says, that it was the practice of a widow to pray for the soul of her deceased husband, desiring on his behalf *present refreshment or rest, and a part in the first resurrection*; and offering annually an oblation for him on the day of his falling asleep, i. e., his death. And elsewhere he represents a bereaved husband as praying for the soul of his deceased wife, and offering annual oblations for her<sup>35</sup>.

*Origen* (d. 254), tells us, that Christians in his time "thought it right and useful to make mention of the saints in their public prayers, and to improve themselves by the commemoration of their worthies<sup>36</sup>."

*Cyprian* (d. 258), affirms, that in his time it was the practice of Christians to offer oblations and sacrifices of commemoration for martyrs, on the anniversary days of their martyrdom, with thanksgiving; and he refers also to the oblations and supplications, or deprecatory prayers, on behalf of other departed members of the church<sup>37</sup>. In another place *Cyprian* says, "When we have departed hence, there is no place left for repentance, and no effect of satisfaction<sup>38</sup>."

*Arnobius*, in his treatise against the heathen, written probably about the year 305, speaking of the prayers offered after the consecration of the elements in the Lord's supper, says that

<sup>34</sup> Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus. TERTULL. *De Corona Militis*, c. 3.

<sup>35</sup> Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annis diebus dormitionis ejus. *Id. De Monogamia*, c. 10. Jam repete apud Deum pro cujus spiritu postules, pro qua oblationes annuas reddas. *Exhort. ad Castil.* c. 11. Tertullian held that every little offence of the faithful would be punished by delaying their resurrection. Modicum quodque delictum mora resurrectionis luendum. *De Anima*, c. 58.

<sup>36</sup> Meminisse sanctorum sive in collectis solemnibus, sive pro eo ut ex

recordatione eorum proficiamus, aptum et conveniens videtur. ORIG. lib. ix. in *Rom.* 12.

<sup>37</sup> Celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum. CYPR. *Ep.* 37, al. 22, ad *Clerum*.—Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passionis et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus. *Ep.* 34, al. 39.—Non est quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in ecclesia frequentetur. *Ep.* 66, al. 1.

<sup>38</sup> Quando isthinc excessum fuerit, nullus jam locus penitentiae est, nullus satisfactorius effectus. CYPR. ad *Demetrian*, § 16.

Christians prayed for pardon and peace, on behalf of the living and the dead<sup>o</sup>.

*Cyrl of Jerusalem* (d. 386), reports the prayer made after consecration of the elements at the holy communion, in these words:—"We offer this sacrifice in memory of all those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God by their prayers and intercessions may receive our supplications; and then we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and all that have fallen asleep before us, believing that it is a great advantage to their souls to be prayed for, whilst the holy and tremendous sacrifice lies upon the altar." (*Catech. Mystag.* 5, n. 6.)

The same writer furnishes evidence, that in his time many persons doubted the efficacy of prayer, as a means of procuring benefit to the dead. "I know many," he observes in the same book, "who say, What profit does the soul receive that goes out of this world, either with sins, or without sins, if you make mention of it in prayer?"

*Gregory of Nazianzum* (d. 390), prayed, that God would receive the soul of his brother Cæsarius. (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 10.) Archbishop Usher quotes the following passage from this father, in testimony of his dissent from the opinion that the dead could be profited by the prayers of the living: "Then in vain shall one go about to relieve those that lament. Here men may have a remedy, but afterwards there is nothing but bonds, or all things are fast bound." (GREG. NAZ. in *Carm. de Rebus Suis.*) It may be observed, that this passage proves only that Gregory esteemed prayer of no avail to those who may die in sin.

In the writings of *Ambrose* (d. 397), we meet with prayers of that father, on behalf of the deceased Theodosius and Valentinian and his own brother; and we find him giving instructions to a Christian not to weep for a deceased sister, but to make prayers and oblations for her. (AMBROS. *De Obitu Theodosii; Le Obit. Valentin.; De Obitu Fratris; Ep.* 8, *ad Faust.*) The same author affirms, in another place, that "death is a haven of rest,

<sup>o</sup> Cur immaniter conventicula nostra dirui meruerint? In quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur, magistratibus, exercitibus, regi- bus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus, et resolutis corporum viuictione. ALEXON. *Adv. Gentes*, lib. iv.

and makes not our condition worse; but according as it finds every man, so it reserves him to the judgment that is to come.” (*De Bono Mortis*, c. 4.)

Aërius appears to have been the first who publicly protested against the practice of praying for the dead; which he did upon the ground of the uselessness of such prayers to those who were the subjects of them. His objections were met by *Epiphanius*, (d. 403,) who maintained (*Hæres.* 75), first, that prayer for the dead was useful, as testifying the faith and hope of the living, inasmuch as it showed their belief that the departed were still in being, and living with the Lord; and, secondly, as a further argument, that “the prayer which is made for them does profit, although it do not cut off all their sins; yet, forasmuch as whilst we are in the world we oftentimes slip, both unwillingly and with our will, it serves to signify that which is more perfect. For we make,” continues he, “a memorial both for the just and for sinners;—for sinners, entreating the mercy of God; for the just, (both the fathers and patriarchs, the prophets, and apostles, and evangelists, and martyrs, and confessors; bishops also, and authorities, and the whole order,) that we may sever our Lord Jesus Christ from the rank of all other men, by the honour that we do unto him, and that we may yield worship unto him.” Archbishop Usher, (from whom this translation has been quoted,) mentions a sentiment of Epiphanius, declared in another part of his writings, (*Contr. Cathar. Hæc.* 59,) that “after death there is no help to be gotten either by godliness or repentance. For Lazarus does not go there unto the rich man, nor the rich man unto Lazarus; neither doth Abraham send any of his spoils, that the poor may afterward be made rich thereby; neither doth the rich man obtain that which he asketh, although he entreat merciful Abraham with instant supplication. For the garners are sealed up, and the time is fulfilled, and the combat is finished, and the lists are voided, and the garlands are given, and such as have fought are at rest, and such as have not obtained are gone forth, and such as have not fought cannot now be present in time, and such as have been overthrown in the lists are cast out, and all things are clearly finished, after that we are once departed from hence.”

It may be thought that the sentiments of these two passages do not entirely coincide. But, at all events, we may sum up the answer of this writer to the Aërians in the words of Bingham, and consider him as maintaining that “there are many good reasons for mentioning the names of the dead in our prayers; because this was an argument that they were still in being, and living with the Lord; because it was some advantage to sinners, though it did not wholly cancel their crimes; because it put a distinction between the perfection of Christ and the imperfection of all other men.”

*Chrysostom*, (d. 407,) speaking of the death of the wicked, says, “They are not so much to be lamented, as succoured with prayers, and supplications, and alms, and oblations. For these things were not designed in vain, neither is it without reason that we make mention of those that are deceased in the holy mysteries, interceding for them to the Lamb that is slain to take away the sins of the world; but that some consolation may hence arise to them. Neither is it in vain that he who stands at the altar, when the tremendous mysteries are celebrated, cries, ‘We offer unto thee for all those that are asleep in Christ, and all that make commemorations for them.’ For if there were no commemorations made for them, these things would not be said. Let us not therefore grow weary in giving them our assistance, and offering prayers for them. For the common propitiation of the whole world is now before us. Therefore we now pray for the whole world, and name them with martyrs, with confessors, with priests; for we are one body, though one member be more excellent than another; and we may obtain a general pardon for them by our prayers, by our alms, by the help of those that are named together with them.” (*Hom.* 41, *in* 1 *Cor.*) In another place he says, that “prayers were made in general for all those that were deceased in the faith; and none but catechumens, dying in a voluntary neglect of baptism, were excluded from the benefit of them.” (*Hom.* 3, *in* *Philipp.*) And again, in his treatise on the *Priesthood*, this father affirms, that “a bishop is to be intercessor for all the world, and to pray to God to be merciful to the sins of all men, not only the living, but the dead also.” (*De Sacerdot.* lib. vi. c. 4.) In another place, *Chrysostom* represents



the prayers of survivors as effectual to procure an addition to the rewards and retributions of the righteous. (*Hom. 32, in Matth.*) Archbishop Usher, in his *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*, speaks of this opinion as "a private conceit, entertained by divers, (as well of the elder as of the middle times,) in their devotion for the dead;" and he had before remarked, that we ought "prudently to distinguish the original institution of the church from the private opinion of particular doctors, which waded further herein than the general intendment of the church did give them warrant." It must be admitted, however, that the statements of such a doctor as Chrysostom, addressed to a popular audience, and advanced without any hesitation, or show of argument, are a plain sign of the prevailing opinions of the church in his time; just as any assertions of doctrine, made without attempt at discussion or appearance of novelty, which may occur in the Sermons of the present bishop of London, may well be reckoned among the prevailing and acknowledged tenets of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. It should be observed, however, that the remark of Usher was made with especial reference to the false position of the Romanists, that the use of prayers for the dead in the early ages of the church presupposed the doctrine of purgatory. This distinction, which the archbishop points out, is, to a certain extent, real, and ought, in many cases, to be particularly noticed.

*Jerome* (d. 420) says, "While we are in this present world we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers or by our counsels; but when we shall come before the judgment-seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can entreat for any one, but every one must bear his own burden." (*Lib. iii. Comment. in Galat. c. 6.*)

*Augustin* (d. 430) maintained that the martyrs do not need the prayers of the church, and that we ought to offer only thanksgivings on their behalf. He considered that the prayers of the living might be of some advantage to such of the dead as had been guilty of only minor trespasses; but that they could not at all assist those who had been very wicked. "There goes a common saying under his name," says Bingham, "which Pope Inno-

cent III. quotes as holy Scripture, 'that he who prays for a martyr does injury to the martyr, because they attained to perfection in this life, and have no need of the prayers of the church, as all others have'<sup>40</sup>. Therefore, he says, 'When they were named at the altar, and their memorials celebrated, they did not commemorate them as persons for whom they prayed, as they did all others that rested in peace, but rather as men that prayed for the church on earth, that we might follow their steps'<sup>41</sup>. Upon this account, St. Austin thought that oblations and alms that were usually offered in the church for all the dead that had received baptism were only thanksgivings for such as were very good, and propitiations for those that were not very bad; and for such as were very evil, though they were no helps to them when they were dead, yet they were some consolation to the living. And to those who derive any benefit from these prayers, this is the benefit, either that they obtain a full remission, or that their condemnation be made more tolerable<sup>42</sup>."

In the *Confessions of Augustin*, (lib. ix. c. 13,) we find a long prayer of this writer on behalf of his departed mother Monica<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> INNOC. in *Decretal. Gregorii*, lib. iii. tit. 41, cap. 5.—Perfectio in hac vita nonnulla est, ad quam sancti martyres pervenerunt. Ideoque habet ecclesiastica disciplina, quod fideles noverunt cum martyres eo loco recitantur ad altare Dei, ubi non pro ipsis oretur, pro cæteris autem commemoratis defunctis oratur. Injuria est enim pro martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari. AUG. *Serm. 17, De Verb. Apost.*

<sup>41</sup> Ad ipsam mensam non sic eos commemoramus, quemadmodum alios qui in pace requiescunt, sed magis ut (orent) ipsi pro nobis, ut eorum vestigiis inhaereamus. AUG. *Tract. 84 in Joau.*

<sup>42</sup> Cum ergo sacrificia sive altaris sive quarumcunque elemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur, pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones

sunt; pro non valde malis propitiations sunt; pro valde malis etsi nulla sunt adjuncta mortuorum, qualescunque vivorum consolationes sunt. Quibus autem prosunt, aut ad hoc prosunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certe tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio. AUG. *Enchirid. ad Laurent.* chap. 110.—It may be observed that this passage does not contradict another from the same author, which is quoted in the *Homily concerning Prayer*, part 3.

<sup>43</sup> "St. Austin prayed for pardon for his mother; and did 'believe the thing was done already; but he prayed to God to approve the voluntary oblation of his mouth.' . . . St. Austin prayed, besides many other reasons, to manifest his kindness, not for any need she had." BISHOP TAYLOR, *Dissuasive from Popery*, part II, book ii. sect. 2.

*Theodoret* (d. 456) says, "After death the punishment of sin is without remedy (*immedicabilis*)." (*Quæst. in lib. ii. Reg.*, cap. 18, 19.)

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* we find the following prayer among those which are appointed to be repeated after the consecration of the elements in the Lord's Supper.

"We offer unto thee for all thy saints that have lived well-pleasing in thy sight from the foundation of the world, for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names thou knowest."

The form of prayer to be used at funerals, as given in the *Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 41), is still more express.

*The deacon shall say,*

Let us pray for our brethren that rest in Christ, that the merciful God who receives his soul may grant unto him forgiveness of all his sins, whether committed wilfully or without his will; may be good and gracious unto him; and may translate him into the region of the pious, who rest in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and into the company of all those who from the beginning of the world have pleased God, and done his will; where there is no more pain, nor sorrow, nor crying. Let us stand up and commend ourselves, and one another, to the grace of the eternal God, through his Word, which was in the beginning.

*Then the bishop shall pronounce the following prayer.*

O thou, who in thy nature art immortal and everlasting; thou, from whom all things, immortal and mortal, do proceed; thou who hast created man, a rational creature (*λογικὸν ζῶον*), and the inhabitant of this world (*τὸν κοσμοπολίτην*), mortal, but hast given unto him the promise of immortality (*ἀναστασίαν*, al. *ἀνάστασιν*, a resurrection; but the former appears to be the true reading); O thou who didst save Enoch and Elijah from the suffering of death (*θανάτου πείραν*); O God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, thou art not the God of the dead, but the God of the living! For all souls live unto thee, and the spirits

of the righteous are in thy hand, where no pain reaches them, because in thy hands all are sanctified; look now, we beseech thee, upon this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen, and hast taken unto thyself to another destination (*εἰς ἑτέραν λήξιν*). Forgive him in whatsoever he may have sinned against thee, whether wilfully or unintentionally. Grant unto him favourable angels<sup>44</sup>, and translate him into the bosom of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, and all those who from the beginning of the world have pleased thee, where there is no sorrow, pain, or sighing, but the tranquil region of the pious, the quiet land of the righteous, and the company of all those who behold the glory of thy Christ. Through whom be unto thee honour, praise, worship, thanksgiving, and adoration, in the Holy Spirit, for ever. Amen.

*Then shall the deacon say (to the people),*

Bow down, and receive the benediction !

*And the bishop shall pronounce over them the following thanksgiving.*

O Lord, save thy people, and bless thine inheritance, which thou hast redeemed by the precious blood of thy Christ. Feed them by thy right hand, and protect them beneath thy wings. Grant that they may fight a good fight, and finish their course, and keep the faith, holy and unblameable; through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy beloved son, with whom be unto thee honour, praise, and adoration, and unto the Holy Ghost, for ever. Amen.

The *liturgies* extant under the names of Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Cyril, many parts of which were probably composed during the fifth century, contain prayers for all saints, the Virgin Mary herself not excepted<sup>45</sup>.

The original Sacramentary of *Gregory* (d. 604) contained the following prayer:—"Remember, O Lord, all thy servants, men

<sup>44</sup> Angelorum officia in hominum morte, ex doctrina SS. sunt: assistere morientibus, eosque pro viribus adjuvare; piis esse ἀγγέλους εἰρήνης, placidos animæ evocatores, acceptores exuentes eam corruptibile corporis indumentum, in cœlum portantes, ad Deum deducentes, δορυφοροῦντας, viæ duces ac comites, propugnatores, occursatores;

impis vero tristes, horribiles, ἀπειληφόρους, exactores, et raptores, ad judicium acerbe pertrahentes. CO-TELEMIUS, *in loc.*

<sup>45</sup> These prayers are quoted in BISHOP TAYLOR'S *Dissuasive from Popery*, part II. book II. sect. 2; also in ARCHBISHOP USHER'S *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*.

and women, who have gone before us in the seal of the faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. We beseech thee, O Lord, to grant them, and all that rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light, and peace, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord<sup>46</sup>.

On the whole, therefore, it appears, that from the time of Tertullian, at least, and probably from a still earlier date, the church was accustomed to offer prayers for the dead. Many teachers of the church during the third and fourth centuries sanctioned this superstitious practice; some of them encouraging a belief that the prayers of the living were a means of procuring certain imaginary benefits for those who had died in sin, as well as for those who had departed in the faith; but others affirming that the dead could derive no benefit from the prayers of survivors. So that while it was the erroneous opinion that prayers and oblations ought to be made for the dead, and was the received and universal doctrine of the church, it was yet a question among Christian doctors, on which they were allowed to differ, whether the dead received any profit from such prayers<sup>47</sup>. The entire abandonment of a custom so much at variance with divine truth was reserved for that brighter period in the history of the church, in which "the Bible, the Bible alone," began (perhaps for the first time since the commencement of the second century) to be recognised as the sole depository of the principles of our religion, and the only unerring guide of Christian practice.

When the prayers of the early church were offered on behalf of persons supposed to have died in the faith, who were regarded as about to enter into happiness, Christians were understood to beseech God that he would receive those persons to himself;—they gave thanks for their deliverance out of this sinful world;—they petitioned for the divine forgiveness of all remains of sin and imperfection in the departed;—they intended to offer a tribute of respect and affection to the deceased, and to testify

<sup>46</sup> *Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat.* tom. ii. p. 129.

<sup>47</sup> "Some of them maintained that the soul of every one that departed out of this life received very great profit by the prayers and alms that

were performed for him; and others on the contrary maintained that it was not so." GOBAR. in *Photii Biblioth.* quoted by Usher, in his *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*.

their own belief of the immortality of the soul and a future life;—and they sought to procure for their departed friends the blessing of an early share in the millennial reign of Christ upon earth (which was confidently expected by the early Christians),—as well as favour at the day of judgment, (when they supposed that *all men* would pass through a fire of purgation,)—and an augmentation of their reward and glory in the state of final blessedness.

It is certain also, that prayers were offered for those who had died in sin, in the hope of mitigating their sufferings, or rendering their condemnation more tolerable. (CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* 3, *in Phil.*; *Conf. Hom.* 21, *in Act.*; *Hom.* 32, *in Matth.*; AUGUST. *Enchirid. ad Laurent.* c. 110; PAULIN. *Ep.* 19; ATHANAS., *Quest. ad Antioch.* ix. 34; PRUDENT. *Cathemerin. Carm.* 5, *De Cereo Paschali.*) This supposed efficacy of prayer for those who had died in sin, carried to an extreme, is broadly and most offensively stated in the following terms, by a writer who lived when the corruptions of the church had gathered strength after the lapse of centuries,—Theophylact. “Observe,” says he, in a commentary on Luke xii. 5, “that our Lord did not say, ‘Fear him who after he hath killed *casteth into hell,*’ but ‘*hath power to cast into hell.*’ For sinners who die are not always cast into hell; but it remains in the power of God to pardon them also. And this I say with reference to the oblations and gifts which are made for the dead; which do not a little avail even those who die in grievous sins. He does not therefore universally, after he hath killed, cast into hell; but he hath power to cast. Wherefore let us not cease by alms and intercessions to appease him who hath power to cast, but who does not always use this power, being able to pardon also.”

---

Archbishop Usher and many of our old divines take pains to show, that the use of prayer for the dead does not necessarily involve the doctrine of purgatory. This is true<sup>48</sup>; and it is of

<sup>48</sup> “Though the fathers prayed for the souls departed, that God would show them mercy; yet it was that God would show them mercy in the day of judgment; ‘in that formidable and dreadful day, then there is need of much mercy unto us,’ saith St. Chrysostom. . . . Is there no mercy to be showed to them unless they be in purgatory? Some of the ancients

some importance in arguing with Romanists, who sometimes insist upon the contrary position. But it cannot be denied, that the mistaken practice in question was adapted to pave the way for the introduction of that false doctrine; and that, as a matter of fact, the fable of purgatory did follow in the train of the

speak of visitation of angels to be imparted to the souls departed; and the hastening of the day of judgment is a mercy; and the avenging of the martyrs upon their adversaries is a mercy, for which 'the souls under the altar pray,' saith St. John, in the Revelation; and the Greek fathers speak of a fiery trial at the day of judgment, through which every one must pass; and then will be great need of mercy. And after all this, . . . at the day of judgment, there shall be . . . the final pardon, for which, till it be accomplished, all the faithful do night and day pray incessantly." BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR, *Dissuasive from Popery*, p. 2, b. ii. sect. 2.

"There are two great causes of their [the Romanists] mistaken pretensions in this article [respecting purgatory] from antiquity.

"The first is, that the ancient churches in their offices, and the fathers in their writings, did teach and practise respectively prayer for the dead. Now, because the church of Rome does so too, and, more than so, relates her prayers to the doctrine of purgatory, and for the souls there detained; her doctors vainly suppose, that whenever the holy fathers speak of prayer for the dead, they conclude for purgatory; which vain conjecture is as false as it is unreasonable; for it is true, the fathers did pray for the dead, but how? 'that God should show them mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a blessed sentence in the great day.' . . . The other cause of their mistake is, that the fathers often speak of a fire of purgation after this life; but such a one that is not to be

kindled until the day of judgment, and it is such a fire that destroys the doctrine of the intermediate purgatory. We suppose that Origen was the first that spoke plainly of it; and so St. Ambrose follows him in the opinion, (for it was no more;) so does St. Basil, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, and Lactantius, as their words plainly prove, as they are cited by Sixtus Sennensis, affirming, that 'all men, Christ only excepted, shall be burned with the fire of the world's conflagration at the day of judgment;' even the blessed Virgin herself is to pass through this fire. There was also another doctrine very generally received by the fathers, which greatly destroys the Roman purgatory; Sixtus Sennensis says, and he says very true, that Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Victorinus Martyr, Prudentius, St. Chrysostom, Arethas, Euthymius, and St. Bernard, did all affirm, that before the day of judgment the souls of men are kept in secret receptacles, reserved unto the sentence of the great day; and that before then no man receives according to his works done in this life. We do not interpose in this opinion to say, that it is true or false, probable or improbable; for these fathers intended it not as a matter of faith, or necessary belief, so far as we find. But we observe from hence, that if their opinion be true, then the doctrine of purgatory is false; if it be not true, yet the Roman doctrine of purgatory, which is inconsistent with this so generally received opinion of the fathers, is, at least, new, no catholic doctrine, not believed in the primitive church." *Ibid.* part 1, chap. i. sect. 4.

common and authorized practice of praying for the souls of the departed. The seeds of the later delusion were contained in the earlier error. And we ought to bear this in mind, in the formation of our own opinions, and in the regulation of our practice. Prayer for the dead ought to be rejected not only as inexpedient, and as a custom harmless in itself, although liable to abuse; but as an unscriptural and erroneous practice, wrong in itself to a certain extent, and directly tending, especially if sanctioned by public authority, to more serious follies and falsehoods.

We shall have derived no small benefit from this examination of the false views and erroneous practice of the early church respecting prayer for the dead, if we are led by this means to offer up, with increased seriousness, humility, and self distrust, that wise petition of our own scriptural liturgy, "God, who . . . didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people, by the sending to them the light of thy Holy Spirit, grant us, by the same Spirit, to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort; through the merits of Christ Jesus our Saviour, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the same Spirit, one God, world without end."

Our review of this subject may also tend to confirm our attachment to our own church, as a teacher of sound doctrine, while we contrast with the errors of former times the following plain declarations of divine truth, contained in the *Book of Homilies*,—"Now, to intreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world, or no? Wherein, if we will cleave only unto the word of God, then must we needs grant that we have no commandment so to do. . . . He that cannot be saved by faith in Christ's blood, how shall he look to be delivered by man's intercessions? Hath God more respect to man on earth, than to Christ in heaven? 'If any man sin,' saith St. John, 'we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.' But we must take heed, that we call upon this advocate while we have space given us in this life, lest, when we are once dead, there be no hope of salvation left to us. For as every man sleepeth with his own cause, so every man shall rise again with his own cause. And look, in what state he dieth, in the same



state he shall be also judged, whether it be to salvation or condemnation. Let us not dream therefore either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead; but let us earnestly and diligently pray for them that are expressly commanded in holy Scripture, namely, for kings and rulers, for ministers of God's holy word and sacraments, for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful; to be short, for all men living, be they never so great enemies to God and his people, as Jews, Turks, Pagans, infidels, heretics, &c. Then shall we truly fulfil the commandment of God in that behalf, and plainly declare ourselves to be the true children of our heavenly Father, who suffereth the sun to shine upon the good and the bad, and the rain to fall upon the just and the unjust. For which, and all other benefits most abundantly bestowed upon mankind from the beginning, let us give him hearty thanks, as we are most bound, and praise his name for ever and ever." (*Third part of the Homily concerning Prayer.*)

#### § 8.—OF THE PUBLIC USE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE public reading of the Scriptures is a practice which passed unaltered from the Jewish synagogue into the Christian church. After the return from the captivity, it was the custom of the Jews to read a portion of "the Law" in the synagogue every Sabbath. When the use of the law was forbidden, during the Syrian persecution, and especially under Antiochus Epiphanes, a portion of "the Prophets" (including the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings) was substituted for the originally appointed portion of the law; and after the persecution had ceased, the practice was adopted of reading two portions, namely, one from the Law and another from the Prophets, every Sabbath. Such was the custom which prevailed during the ministry of our Saviour and his apostles (Acts xiii. 15; v. 27; Luke iv. 16, 17). It is uncertain whether or not the third class of Jewish Scriptures, the Hagiographa, or devotional books, were ever read publicly. These books are entitled by Jesus the son of Sirach, Josephus, Philo, and in the New Testament, either *ἄλλα*, *ἄλλα πατέρα βιβλία*, *other (Jewish) books*, *ὑμνοι καὶ ἄλλα*, *hymns*,

ἄλλοι, ψαλμοὶ, *the psalms*, or τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων, *the other books*; but the Talmudic and Patristic appellations כתובים (ketubim), γραφεῖα, ἀγιόγραφα, are of later (and uncertain) date. It appears, however, to be beyond doubt that these books were not regularly read in the Jewish Synagogue; while it is equally certain that the exclusion of this portion of the sacred volume from public use was either entirely unknown to the early church, or at least was rejected in practice.

The first account which has come down to us of the public reading of the writings of the evangelists and apostles (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων), together with the books of the Old Testament, is found in the works of Justin Martyr (*Apoloq.* i. c. 67). We learn from this narrative, that on every Lord's day a portion of these sacred writings was read in the public assembly, by an officer appointed for the purpose (ἀναγινώσκων, a reader); and when the whole had been read, the presiding minister (ὁ προεστῶς) delivered an instructive and admonitory address, with reference to the passage. Such is the first description of a Christian lecture or sermon.

Tertullian also (*Apologet.* c. 39) mentions the "Commemoratio literarum divinarum," for the instruction and strengthening of the faithful, as a chief exercise in public worship; and it is evident from other passages of the same writer, that he was acquainted with the public reading of the New Testament, as well as of the Old. Tertullian speaks also of the office of a reader (lector), as one regularly established and well known in the church (*De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 41).

Cyprian, in two of his Epistles, gives us an account of the ordination of two readers, named Aurelius and Celerinus (CYPRIAN, *Epp.* 33, 34).

In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the reading of lessons out of Scripture is reckoned among the chief parts of public worship, and the reading of the Gospels is especially referred to, as the duty of the deacons and presbyters (*Const. Ap.* lib. ii. c. 25, 57).

Origen makes frequent allusion to the use of the Scriptures, both public and private (See especially ORIG. *Cont. Cels.* iii. 45, 50). In a Homily, *De Consummatione Sæculi*, attributed to Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenæus and friend of Origen, we find

the following sentence:—"Divine worship (*λειτουργία*) will cease, the singing of Psalms will be silenced, and the reading of the Scriptures (*ἀνάγνωσις τῶν γραφῶν*) will be no longer performed."

Chrysostom frequently refers to the public reading of the Scriptures, which indeed he regards as the centre of the whole course of religious worship. He was particularly zealous in urging upon his hearers the duty of an earnest and continual study of the Holy Scriptures (See especially *Hom.* 10, in *Johan.*; *Hom.* 8, in *Ep. ad Hebr.*; *Hom.* in *Pentec.*). From Chrysostom we learn, not only that the practice of reading the Scriptures in public obtained in his time, but that it had been reduced to a system, so that the sacred books were read in course, and according to certain prescribed divisions. He uses the received phrase, *περικοπή τῶν εὐαγγελίων*.

Optatus makes reference to the practice of reading lessons out of Scripture, which prevailed in his time (the fourth century), in his treatise *De Schismate Donatistarum*, lib. iv. c. 5.

It is remarkable that the Council of Nicea did not undertake either to settle the canon of the New Testament (which, though a great matter of debate in the early church, was, in fact, never fixed by any synod), or to arrange a system of reading the lessons in the church; but it clearly recognised the great principle that in the Christian church everything must be referred to the authority of the writings of the evangelists, and apostles, and of the old prophets (See THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 7). The same principle was recognised by other councils (*Conc. Laod.* c. 59; *Conc. Carthag.* iii. c. 47). Several synods prescribed rules concerning the functions and conduct of readers (lectores); but without appointing a table of lessons, or making any regulations respecting the portions of Scripture to be read in the church (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, c. 13, 14; *Tolet.* i. c. 2; *Vasense* ii. c. 2; *Valentin.* c. 1; *Arausiac.* i. c. 18).

It may be recorded as a general rule that none but canonical books were read *as Scripture or the Word of God* in the early churches<sup>49</sup>. But as opinions differed, for a considerable time,

<sup>49</sup> Placuit ut præter Scripturas canonicas nihil in Ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum. *Conc.*

*Carthag.* ii. c. 47; *Conf. Conc. Laodic.* c. 59.

respecting the extent of the canon, the practice of different churches was subject to a corresponding variation in this particular; so that in some provinces or churches a book was read as Scripture which did not receive the same honour in other places. With respect to the Jewish Apocrypha (or Deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament), it may be asserted, in general, that those books were not regarded as belonging to the canon, or authentic; but the reading of them was allowed, and they were recommended to the diligent perusal of the catechumens. Christian writers, however, did not appeal to them in their apologetic, doctrinal, or controversial treatises. As to the Antilegomena (*i. e.*, the doubtful or controversial books) of the New Testament, it appears that they were read in public, even before they were admitted as belonging to the canon. (EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 23.) The Apocalypse, however, was entirely excluded in the churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Cæsarea, and other places. (HIERONYM. *Ep. ad Dardan.*) Gregory of Nyssa includes this book among the Apocrypha, (ORAT. *in suam. Ordin.*) Ephraim the Syrian, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Pseudo-Dionysius, and Leontius of Byzantium, appear to have been especially instrumental in removing the prejudice which so long existed against this book.

Another general rule of the early churches was this—that they made no difference, in point of value or authority, between the writings of the Old and New Testaments; and, hence, it was the prevailing practice to read lessons from each alternately. This was in direct opposition to Gnostic and Manichæan errors.

Sometimes, and in some countries, certain other Apocryphal and ecclesiastical writings were read in the public assemblies. Such were,—

1. The books ascribed to St. Peter, which went under the titles of *κήρυγμα*, (Prædicatio Petri, the Preaching of Peter,) and *Ἀποκαλύψις* (Revelatio Petri, the Revelation of Peter).—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 14; SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 19; ASSE-MANNI, *Bibl. Or.* t. iii. p. 1.

2. The *Διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, Doctrines of the apostles; chiefly for the catechumens:—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 25; ATHANAS. *Ep. Fest.*; *Synopsis. S. S.*

3. The "Shepherd" of Hermas:—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3; v. 8; ATHANAS. *Ep. Fest.*; HIERON. *de Vir. Ill.* c. 10.

4. The epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians:—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 16; iv. 23.

5. The Homilies of celebrated Fathers of the church; *e. g.*, of Ephraim the Syrian, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, Augustin, and others:—HIERON. *de Vir. Ill.* c. 115; *Regul. S. Bened.* c. 9, 11.

6. The creeds, decrees of councils, letters from bishops, imperial edicts, and other such public documents, according to occasion.

7. Histories of the lives and sufferings of martyrs and saints. These were read, at a very early period of the church, on the festivals of martyrs and saints, and other particular occasions: as appears from EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 15; v. 4; AUGUST. *Serm.* 12 *de Sanctis*; *de Divers. S.* 45, 63, 101, 102, 103, 105, 109; LEO. M. *Serm. de Machab.* These histories or narratives were called *Legends*. A collection of such legends is mentioned by EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 4; CASSIODOR. *Instit. Div. Lect.* c. 32. To this class also belong the Martyrologia (Martyrologies), and Acta Sanctorum (Acts of the Saints).

It appears that a certain method or plan of reading the holy Scriptures was observed in the early church, especially on the great festivals; although sometimes the lesson was at the discretion of the bishop. (See ATHANAS. *Apolog.* 2 *contra Arian.*; and AUGUST. *in Ps.* 138; with which, however, compare AUGUST. *Serm.* 143, 144, *de Tempore.*) We learn from Augustin that lessons appointed for annual festivals superseded those which occurred in the regular course of the service<sup>50</sup>.

We find no complete table of lessons in the records of the early church; but we occasionally meet with the mention of certain portions of Scripture which were read at different parts of the ecclesiastical year. Thus, the history of our Lord's

<sup>50</sup> Meminit sanctitas vestra, evangelium secundum Joannem *ex ordine lectionum* nos solere tractare. Sed quia nunc interposita est solemnitas sanctorum dierum, quibus certas ex evangelio lectiones oportet in ecclesia recitari, quæ ita sunt annuæ, ut aliæ esse non possint: ordo ille, quem suscepimus, necessitate paululum intermissus est, non omissus. AUGUSTIN. *Expos. in 1 Joan.*

resurrection was read during Easter, in such manner that the narratives of the evangelists followed each other in order<sup>51</sup>. The Acts of the Apostles furnished lessons from Easter to Whitsuntide, (AUGUST. *Tractat. 6 in Johan.*; CHRYSOST. *Hom. 63, al. 66; Hom. 47, 48.*) In the west, it was the practice to read during this last-mentioned period, the Acts of the Apostles, in connexion with the Catholic Epistles, or the Apocalypse (except on certain days). And the fourth council of Toledo, held in the year 633, threatens with excommunication those who should fail to read and expound the Apocalypse at this period of the year; (can. 16.) Genesis was usually read during Lent, (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 7 ad pop. Antioch.*; Conf. *Hom. 1 in Genes.*); the history of the sacrifice of Isaac being reserved for Easter-eve, (AUGUST. *Serm. 71 de Temp.*) As early as the third century, the Book of Job was appointed to be read during passion week (ORIGEN. *in Jobum lib. 1*); Ambrose says, the Books of Job and Jonas (*Ep. 33*).

The fact that a certain method was observed in the public reading of Scripture in the time of Chrysostom, is evident from the circumstance that this father used frequently to exhort his hearers to read carefully at home the portion of Scripture which they were about to hear read and expounded in the church, (e. g., *Hom. 10 in Johan.*)

The division of the New Testament into *εὐαγγέλιον* (i. e., the four Gospels), and *ἀπόστολος* (i. e., the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles), is very ancient;—it is recognised by Irenæus and Tertullian, and perhaps even by Ignatius, (IREN. *adv. Heres. lib. iii. c. 29*; TERTULL. *adv. Marc. lib. iv. c. 2; v. 3; De Præscript. Hæret. c. 36*; IGNAT. *Ep. ad Philadelph. c. 5; Ep. ad Diogn. c. 11*).

<sup>51</sup> Per hos dies, sicut recolitur caritas vestra, solemniter leguntur evangelicæ lectiones ad resurrectionem pertinentes. AUGUSTIN. *Serm. 139 (in die S. Paschæ)*.—Hesterno die, id est, nocte (Sabbato magno) lecta est ex evangelio resurrectio Salvatoris. Lecta est autem ex evangelio secundum Matthæum. Hodie vero, sicut audistis pronuntiare lectorem, recitata est

nobis Domini resurrectio, sicut Lucas evangelista consentit. *Id. Serm. 140*.—Primo enim lecta est secundum Matthæum, hesternam autem secundum Marcum, hodie secundum Lucam. *Id. Serm. 194 (Fer. III)*.—Et hodie lectio recitata est, de his, quæ facta sunt post resurrectionem Domini, secundum evangelistam Joannem. *Id. Serm. 143 (Fer. IV)*.

It is well known that the existing division of the Bible into chapters, is the work of Hugo de S. Caro, in the thirteenth century; and that the New Testament was first divided into verses in the edition of Robert Stephens, A. D. 1551. But, at a much earlier period, the Scriptures were divided into certain sections, *περικοπὰς* or *κεφάλαια*, for ecclesiastical purposes, as we learn from Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria. The notes found in the margin of manuscripts of the New Testament are by no means the earliest testimonies on this point; since the date of the oldest manuscripts extant does not rise higher than about the beginning of the sixth century. The lectionaries of various churches, under different titles, are of a still later date; but we know that such compositions were made as early as the middle of the fifth century. (SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, lib. iv. *Ep.* 11; GENNAD. *de Scriptor. Eccl.* c. 79.) It is probable, also, that Jerome prepared some kind of lectionary, or table of lessons.

The Scriptures appear to have been recited in the early church with a peculiar tone, or in a manner between that of singing and reading.

The reading of the Scriptures was prefaced by a certain salutation, or some form of words bespeaking attention and reverence; and usually another form was pronounced at the conclusion.

We learn from Cyprian that it was usual at Carthage for the reader to begin by saying, *Pax vobis*, or *vobiscum!* Peace be with you! but this practice was prohibited by the third council of Carthage, A. D. 397 (*ut lectores populum non salutent*, c. 4); and we find that in later times, this salutation was pronounced only by the presbyter or bishop. (See AUGUST. *Ep.* 155; *De Civit. Dei*, xxii. c. 8; CHRYSOST. *Hom. in Coloss.* iii.)

Before the reading began, the deacon proclaimed silence, or bespoke the attention of the audience, by saying with a loud voice, *προσχωμεν*, *attendamus*, *attention!* Then the reader began, introducing the lessons from the Old Testament and the Gospels with "Thus saith the Lord;" and those from the Epistles with "Dearly beloved brethren."

In many churches, if not in all, the people responded at the close of the lesson, saying Amen!—Thanks be to God!—Glory

be to thee, O Lord!—or, Glory be to thee, O Christ! But this practice was discontinued on account of some abuses to which it led; concerning which we find complaints in the writings of Ambrose, Augustin, Chrysostom, and others. It was usual, however, afterwards, for the minister (not the people) to say, Thanks be to God! on reading the epistle,—and, Glory be to thee, O Lord! on reading the gospel.

In the earliest times, all portions of Scripture were read from a high desk, called *pulpitum* (Cyprian uses this word), *ambo* (*ἄμβων*, from *ἀναβαλναι*), *suggestus*, *pyrgus* (*πύργος*, *turris*), *tribunal*, *lectricium*, or *lectorium*. In later times, the common lessons were read from this desk; but the epistle and gospel were read or sung at the altar, the former on the left side by a sub-deacon, the latter on the right by a deacon.

It was the universal practice for the reader and people to stand during the reading of the gospel (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 1, in Matt.; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 19); and perhaps, in some places at least, this practice was observed with reference to the reading of the Scriptures in general. (CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 39.)

The earliest testimony extant concerning the use of lighted tapers at the reading of the gospel occurs in the writings of Jerome, who affirms that in his time it prevailed in all the eastern churches. Vigilantius having inveighed against the respect shown to martyrs as a piece of heathenish superstition, and having especially condemned the use of lighted tapers in churches, Jerome showed in reply that the censure was unfounded, inasmuch as the martyrs were not in any manner worshipped, the church only intending to manifest a due respect to their memory; and then, with respect to the use of tapers, he adds,—“In all churches of the East they light tapers, without any respect to the relics of martyrs, when the gospel is to be read, even when the sun shines brightly; which is done, not for the sake of giving light, but as an expression of joy. Hence the virgins in the gospel had their lamps lighted; and hence the apostles were warned to ‘let their loins be girded about, and their lights burning.’ (Luke xii. 35.) Hence it is said of John, —‘He was a burning and a shining light.’ (John v. 35.) Also,



under the figure of a material light (*lucis corporalis*) is represented that light of which we read in the Psalter,—“Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” (Psalms exix. 105.)” (HIERON. *contra Vigil.* c. 3; *conf.* c. 4.)

The Psalter was, from the earliest times, a favourite book of Scripture, and the one which obtained the most extensive use both in public and in private. (TERTULL. *De Anima*, c. 9; *De Jejun.* c. 13; *De Virg. Vel.* c. 17; *Ad Uxor.* ii. 9.) It was regarded as an epitome of the Bible, and as especially adapted to the use of youth and the people at large. (ATHANAS. *ad Marcell.*; AMBROS. *in Psalm. David. præfat.*) The clergy were recommended, and even required, (*Conc. Tolet.* vii. c. 10; *Conc. Nic.* ii.,) to have this book by heart. And in later times, when the use of the Bible as a whole was denied to the people, the Psalter (in Latin) was left in their hands, (*Conc. Tolosat.* A.D. 1129, can. 12; INNOCENT III. *Epist.* lib. ii.; *Opp.* t. i. p. 432, *seq.* ed. Baluz.;) and we know that at the time of the Reformation the seven penitential psalms, at least, were in the hands and mouths of the people. So that, for a considerable space of time, the Psalter became the representative of the whole Bible.

It is uncertain at what time the epistles and gospels, (*pericopæ*,—*περικοπῆ*), section, being the word used by ecclesiastical writers, and by them only, in the same sense as *περιοχῆ*, Acts viii. 32,) for Sundays and holidays, were first selected. Many writers attribute the selection to Jerome (BONA *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 6); while others suppose it to have been a work of the earlier part of the fourth century. Others assign it to Musæus, a presbyter of Marseilles, in the time of Leo the Great (GENNADIUS *de Vir.* Ill. c. 79); and others to Gregory the Great. Some of the reformers endeavoured, but perhaps without sufficient reason, to prove that it was the work of the eighth or ninth century; attributing it either to Venerable Bede, or to Alcuin, or Paul Warnefried; while others sought for the institution as late as the eleventh or twelfth century<sup>52</sup>. Many of these portions

<sup>52</sup> Spectat etiam ad hujus ætatis (sæc. IX.) primordia, ut colligitur ex Homiliario Pauli Diaconi, cum Præfatione Caroli. M., ex Sigeberto, Tri-

themio, &c., *nova quædam ratio lectionis sacræ et ecclesiasticæ*. Olim ante Eucharistiam S. Lectiones factæ ex libris utriusque testamenti, post quas habitæ

of Scripture must, however, have been appropriated to the days on which they are now read in very ancient times, as appears from the allusions to them which are found in the works of early ecclesiastical writers, both Greek and Latin. Thus Basil the Great comments on Matt. ii. 1—12, as the gospel for the Feast of Epiphany; Gregory of Nazianzum on Acts ii. 1—13, as the portion appointed for the epistle on Whitsunday; Epiphanius and Chrysostom refer to the gospel for Christmas-day; Ambrose refers to the portions selected for Christmas-day, the Feast of Epiphany, and St. John's day. See also PETR. CHRYSOL. *Serm.* 66, 118; AUGUSTIN. *Serm. de Temp.* 139, 140, 191, 194.

Modern writers, in establishing the authenticity of Scripture, have carefully investigated and expounded the history of the sacred books of the New Testament during the early ages of the church. Paley, especially, in his *Evidences of Christianity*, has extracted and arranged a large store of materials on this subject from LARDNER'S *Credibility of the Gospel History*. It would be superfluous to repeat here, or even to refer to, the authorities thus collected in a work so generally read as PALEY'S *Evidences*; but the several propositions which contain the results of this learned investigation, and which thus exhibit a general view of all the information we possess respecting the public reception and use of the Christian Scriptures in the early ages of the church, may claim a place at the conclusion of this chapter. These propositions, as stated by Paley (*Evidences of Christianity*, part i. chap. 9, sect. 1—11), after Lardner (*Credibility of the Gospel History*), are the following:—

“1. That the historical books of the New Testament, meaning thereby the four gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, are quoted, or alluded to, by a series of Christian writers, beginning with those who were contemporary with the apostles, or who immediately followed them, and proceeding in close and regular succession from their time to the present.

ad populum conciones vel Homiliae. Tandem certæ Lectiones ex Epistolis et Evangelii decryptæ ac singulis per annum diebus præscriptæ, et in seriem dispositæ, quas perperam aseribunt

Hieronymo, posterioris sæculi X. et XI. sub titulo Comitæ et Lectionarii, et ita quoque Pamelius in Liturgiis, et Card. Bona Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. 6. SPANHEM. *Hist. Eccl.* sæc. IX.

“2. That when they are quoted or alluded to, they are quoted or alluded to with peculiar respect as books *sui generis*; as possessing an authority which belonged to no other books, and as conclusive in all questions and controversies among Christians.

“3. That they were, in very early times, collected into a distinct volume.

“4. That they were distinguished by appropriate names and titles of respect.

“5. That they were publicly read and expounded in the religious assemblies of the early Christians.

“6. That commentaries were written upon them, harmonies formed out of them, different copies carefully collated, and versions of them made into different languages.

“7. That they were received by Christians of different sects, by many heretics as well as catholics, and usually appealed to by both sides in the controversies which arose in those days.

“8. That the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of St. Paul, the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter, were received, without doubt, by those who doubted concerning the other books which are included in our present canon.

“9. That the gospels were attacked by the early adversaries of Christianity, as books containing the accounts upon which the religion was founded.

“10. That formal catalogues of authentic Scriptures were published; in all which our present sacred histories were included.

“11. That these propositions cannot be affirmed of any other books claiming to be books of Scripture; by which are meant those books which are commonly called apocryphal books of the New Testament.”

#### § 9.—OF PREACHING.

IN the early church, preaching consisted simply of a popular exposition and application of a certain portion of Scripture, chosen for the purpose. The history of the Latin church indeed presents us with some specimens of short discourses without

immediate reference to any particular text, or appeal to any single passage of Scripture by way of proof; but it will be found that these discourses usually refer to some lesson or portion of Scripture previously read in the course of divine service; a reference made either tacitly, or (sometimes) expressly, by the use of “as has been read,” “as we have just heard,” and other similar expressions. So that, in short, all religious discourses addressed to the church were founded, more or less directly, upon certain passages of Scripture, to which the preachers referred for the proof of their positions, or as the germs of the sentiments expressed. This is the real difference between a sermon or homily and any other oration. The custom of addressing a Christian assembly from passages of Aristotle was peculiar to the schoolmen of the middle ages.

The following are the titles by which the discourses of Christian preachers were designated:—*λόγος*, sometimes (but the corresponding Latin word, *oratio*, was not used in this sense);—*ὁμιλία*, usually, especially after the time of Origen; and this word is peculiarly appropriate to the discourses of early preachers, which were familiar addresses to large assemblies of persons, without either order or arrangement, of a diffuse and somewhat colloquial character; the corresponding Latin word was *sermo* (whence our word “sermon”), sometimes the word itself, *homilia* (whence our “homily”), or, in later times, *conciō*;—*κήρυγμα*, *prædicatio*, (whence our word “preaching,”) very rarely;—*φιλοσοφία*, *φιλοσόφημα*, sometimes, by Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, and other writers, in imitation of Isocrates. Homilies which were especially designed for the full explanation of some entire passages of Scripture, were called also *ἐξηγήσεις*, *ἐξηγήματα*, *ἐξηγητικὰ*, *ἐκθέσεις*, *exegeses*, *expositiones*, *explanationes*. *Tractatus*, *tractare*, and *tractator*, are words peculiar to the Latin writers, and are often found in Tertullian, Cyprian, Petrus Chrysologus, Optatus Milevitannus, Augustin, and other writers, with reference to discourses, lectures, or disputations on Scripture, especially designed for instruction or edification. The Latins also sometimes use *disputatio*, and *disputare*, when speaking of sermons or lectures. (AUGUSTIN. *Tract.* 89, *in Johan.*; *Confess.* lib. v. c. 13; HIERON. *Epist.* 22, *ad Eustach.*, c. 15.)

The use of preaching in the Christian church may be traced to the custom which prevailed in the Jewish Synagogue of delivering a discourse, by way of exposition or comment, upon the portion of Scripture read during the service, and to the corresponding practices of our Saviour and his apostles. (Nehem. viii. 2—8; Luke iv. 16—22; Matt. iv. 23; xiii. 54—58; Acts xiii. 15—27; xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 15.) And we find that the discourses of the apostles, recorded in the New Testament, consist either of an exposition of some passages of the Old Testament, or a brief outline of the history of the Jewish church. Thus St. Peter, in the sermon recorded in the first chapter of the Acts, comments upon Psalm xli. 10; lxix. 26; cix. 8. The discourse in Acts ii. 14—36, is upon Joel iii. 1—4. These discourses, as well as our blessed Saviour's sermon on the mount, may therefore be referred to the former of the two classes mentioned; while to the latter belong the discourse of the martyr Stephen, Acts vii. 2—58, and those of St. Paul, Acts xvii. 22—31; xxii.; xxvi.

There is no reason to doubt that preaching formed a part of divine service in the Christian church, during the first and second centuries. We learn from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. c. 67), that it was the practice in his days not only to read portions from the collected writings of the prophets (*συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν*), *i. e.*, the Old Testament, and the memoirs of the apostles (*τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), *i. e.* the gospels and epistles, written by apostles, but also to explain and apply the passages so read. This writer says expressly, “When the reader has ended, the presiding minister delivers a discourse, in which he admonishes the people, exciting them to an imitation of the good works which have been brought before their notice.”

The same practice is recognised in the description given by Tertullian of the mode of conducting Christian worship in the second century (*Apoloq. adv. Gent.* c. 39). “We meet together,” says he, “for the purpose of reciting the holy Scriptures (*ad literarum divinarum commemorationem*), in order to learn from them that which, according to the circumstances of the present time, may either serve as instruction for the future, or may be applied to immediate use. At least, by means of the sacred

word, we confirm our faith, excite our hope, and establish our confidence; and by the inculcation of the divine precepts, we bring our hearts under the power of the saving doctrine. We exhort and correct one another, and submit ourselves to the guidance of the divine word. For here the judgment of God is of great weight, inasmuch as no one doubts but that he is standing in the divine presence." This passage seems evidently to refer to an homiletical exposition and application of the holy Scriptures.

"Eusebius records of Origen, and cites for his authority the letters of bishops contemporary with Origen, that, when he went into Palestine about the year 216, which was only sixteen years after the date of Tertullian's testimony, he was desired by the bishops of that country to discourse and expound the Scriptures publicly in the church, though he was not yet ordained a presbyter. This anecdote recognises the usage, not only of reading, but of expounding the Scriptures; and both as subsisting in full force. Origen also himself bears witness to the same practice: 'This,' says he, 'we do, when the Scriptures are read in the church, and when the discourse for explication is delivered to the people.' And what is a still more ample testimony, many homilies of his upon the Scriptures of the New Testament, delivered by him in the assemblies of the church, are still extant." (PALEY *from* LARDNER.)

In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, although no mention is made of preaching, as a separate or independent part of religious services, yet this exercise is evidently included under the idea of reading and expounding the Scriptures<sup>53</sup>."

These testimonies sufficiently prove that the practice of preaching was usual in the first centuries of the church. From the time of Origen, the works of ecclesiastical writers abound with allusions to it; and, in fact, contain numerous homilies and discourses delivered to the church. The arrangement of these

<sup>53</sup> Καὶ ὅταν ἀναγινωσκόμενον ἢ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς στηρέτωσαν μετὰ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας. . . . Καὶ ἐξῆς παρακλιέτωσαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν λαόν, ὁ καθείς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἅπαντες

καὶ τελευταῖος πάντων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ὃς ἔοικε κυβερνήτῃ. *Const. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 57.—Καὶ ἀναγρόντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν φόβῳ καὶ τρόμφῳ, καὶ προσλαλήσαντες τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν. *Id.* lib. v. c. 19. *Conj.* lib. ii. c. 58.

sermons into different classes, such as *Sermones de Tempore* (*i. e.* sermons for the different Sundays and festivals of the year, or on particular occasions), *De Sanctis*, *De Diversis*, *Super Evangelia*, was unknown before the seventh century; and therefore such classification in the works of ancient writers is always to be regarded as the work of collectors and editors, not of the authors themselves.

The terms *postilla*, *postillæ*, *postillare*, and the like, (from, *post illa verba scripturæ sacræ*,) came into use during the middle ages; denoting sometimes merely expositions of Scripture, and sometimes popular discourses founded upon a passage just read.

Justin ascribes the office of expounding and applying the Scriptures, that is to say, of preaching, to the presiding minister or bishop of every church. This exercise was indeed regarded, in early times, as peculiarly belonging to the episcopal functions. Ambrose says expressly, “*Episcopi proprium munus docere populum*,” *i. e.* “*It is the peculiar office of the bishop to teach the people.*” (*De Offic. Sac. lib. i. c. 1.*) The Scriptural rule that a bishop should be *διδασκαλικός*, *apt to teach*, (1 Tim. iii. 2,) or, as Cyril of Alexandria expresses it, that he should possess the *ἀξίωμα διδασκαλικόν*, was steadily kept in view. Chrysostom says that a bishop not possessing this qualification ought to be removed from his office<sup>54</sup>; and it is enacted in the Apostolical Canons (c. 58), that a bishop neglecting to instruct the people should be punished by suspension or removal. We find afterwards that any bishops who were not good preachers were extremely unpopular in the church (*Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. lib. viii. c. 27*); while, on the other hand, a singular talent for preaching was often a recommendation or the ground of election to the sacred office, as in the case of Gregory of Nazianzum, Eusebius of Emisa, Chrysostom, and Augustin.

Deacons originally were not permitted to preach, except by special commission from the bishop, and as his representatives. And in episcopal churches, even the presbyters were forbidden to undertake this duty, except in the absence of the bishop, or by

<sup>54</sup> Ὅτι οὐκ εἶδως ἂν χρὴ περὶ ὀρθῆς διδασκαλικοῦ. CHRYSOST. *Hom. x. in δάσκειν διδασκαλίας, πῶρρω ἕστω θρόνον* | 1 *Ep. ad Tim.*

his especial commission. (POSSIDI *Vita August.* c. 5; CHRYSOST. *Hom. 2 in Tit.*; *Hom. 10 in 1 Tim.* iii.; PALLAD. *in Vita Chrysost.*) And the bishops were always held responsible for what was delivered by their presbyters or deacons.

But it must not be supposed that presbyters in general were excluded from the office of preaching; for what has been said extends only to the case of presbyters belonging to those churches which were under the immediate superintendence of a bishop. In churches to which no bishop was attached, the presbyter ordinarily discharged, in this respect, the episcopal functions; and his own place was supplied, in case of necessity, by a deacon; or, at least, a deacon was permitted or required to read some published homily of one of the fathers<sup>55</sup>. Hence the *Apostolical Canons* (c. 58) require that "either the bishop or presbyter" should preach. See also CYPRIAN. *Ep. 2 ad Mart. et Confess.*; PHILOSTORG. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 17.

Monks were at first forbidden to preach<sup>56</sup>; but this prohibition was removed during the middle ages, when in fact whole orders were invested with this privilege.

The laity, in general, were strictly excluded from the office of preaching or teaching in the church. But the rule was not without exceptions. We learn from Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 19), that some bishops, for the benefit of the brethren, permitted lay persons (*λαϊκοῖς*) to address the people in their presence (*τῶν παρόντων ἐπισκόπων τῷ λαῷ προσομιλεῖν*).

<sup>55</sup> Si presbyter aliqua infirmitate prohibente per se ipsum non potuerit prædicare, sanctorum patrum homilie a diaconis recitentur. Si enim digni sunt diaconi, quæ Christus in evangelio loquutus est legere, quare indigni judicentur, sanctorum patrum expositiones publice recitare? *Conc. Vasens.* 2, A. D. 529, c. 2. *Conf. GREGOR. M. Præfat. ad Libr. xi. Homil. in Evangel. ad Secund.*; JO. DIACONI *Vit. Gregor. M.* lib. ii. c. 18.

<sup>56</sup> Illud quoque dilectionem tuam convenit præcavere, ut præter eos, qui sunt Domini sacerdotes, nullus sibi jus docendi et prædicandi audeat ven-

dicare, sive sit ille Monachus, sive Laicus, qui alienius scientiæ nomine glorientur: quia etsi optandum est, ut omnes ecclesiæ filii, quæ recta et sana sunt, sapiant, non tamen permittendum est, ut quisquam extra sacerdotalem ordinem constitutus gradum sibi prædicatoris assumat, cum in Ecclesia Dei omnia ordinata esse conveniat, ut in uno Christi corpore et excellentiora membra suum officium impleant, et inferiora superioribus non resultent. *LEO. M. Ep. 62 ad Maxim. Antioch. Ep. Conf. Ep. 63 ad Theodoret.*; *Conc. Chalced.* can. 2, 8; *ΠΙΕΡΟΣ. Ep. 55 ad Ripar.*; *Ep. 1 ad Heliodor.*



And it appears to have been not unusual with Constantine and other emperors to preach to the people. (EUSEBII *De Vita Const.* M. lib. iv. c. 29—34; FABRICII *Bibl. Gr.* t. vi. p. 367.) Women, however, were absolutely forbidden to preach, according to the apostolical injunctions, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12; (*Const. Ap.* lib. iii. c. 9). The Montanists, indeed, violated this rule, by permitting their “prophetesses” to speak in their assemblies;—a practice condemned even by their own zealous partisan, Tertullian. The fourth Council of Carthage (A.D. 399) ordained that no layman should preach, in the presence of the clergy, *unless at their request* (c. 98); and that no woman, however learned or pious she may be, should presume to teach men in the public assembly<sup>57</sup>.

From the description already given of preaching in the early church, it may easily be supposed to have taken place as often as the Scriptures were read; and hence we may account for the fact that several discourses were delivered consecutively in the same assembly, by different speakers; numerous proofs of which have been collected by Bingham from the writings of Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, Augustin, Jerome, and others.

The length of the discourses was determined, for the most part, by time and circumstances, or by the custom of the place. But it may be remarked, as a general rule, that the homilies of Latin writers are the shorter, and those of the Greek are the longer. The delivery of the former could not have occupied more than half an hour; often less.

In the earliest times, sermons were delivered in the chancel, in front of the altar, or from the bishop’s seat. (CHRYSOLOG. *Serm.* 173; AUGUSTIN, *Exposit. Ps.* cxvi. cxvii.) But after-

<sup>57</sup> Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tinguere [tingere], nec offerre. TERTULL. *de Veland. Virgin.* c. 9. Conf. *De Præscript.* c. 41; *De Baptismo*, c. 17.—  
 sis rogantibus, docere non audeat. —Mulier, quamvis docta et sancta, viros in conventu docere non presumat. *Conc. Carthag.* 4, A.D. 399, c. 98, 99.  
 Laicus præsentibus clericis, nisi ip-

wards, for the sake of convenience, they were delivered from the ambo (reading-desk), or some other raised place in the nave or body of the church; a practice which was adopted (perhaps for the first time) by Chrysostom at Constantinople; (SOCRATES *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 5; SOZOMEN. *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 5; see also AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 122 *de Diversis*; *De Civit. Dei*, lib. 22, c. 8; *Ep.* 225, 203).

It was usual, in the ancient church, for the preacher to sit during the delivery of the sermon, and for the people to stand; but the practice in this respect varied in different countries and dioceses. Perhaps the custom alluded to prevailed especially in the African and Gallican churches. (AUGUSTIN. *Serm. de Divers.* 49; *de Catechiz. Rudibus*, c. 13; AUGUST. (OF CESAR. AREL.) *Hom.* 50, *Serm.* 26; HIERONYM. *Ep.* 22 *ad Eustoch.*) The passages adduced by Bingham to prove that the custom of the people's sitting during the service prevailed in many Eastern churches have been deemed insufficient to establish the point; and we know from many passages of Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, and Eusebius, that the hearers stood during the delivery of their discourses. But we may fully submit to the opinion of our ecclesiastical antiquarian, that "this must be reckoned among those indifferent rites and customs, about which there was no general rule of the universal church; but every one followed the custom of the place where he lived, and every church appointed what she judged most proper for the edification of the people."

The behaviour of the hearers during the delivery of a sermon seems also to have varied according to the difference of country, time, and manners. It was a general custom for the people to testify their esteem for the preacher, and express their admiration of his eloquence or approbation of his doctrine, by public applause and acclamations in the church. This was done sometimes in express words, and sometimes by other signs and indications of their consent and approbation. (HIERON. *Ep.* 75 *contra Vigilant*; GREGOR. NAZ. *Somnium de Templo Anastasie*; HIERON. *Ep.* 2 *ad Nepot.*; AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 5 *de Verb. Domini*;

*Sermon. 19, 28, de Verb. Apostoli; Serm. 45 de Tempore; 27 de Diversis; in Psalm cxlvii.; Tract. 57 in Johan.; De Doctrina Christ. lib. iv. c. 26; CHRYSOSTOM. Hom. 1, 4, 54 in Genes.; 2, 5, 6 ad Pop. Antioch.)* So George of Alexandria tells us that “the people applauded the sermons of St. Chrysostom, some by tossing their thin garments, others by moving their plumes, others laying their hands upon their swords, and others waving their handkerchiefs, and crying out, ‘Thou art worthy of the priesthood, thou art the thirteenth apostle, Christ hath sent thee to save our souls,’” &c. (GEORG. ALEX. *Vit. Chrys. ap. Ferrar. de Ritu Concionum*, lib. ii. c. 20.) The ancients, while they did not refuse these acclamations of the people, took care, however, to exhort them rather to repay them with the fruit of their lives and actions; and gave them to understand, that the best praise of a sermon and its rhetoric is the compunction of the hearers, and melting them into tears, and subduing their minds by bending them to obedience, which far exceeds the honour of the greatest acclamations and applauses. Thus Chrysostom says in one place, “What do your praises advantage me when I see not your progress in virtue? Or what harm shall I receive from the silence of my auditors, when I behold the increase of their piety? The praise of the speaker is not the *κρότος*, the acclamation of his hearers, but their zeal for piety and religion; not their making a great stir in the times of hearing, but showing diligence at all other times. Applause, as soon as it is out of the mouth, is dispersed into the air, and vanishes; but when the hearers grow better, this brings an incorruptible and immortal reward both to the speaker and the hearers. The praise of your acclamations may render the orator more illustrious here, but the piety of your souls will give him great confidence before the tribunal of Christ. Therefore if any one love the preacher, or if any preacher love his people, let him not be enamoured with applause, but with the benefit of the hearers.” (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 16, tom. v.*) And it were easy to transcribe many other such passages out of Chrysostom, where he shows great contempt of such popular applauses in comparison of the people’s obedience. He appears, indeed, to have wished that this custom should have been banished out of the church, because it was frequently

abused by vain and ambitious spirits, who made it their chief aim to gain the applause of their hearers. (Abridged from BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xiv. chap. 4, § 27, 28.)

But we find also in the writings of Athanasius, Augustin, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzum, and others, frequent complaints of either the want of attendance at sermons, or the want of attention, talkativeness, or the indecorous behaviour of the audience during the delivery of their discourses.

The practice of taking down sermons in writing during the time of their delivery prevailed to a great extent. Many of the discourses of Origen were preserved by this method, which, as Eusebius tells us, he would not consent to during the early part of his life, although it afterwards received his sanction (*EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 36.*) Socrates informs us (*Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 36.*), that some of the sermons of Chrysostom were published by himself, and others by notaries, or short-hand writers (*ὀξυγράφοις*), who took them from his mouth as he delivered them. And on the contrary, Sozomen remarks (*Hist. Eccl. lib. viii. c. 27.*), concerning Atticus, the second successor of Chrysostom in the see of Constantinople, that his discourses were so poor that they were not thought worthy of being taken down in writing (*μῆτε γραφῆς ἀξίους νομίζεσθαι*). Augustin says concerning his own sermons on the Psalms, that "it pleased the brethren not only to receive them with their ears and heart, but with their pens likewise; so that he was to have regard not only to his hearers but to his readers also." (*Expos. in Ps. li.; conf. POSSIN. in vita Aug.*) "These notaries," says Bingham, "were some of them allowed by the preacher himself, and were therefore a sort of public notaries appointed for the purpose; but others did it privately according to their inclination and discretion. This difference is hinted by Eusebius, when he says that Origen allowed no notaries to take his sermons until he was sixty years old; and by Gregory Nazianzen in his farewell sermon, when he thus takes leave of his church: 'Farewell, ye lovers of my sermons, and ye pens both public and private.' The public notaries were generally allowed, by the author's consent, to publish what they wrote; in which case it was usual for the preacher to review

his own dictates, and to correct such mistakes and supply such deficiencies as might be occasioned by the haste of the scribe, or some things not so accurately spoken by themselves in sudden and extempore discourses (GREGOR. M. *Præf. in Jobum ad Leonard;* *Præf. in Ezek.*) Sometimes the notaries published what they had written without the author's knowledge and consent. We find Gaudentius (about A.D. 386), remonstrating against this as a clandestine practice<sup>58</sup>; and probably there may be reason for the same complaint in other writers." *Antiq.* book xiv. c. 4, § 29.)

It appears to have been the common practice of preachers to take a bible with them into the desk or pulpit, from which they read their text, and occasionally other quotations. Ferrarius (*de Conc. Vct.*) has collected many testimonies on this point; some of which, from Augustin, are here given in a note<sup>59</sup>. These discourses were distinguished by simplicity and earnestness. For the most part, they consisted merely of an exposition and application of a certain portion of Scripture, in the order of the text; admitting indeed of digressions, but with a constant recurrence to the passage which formed the subject or basis of the discourse, as the verses lay. Artificial divisions and subdivisions, with the several arrangements which enter into the regular composition of a modern sermon, were introduced during

<sup>58</sup> De illis tractatibus, quos *Notariis*, ut comperi, latenter appositis, procul dubio interruptos et semiplenos otiosa quorundam studia colligere præsumserunt, nihil ad me attinet. Mea jam non sunt quæ constat præcipiti excipientium festinatione esse conscripta. GAUDENTIUS circ. A.D. 386, *Præfat. ad Benevol. Bibl. Patr. ed Colon.* t. 2, p. 3.

<sup>59</sup> Sed ex ipso *Codice* audite: propterea enim non tantum *Disputatoris*, sed etiam *Lectoris* fungor officio, ut sermo iste noster sanctorum Scripturarum auctoritate fuleiatur, non humanis suspicionibus super arenam ædificetur, si forte aliquid non memoriter occur-

rerit. Andite ergo Evangelium secundum Joannem: Amen, Amen, dico vobis, etc. AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 121 *De Diversis*.—Hoc lectum est, et hanc lectionem tractandam suscepimus; *gestamus in manibus, quod Dominus Jesus ad puteum Jacob loquebatur cum Samaritana muliere.* *Id. Tractat.* 15 *in Joann. Evang.*—Quare ista dixi? Forte enim post hæc verba quisque juste mihi dicat, pone ergo codicem, quod excedit mensuram tuam. *Quid sumis in manuum tuum?* *Id. Tractat.* 36.—De Sancto Evangelio secundum Joannem, *quod gestare nos videtis in manibus, jam multa audivit caritas vestra.* *Id. Tractat.* 40.

the middle ages, by scholastic writers. The discourses of the ancients were arranged according to the text; and were, almost without exception, of the analytical kind.

The discourses of the ancients were usually prepared before delivery, as to their substance, with care and study; but it was considered an essential qualification of a preacher to be able, upon occasion, to deliver a discourse purely extempore. Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, Augustin, and Gregory the Great, were particularly distinguished as able extempore preachers. They placed very humble dependence upon the especial and immediate aid of divine influence in this solemn undertaking<sup>60</sup>. But the practice of delivering extempore sermons, i. e. sermons composed and delivered without previous preparation, (*ὁμιλίαι σχεδιασθεῖσαι*,) was the exception, not the rule. Their preparation consisted in collecting and digesting materials, or determining the substance of what they should say: it does not seem likely that they chose their words and arranged the form of their sentences beforehand, and so preached entirely from memory. Sometimes preachers read their own written discourses; but this practice does not appear to have prevailed to any great extent. The general practice of the ancient fathers, as to the mode of delivering their discourses, appears to have corresponded with what is commonly called extemporaneous preaching at the present day.

Prayer was always regarded as essential to a Christian discourse; and in all cases where it is not expressly recorded, as it usually is in the works of the fathers, it must be understood as having been pronounced. But the prayers of early preachers at the beginning and end of their discourses were short and simple. Brief invocations of the divine aid and blessing (such as, “ Bless

<sup>60</sup> Οὐκ οἶμαι ταῦτα ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ εἰρηκέναι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ μέλλοντα προειδὸτος εἰς τὴν διάνουαν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐμβεβληκέναι τὰ ῥήματα. CHRYSTOST. *Hom.* 2, *ad Poss. Antioch.*—Non hoc temeritate aggredior, sed humilitate. Scio enim, quia plerumque multa

in sacro eloquio, quæ solus intelligere non potui, coram fratribus meis positus intellexi. GREGOR. M. *Hom.* 19, in *Ezech.*; *Conf.* AUGUSTIN, *De Doctr. Chr.* lib. iv. c. 14; *Serm.* 46, *De Temp.*; *Serm.* 15, *De Verb. Apost.*

us, O Lord,") short ejaculations, (as, "Blessed be God,") the salutation "Peace be with you," or the apostolical benediction, were usual at the commencement of a discourse; and at the conclusion a short doxology was repeated<sup>61</sup>.

Bingham (*Antiq.* book xiv. c. 4, § 18, 19) cites three passages, from Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, and Augustin, which give a good idea of the general substance or matter of the discourse of ancient Christian preachers. "Their subjects, as Gregory Nazianzen describes the choice of them, were commonly such as these:—of the world's creation, and the soul of man; of angels, as well those that kept, as those that lost, their first integrity; of providence, and its wise laws and constitutions; of the formation of man and his restoration; of the two covenants, the types of the old, and the antitypes of the new; of Christ's first and second coming, of his incarnation and passion; of the general resurrection and end of the world; of the day of judgment, the rewards of the just, and the punishment of the wicked; and above all, of the doctrine of the Trinity, which was the principal article of the Christian faith. (*GREG. NAZ. Orat. De Trinitate*, p. 15). In like manner Chrysostom puts his auditors in mind of what matters he had used to preach to them;—of the nature of the soul; of the fabric of the body; of the state of immortality; of the kingdom of heaven, and the torments of hell; of the long suffering of God, and the methods of pardon; of the powers of repentance, of baptism, and the forgiveness of sins;

<sup>61</sup> Πρότερον εὐχή, καὶ τότε λόγος οὐτῶ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι. CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 28, *De Incomprehens. Dei Nat.*—Τί εἶπω; ἢ τί λαλήσω; εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς, τοῦτο εἶπον ἐξῆς τὸ ῥῆμα, τοῦτο πάλιν ἐπαναλαμβάνω. *Id. Hom. Post. Red.*—In the *Apostolical Constitutions* the minister is directed, immediately after the reading of the Scriptures, to salute the people with the apostolical benediction, and when this has been returned by the words "And with thy Spirit," the minister is to address to the people the words of exhortation. *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 5.—Omnis

tractatus in ecclesia a nomine Dei incipitur, et ejusdem nomine terminatur. ORAT. MILEV. *De Schisma Donat.* lib. vii.; *Conf.* AUGUST. *Hom.* 46, *De Temp.*—*Conversi ad Dominum*, ipsum deprecemur pro nobis et pro omni plebe sua, adstante nobiscum in atriis domus sue, quam custodire protegereque dignetur: per Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum, qui cum eo vivit et regnat in sæcula sæculorum. Amen! AUGUST. *Serm.* 121, *De Div.*; *Conf. Serm.* 30, *De Verb. Dom.*; *Serm.* 102, 120, *De Div.*

of the creation of the superior and inferior world; of the nature of men and angels; of the subtilty of Satan, and his methods and policies; of the different opinions of the Christian world; of the true faith, and the gangrene of heresies; and other such mysteries, which it behoves a Christian to be acquainted with. (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 24, De Baptisma Christi.*) The design of Christian oratory, as St. Austin observes, is either to instruct men in the truth, or to refute their errors, or to persuade them to the practice of holiness and virtue, and dissuade them from the contrary vices. The first of these requires plain narration; the second, strength of argument and ratioecination; and the third, the art and power of moving the mind and affections. And in doing each of these, the Christian orator, as he never speaks anything but what is holy, just, and good, so he endeavours to speak these in such a manner, as that he may be heard with understanding, with pleasure, and with obedience." (AUGUST. *De Doctrina Christi*, lib. iv. cap. 4, 15.)

#### § 10.—OF CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

CLOSELY allied to the practice of preaching in the early church was that of catechetical instruction, that is, of delivering to candidates for baptism addresses concerning the general outline of Christian doctrine. Specimens of these addresses and their contents are preserved in the "Catecheses" of Cyril of Jerusalem, the *Λόγος κατηχητικός* of Gregory of Nyssa, and the treatise of Augustin *De Catechizandis Rudibus*. It must be remembered, that such addresses were delivered at first chiefly to persons of full age, and therefore are not to be brought into comparison with catechisms of the present day, provided for the use of children, either as to their form, or as to their contents. After the general prevalence of infant baptism, these catechetical discourses grew out of use; or rather gave way to treatises, called instructions before baptism, on the creed, and the like. After the time of Charlemagne the terms *Institutio*, *Catechetica*, *Catechismus* revived; but real catechetical instruction was at a low ebb until the period of the Reformation; when, by the good providence of God, new life and vigour were imparted to this part of ecclesiastical discipline and labour, as well as to many others.



At first it was the office of the bishop to prepare the candidates for baptism, (*κατηχούμενοι*, catechumens,) as well as to admit them into the church by that sacred rite. But after the labours of bishops had greatly multiplied, in consequence of the extension of the church, it became impossible for them to devote the requisite attention to this part of their office, and, accordingly, they transferred it to such presbyters and deacons as they deemed competent to the undertaking. These were called catechetæ, and their employment was considered peculiarly honourable, as requiring the exercise of eminent talents and qualifications. Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom were placed in this rank of teachers. They were sometimes termed *ναυτολόγοι* or *ναυστολόγοι*, with reference to the well-known comparison of the church with a ship, and to the circumstance that the catechumens took their station in the church at the end of the nave. According to this similitude, the bishop was called *ὁ πρωρεὺς*; the presbyters *οἱ ναῦται*; the deacons *οἱ τοίχαρχοι*; and the catechetæ *οἱ ναυτολόγοι*<sup>62</sup>. Traces of the early exercise of this office by the bishops remained, for some time after it had been transferred, in the occasional catechising of the Competentes previously to confirmation. (AMEROS. *Ep.* 33.)

The catechumens were permitted to take part in all offices of religious worship, except such as were reserved exclusively for the faithful, or full members of the church; and therefore they heard the Scriptures read and expounded in the general assemblies. But their own peculiar course of instruction appears to have been carried on, in some place apart from the church, not before the congregation. We find mention of *κατηχοίμενα*, i.e., buildings set apart for the instruction of catechumens, in the neighbourhood of the churches; and we learn that sometimes the baptisteries were made use of for this purpose. (LEONIS *Novell.* 73; *Conc. Trullan.* can. 97; AMEROS. *Ep.* 33.)

The course of catechetical instruction consisted chiefly of an

<sup>62</sup> Erant *ναυστολόγοι* seu *ναυτολόγοι*, qui in prora constituti, tum navem intrantes recipiebant, tum vero cum navigaturis de futuro itinere colloquebantur, de nauo paciscebantur. Quo- circa Naustologos referunt partim janitores, ratione videlicet primi naustologorum officii, partim Catechistæ, ratione posterioris. COTELERIUS, *Ad Const. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 57.

exposition of the ten commandments, a creed, or summary confession of faith, and the Lord's prayer; with suitable comments and remarks. At least, these formularies were the text which formed the basis of catechetical lectures. During the existence of the system of secret discipline, no instruction respecting the nature of the sacraments was given before baptism.

This system of concealing certain sacred mysteries from the catechumens, called the *Disciplina Arcani*, *System of Secret Instruction*, did not exist in the earliest ages of the church. It originated, probably, in the precautions which became necessary during times of persecution; and its formation may have been assisted by a desire of imitating the Eleusinian mysteries (especially after the conversion of large numbers of the heathen to Christianity), and also by the efforts of the clergy to promote the dignity and influence of their order. Neander supposes that it took rise in the Church of Alexandria; whence it extended first to the eastern, and afterwards to the western, churches. The subject is involved in considerable obscurity; but it is certain that the system was gradually established after the middle of the second century; and it is supposed to have reached its perfection during the fourth century,—soon after the conversion of Constantine and the Council of Nicæa. The mysteries which, at that time, were carefully concealed from the catechumens, and all uninitiated persons, were, (to follow the enumeration of BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book x. chap. 5.) first, the manner of administering baptism; secondly, the manner of administering the holy unction or confirmation; thirdly, the ordination of priests; the public liturgy, or solemn prayers of the church; the manner of celebrating the eucharist, and all discourses which treated plainly on the subject; the mystery of the Trinity, the creed, and the Lord's prayer, (at least, from the first or lowest class of catechumens.) The reasons for concealing these things from the catechumens, as stated by the same author, were, first, that the plainness and simplicity of the Christian rites might not be contemned by them, or give any occasion of scandal or offence to them, before they were thoroughly instructed about the nature of the mysteries; secondly, to conciliate a reverence in the minds of men for the mysteries so concealed; and, thirdly, to make the

catechumens more desirous to know them, or to excite their curiosity. “Though the sacraments,” says Augustin, “are not disclosed to the catechumens, it is not because they cannot bear them, but that they may so much the more ardently desire them, by how much they are the more honourably hidden from them.” (Aug. Hom. 96, in Johan.)

### § 11.—ANCIENT CREEDS.

IT was usual, as has been said, to require the assent of Catechumens to a summary of the leading articles of Christian faith, or a creed, in which they had been previously instructed. This creed, from the nature of its contents, and the uses to which it was applied, was called sometimes *symbolum*, a *mark*, *token*, or *badge*; sometimes *κανὼν*, *regula fidei*, the *rule*, or *rule of faith*; sometimes, among the Greeks, *πίστις* the *faith*, *ὄρος* or *ἔκδοσις πίστεως* the *determination or exposition of the faith*, *μάθημα* the *lesson*.

There can be no doubt that such a set form of doctrine was in use at a very early period, and even in the days of the apostles. Many writers, indeed, and among them some of our divines, have contended that the creed commonly called the Apostles' was composed in its present form by the apostles themselves<sup>63</sup>;

<sup>63</sup> Some have thought that the twelve apostles, in a full meeting, composed the creed in the very same form of words as now it is used in the church; and others have gone so far as to pretend to tell what article was composed by every particular apostle. Dr. Comber is so positive in the matter, as to say, “We have no better medium to prove the books were written by those authors whose names they bear, than the unanimous testimony of antiquity; and by that we can abundantly prove the apostles were the authors of this creed.” For this he cites Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Rufinus, Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, Pope Leo, Maximus Taurinensis, Cassian, and Isidore. But none of these writers, except Rufinus, speak home

to his purpose; but only say, the creeds in general are of apostolical institution; which, for the substance, no one denies; for they speak of several forms, and yet ascribe them all to the apostles: which is an argument they did not mean this particular form any more than others. For the Nicene Creed is often called the Apostles' Creed; and yet no one believes that that creed was composed, *totidem verbis*, by the apostles. Rufinus indeed seems to say, “there was an ancient tradition that the apostles, being about to depart from Jerusalem, first settled a rule for their future preaching; lest, after they were separated from one another, they should expound different doctrines to those whom they invited to the Christian faith. Wherefore being all assen-

but this opinion is now entirely exploded; and it is agreed that, although the apostles probably used creeds approaching in substance to that which is now called by their name, yet these creeds were not restricted to any precise form, nor did they contain so many articles of belief as the one in question. It is likely that the article of "The holy Catholic Church" was not inserted at first, but was introduced perhaps about the end of the first or beginning of the second century; and it appears plainly that the articles "He descended into Hell," and "The communion of saints," did not form part of any creed during the first three centuries. Many early creeds omit also the article of "The life everlasting," the belief in that truth being implied in the foregoing words, "The resurrection of the body." "These are plain demonstrations, without any other argument, that the creed as it stands in its present form, could not be composed, in the manner as is pretended, by the apostles. The silence of the Acts of the Apostles about any such composition, is a collateral evidence against it. The silence of ecclesiastical writers, for above three whole centuries, is a further confirmation. The variety of creeds in so many different forms, used by the ancients, yet extant in their writings, some with omissions, others with additions, and all in a different phrase, are no less evident proofs, that one universal form had not been pitched upon, and prescribed to the

bled together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, they composed this short rule of their preaching, each one contributing his sentence, and left it as a rule to be given to all believers." And for this reason, he thinks, it might be called the symbol, because that word in Greek signifies both a test, and a collection of opinions together. The author under the name of St. Austin (*Aug. De Tempore, Serm. 115, al. 42,*) is a little more particular in the story; for he pretends to tell us what article was put in by each particular apostle: Peter said, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." John, "Maker of heaven and earth." James, "And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord." Andrew added, "Who was conceived

by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." Philip said, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." Thomas, "He descended into Hell; the third day he rose again from the dead." Bartholomew, "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty." Matthew, "From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." James, the son of Alphaeus, added, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church." Simon Zelotes, "The communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins." Jude, the brother of James, "The resurrection of the body." Matthias, "Life everlasting." BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book x, c. 3, § 5.

whole church by the apostles. . . . Upon the whole, Dr. Grabe concludes that all the articles of the creed except these three,—the communion of saints, the church, and the descent of Christ into hell,—were solemnly professed by the first Christians in their confessions of faith in the apostles' days, by their authority, or at least their approbation; for which reason the creed, as to those parts of it, may properly be called apostolical. And it could hardly be, that all churches in the world should so unanimously agree in the common confession of so many articles of it, unless it had proceeded from some such authority as they all acknowledged. But the reason why the confessions of particular churches differed in words and phrases, he thinks was from hence, that the creed which the apostles delivered was not written with paper and ink, but in the fleshly tablets of the heart, as St. Jerome words it, (*Ep.* 61 *ad Pammach.* c. 9.) Whence every church was at liberty to express their sense in their own terms." (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book x. chap. 3, § 5, 7.)

In the absence, then, of any one form or creed in which the articles of our faith were comprised in the apostles' days, it becomes interesting to collect those summaries or confessions of faith which are found in the works of early ecclesiastical writers, or were drawn up and used by public authority. Such creeds or confessions are found in the works of <sup>64</sup> Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory (Thaumaturgus) of Neocæsarea (all Ante-Nicene); a creed composed by Lucian the Martyr, (who suffered in the last persecution under Diocletian,) is preserved by Athanasius, Soerates, and Hilary; and another is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the date of which cannot be supposed

<sup>64</sup> There is a summary of the articles of Christian faith in one of the epistles of Ignatius, which is not usually reckoned among the creeds, but was very probably penned with reference to some form of confession used in the author's time; and, if so, presents perhaps the earliest trace of a creed now extant. The following is the passage to which I refer:—Κωφώθητε οὖν, ὅτ' ἂν ἰμῶν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῆ τις, τοῦ ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας, ὅς

ἀληθῶς ἐγενήθη, ἔφαγεν τε καὶ ἔπιεν, ἀληθῶς ἐδώθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν, βλέπόντων τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καὶ ἐπιγείων, καὶ ἰποχθονίων· ὅς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐγείρωτος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα, ὅς καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ οὕτως ἐγερεῖ ὁ Πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὐ χωρὶς τῶ ἀληθινῶν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν. *Ep.* *ad Trall.* § 9.

later than the end of the third century, or beginning of the fourth. We have also the early public creeds of the churches of Jerusalem (preserved in the catechetical discourses of Cyril of Jerusalem), Cæsarea in Palestine (preserved by Eusebius), Alexandria (recorded by Socrates), Antioch (recorded by Cassian), Rome (attested by Ruffin, and others), Aquileia (preserved by Ruffin). To which may be added the Nicene Creed, as first published by the Council of Nicæa, and afterwards completed by the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381.

I proceed now to transcribe all these ancient confessions of faith in chronological order; giving an English translation in the text, and subjoining the originals in notes; which method will, I hope, be acceptable at once to the general reader, and to the more learned inquirer. The translations in Bingham are adopted, except where there is reason for alteration; and the originals are such as I find in the works of the several Greek and Latin fathers, or councils, to which reference is made.

*Irenæus*.—“The church, though it be dispersed over all the world from one end of the earth to the other, has received from the apostles and their disciples the belief in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, the sea, and all things in them: and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation: and in the Holy Ghost, who preached by the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advent (*τὰς ἐλεύσεις*, adventum, Int. vet.), nativity of a virgin, passion, resurrection from the dead, and bodily ascension into heaven of the flesh of his beloved Son Christ Jesus our Lord, and his coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father, to restore (*ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι*, ad recapitulanda universa, Int. vet.) all things, and raise the flesh of all mankind; that, according to the will of the invisible Father, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth, to Jesus Christ, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King; and that every tongue should confess to him; and that he may exercise just judgment upon all, and may send spiritual wickednesses, and the transgressing and apostate angels, with all ungodly, unrighteous, lawless, and blaspheming men, into everlasting fire; but, having granted life to all righteous and holy men, that keep

nis commandments, and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance, on these he may bestow the gift of immortality, and invest them with eternal glory<sup>65</sup>.”

*Tertullian*.—Three several descriptions of the rule of faith are found in the writings of this author. They are as follow :

“There is one rule of faith only, which admits of no change or alteration,—that which teaches us to believe in one God Almighty, the maker of the world ; and in Jesus Christ his Son, who was born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day rose again from the dead, received into heaven, and sitteth now at the right hand of God, who shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead, by the resurrection of the flesh<sup>66</sup>.”

<sup>65</sup> Ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως πρώτων τῆς γῆς διεσπυρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλυβοῦσιν τὴν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, πίστιν καὶ εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ἰπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας· καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ελεῦσεις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀναστῆσαι πῦσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος, ἵνα Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ Θεῷ, καὶ σωτῆρι, καὶ βασιλεῖ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἀοράτου, πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πῦσα γλῶσσα ἑξομολογήσῃται αὐτῷ, καὶ κρίσιν δικαίαν ἐν τοῖς πῦσι ποιήσῃται, τὰ μὲν πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, καὶ ἀγγέλους τοὺς παραβεβηκότας, καὶ ἐν ἀποστασίᾳ γεγονότας, καὶ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἀδίκους, καὶ ἀνόμους, καὶ βλασφήμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸ αἰῶμιον πῦρ πέμψῃ, τοῖς δὲ δικαί-  
οις, καὶ ὁσίοις, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ

τετηρήκοσι, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ αὐτοῦ διαμεμενηκόσι, τοῖς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, τοῖς δὲ ἐκ μετανοίας, ζῶνι χαρισίμενος, ἀφθαρσίαν δωρήσῃται, καὶ δόξαν αἰῶνιον περιποιήσῃ. *Iren.* lib. i. c. 2.

Credo in unum Deum, fabricatorem cæli ac terre et omnium quæ in eis sunt, per Christum Jesum Dei Filium, qui propter eminentissimam erga figmentum suum dilectionem, eam quæ esset ex Virgine generationem sustinuit, ipse per se hominem adunans Deo, et passus sub Pontio Pilato, et resurgens, et in claritate receptus, in gloria venturus Salvator eorum qui salvantur, et Judex eorum qui judicantur, et mittens in ignem æternum transfiguratōres veritatis, et contemptores Patris sui et adventus ejus. *Iren.* lib. iii. c. 4.

<sup>66</sup> Regula fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertio die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cælis, sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos, per carnis etiam resurrectionem. *TERTULL.* *de Felund. Virgin.*

“The rule of faith is that, whereby we believe one God only, and no other beside, the maker of the world, who produced all things out of nothing, by his Word, which he sent forth before all things. This word was called his Son, who at sundry times appeared to the Patriarchs, and always spake by the prophets, and at last descended into the Virgin Mary by the power and spirit of God the Father, and was made flesh in her womb, and born of her, a man, Jesus Christ; who preached a new law, and a new promise of the kingdom of heaven; who wrought miracles, and was crucified, and the third day rose again, and was taken into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; whence he sent the power of the Holy Ghost in his stead, to guide them that believe: who shall come again with glory, to take the saints into the possession and fruition of eternal life, and the heavenly promises, and to condemn the profane to everlasting fire, having first raised both the one and the other by the resurrection of the flesh<sup>67</sup>.”

“We believe in one God, but under this dispensation, which we call the economy, that that one God hath a Son, which is his Word, who proceeded from him, by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made. We believe that he was sent by the Father to be born of a Virgin, both man and God, the Son of man and the Son of God, and that he was called Jesus Christ. That he suffered, and was dead and buried according to the Scriptures; that he was raised again by the Father, and taken up again into heaven, where he sits at the right hand of

<sup>67</sup> Regula est autem fidei, ut jam hinc quid credamus, profiteatur, illa scilicet, qua creditur unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi creatorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit per verbum suum, primo omnium amissum: id verbum filium ejus appellatum in nomine Dei, varie visum Patriarchis, in Prophetis semper auditum, postremo delatum ex Spiritu Patris Dei et virtute in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, et ex ea natum, egisse Jesum Christum, exinde prædicasse novam legem et novam promissionem regni cælorum,

virtutes fecisse, fixum cruci tertia die resurrexisse, in cælos ereptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti, qui credentes agant, venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ et promissorum cælestium fructum, et ad profanos judicandos igni perpetuo, facta utriusque partis resuscitatione cum carnis restitutione. Hæc regula a Christo—instituta nullas habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt.

TERTULL. *de Præscript. ad. Hæret.*



the Father; and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead; from whence also he sent from his Father, according to his promise, the Holy Ghost, the comforter, who sanctifies the faith of those that believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost<sup>68</sup>.”

*Origen.*—“The things which are manifestly handed down by the apostolical preaching, are these;—First, that there is one God, who created and made all things, and caused the whole universe to exist out of nothing; the God of all the just that ever were from the first creation and foundation of all; the God of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Moses, and the prophets: and that this God, in the last days, as he had promised before by his prophets, sent our Lord Jesus Christ, first to call Israel, and then the Gentiles, after the infidelity of his people Israel. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, gave both the law and the prophets, and the gospels, being the God of the Apostles, and of the Old and New Testament.” The next article is, “That Jesus Christ who came into the world, was begotten of the Father before every creature, who ministering to his Father in the creation of all things, (for by him all things were made.) in the last times made himself of no reputation, and became man: he who was God, was made flesh, and when he was man, he continued the same God that he was before. He assumed a body in all things like ours, save only that it was born of a Virgin by the Holy Ghost. And because this Jesus Christ was born and suffered death common to all, in truth, and not only in appearance, he was truly dead; for he rose again truly from the dead, and after his resurrection conversed with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven. They also delivered unto us, that the Holy Ghost was joined in the same honour and

<sup>68</sup> Unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione quam *οἰκονομίαν* dicimus, ut unicus Dei sit et Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil, hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum, hunc passum, hunc

mortuum et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cælo resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos, qui exinde miserat secundum promissionem suam a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. *TER- TULL. adv. Praxeam.*

dignity with the Father and the Son." And he adds some observations concerning the immortality of the soul, future rewards and punishments, and the resurrection of the dead. The entire passage is transcribed in the note<sup>69</sup>.

*Cyprian.*—This author represents the interrogations proposed to a catechumen, as amounting in substance to this:—"Dost thou believe in God the Father, and in Christ his Son, and in the Holy Spirit, in the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life by (or through) the church<sup>70</sup>?" Whence it appears, as Bingham

<sup>69</sup> Unus Deus est, qui omnia creavit, atque composuit, quique ex nullis fecit esse universa, Deus a prima creatura et conditione mundi omnium justorum, Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, &c. Et quod hic Deus in novissimis diebus, sicut per prophetas suos ante promiserat, misit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, primo quidem vocaturum Israel, secundo vero etiam gentes post perfidiam populi Israel. Hic Deus justus et bonus pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, legem et prophetas et evangelia ipse dedit, qui et Apostolorum Deus est, et veteris et novi Testamenti. Tum deinde quia Jesus Christus ipse qui venit, ante omnem creaturam natus ex patre est: qui cum in omnium conditione Patri ministrasset, (per ipsum enim omnia facta sunt,) novissimis temporibus seipsum exinanienti homo factus est, incarnatus est cum Deus esset, et homo mansit quod Deus erat. Corpus assumpsit corpori nostro simile, eo solo differens, quod natum ex Virgine et Spiritu Sancto est, et quoniam hic Jesus Christus natus et passus est in veritate, et non per imaginem, communem hanc mortem vere mortuus est: vere enim a morte resurrexit, et post resurrectionem conversatus cum discipulis suis assumtus est.

Tum deinde honore ac dignitate Patri ac Filio sociatum tradiderunt Spiritum Sanctum, in hoc non jam manifeste discernitur, utrum natus an innatus. Sed inquirenda jam ista pro viribus sunt de sacra scriptura, et sa-

gaci perquisitione investiganda, sane quod iste Spiritus Sanctus unumquemque sanctorum vel prophetarum vel apostolorum inspiravit, et non alius spiritus in veteribus, alius vero in his, qui in adventu Christi inspirati sunt, manifestissime in ecclesiis prædicatur. Post hæc jam, quod anima substantiam, vitamque habens propriam, cum ex hoc mundo discesserit, et pro suis meritis dispensabit, sive vitæ æternæ ac beatitudinis hæreditate potitura, si hoc ei sua gesta præstiterint; sive igne æterno atque suppliciis mancipanda, si in hoc eam seelerum culpa detorsit. Sed et quia erit tempus resurrectionis mortuorum, cum corpus hoc quod in corruptione seminatur, surget in incorruptione, et quod seminatur in ignominia, surget in gloria. ORIGEN. in *Proæm. lib. De Principiis.*—To this may be added, Πιστεύσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, χρὴ δὲ καὶ πιστεύειν ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ παση τῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ἀληθείᾳ: δεῖ καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα πιστεύειν, καὶ ὅτι αὐτεξοίσοι ὄντες κολαζόμεθα μὲν ἐφ' οἷς ἀμαρτάνομεν, τιμώμεθα δὲ ἐφ' οἷς εὐπράττομεν.—ORIGEN. *Comment. in Johan.*

<sup>70</sup> Credis in Deum Patrem, Filium Christum, Spiritum Sanctum, remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam? CYPRIAN *Ep. 76, § 6.*

rightly observes, “that not only the articles of the Trinity, but those others which relate to the church, and the remission of sins, and eternal life, were parts of the creed used *in Cyprian’s time* in all the African churches. And except the descent into hell, and the communion of the saints, which are of later date in the creed than the times of Cyprian or Tertullian, all the other articles are taken notice of by these two primitive writers.” Cyprian was a great asserter of the power of the church; and from his time the ecclesiastical hierarchy made great progress in its pretensions, authority, and wealth.

*Gregory of Neocæsarea* (Thaumaturgus).—“There is one God, the Father of the living Word—the subsisting wisdom and power, the eternal express image of God—who is a perfect begetter of a perfect, a father of an only-begotten Son. And one Lord, one of one, God of God, the character and image of the Godhead, the word of power, the wisdom that comprehends the whole system of the world, the power that made every creature; the true Son of the true Father, invisible of invisible, incorruptible of incorruptible, immortal of immortal, eternal of eternal. And one Holy Ghost, who has his existence from God, who was manifested to men by the Son, the perfect image of the perfect Son, the living cause of all living, the fountain of holiness, essential sanctity, who is the author of holiness in all others; in whom God the Father is manifested, who is above all, and in all, and God the Son, whose power runs through all things [literally, who is through all]. In this Trinity, therefore, there is nothing created or servile, nothing adventitious or extraneous, that did not exist before, but afterwards came into it. The Father was never without the Son, nor the Son without the Spirit, but the Trinity abides the same, unchangeable and invariable for ever<sup>71</sup>.”

<sup>71</sup> Εἰς Θεὸς πατὴρ λόγου ζῶντος, σοφίας ἕφεστώσης, καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ χαρακτήρος αἰδίου, τελείου τελείου γενήτωρ, πατὴρ υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς, εἰς Κύριος, μόνος ἐκ μόνου, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, χαρακτήρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος, λόγος ἐνεργὸς, σοφία τῆς τῶν ὄλων συστάσεως περιεκτικῆ, καὶ δύναμις τῆς ὅλης κτίσεως ποιητικῆ, υἱὸς ἀληθινὸς, ἀληθινοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀράτος ἀοράτου, καὶ ἀφθαρτος ἀφθάρτου, καὶ ἀθάνατος ἀθανάτου, καὶ

αἰδῖος αἰδίου, καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἄγιον, ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχων, καὶ δι’ υἱοῦ πεφηνὸς, δηλαδὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ, τελείου τελεία ζωῆ, ζῶντων αἰτία, πηγὴ ἁγία, ἁγιοῦ, ἁγιασμοῦ χορηγὸς, ἐν ᾧ φανεροῦται Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ Θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὁ διὰ πάντων, τριάς τελεία, δόξη καὶ αἰδιότητι καὶ βασιλεία μὴ μεριζομένη, μηδὲ ἀπαλλοτριουμένη. GREGOR. NEOCÆS.

*Lucian the Martyr*<sup>72</sup>.—“ We believe, according to the tradition of the gospels, and apostles, in one God, the Father, Almighty, creator, and maker, and governor of all things, of whom are all things. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, who is God, by whom are all things, who was begotten of the Father, God of God, whole of whole, one of one, perfect of perfect, king of king, lord of lord, the Word, the wisdom, the life, the true light, the true way, the resurrection, the shepherd, the gate, unchangeable and incommutable, the incommutable image of the divine essence, power, and glory, the first-born of every creature, who was always from the beginning God the Word with God, according to what is said in the gospel,—‘ And the word was God,’—by whom all things were made, and in whom all things subsist, who in the last days descended from on high, and was born of a virgin according to the Scriptures, and being the lamb of God, he was made the mediator between God and men, being fore-ordained to be the author of our faith and life: for he said,—‘ I came not from heaven to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me;’ who suffered and rose again for us the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, which is given to believers for their consolation, and sanctification, and consummation, according to what our Lord Jesus Christ appointed his disciples, saying,—‘ Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ Whence the properties of the Father are manifest, denoting him to be truly a Father, and the properties of the Son, denoting him to be truly a Son, and the properties of the Holy Spirit, denoting him to be truly the Holy Spirit: these names not being put simply, and to no purpose, but to express the particular subsistence, or hypostatic subsistence, as the Greeks term it, of each person named, so as to denote them to be three in hypostasis, and one by consent<sup>73</sup>.” The last words

<sup>72</sup> Lucian was a presbyter of the church of Antioch; contemporary with Gregory of Neocæsarea.

<sup>73</sup> Consequenter evangelicæ et apostolicæ traditioni credimus in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, cunc-

torum quæ sunt redificatorem et factorem et provisorum, ex quo omnia: et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium ipsius unigenitum, Deum per quem omnia, qui generatus est ex Patre, Deum ex Deo, Totum ex Toto,

are directed against the Sabellians, who maintained the three persons of the Holy Trinity to be no more than three names; and were not intended to denote any such division of substance in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as implies a diversity of essence, which was the error of the Arians. See *BULL Defens. Fid. Nic.* sect. ii. c. 13, n. 6.

*Apostolical Constitutions.*—"I believe in, and am baptized into, one unbegotten, the only true God Almighty, the Father of Christ, the creator and maker of all things, of whom are all things: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, the first-born of every creature; who before all ages was begotten, not made, by the good will of the Father; by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible; who in the last times came down from heaven, and taking flesh upon him, was born of the holy Virgin Mary, and lived a holy life according to the laws of God his Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us; and the third day, after he had suffered, rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory in the end of the world to judge both the quick and

Unum ex Uno, Perfectum de Perfecto, Regem de Rege, Dominum de Domino, Verbum, Sapientiam, Vitam, Lumen verum, Viam veram, Resurrectionem, Pastorem, Januam, inconvertibilem et incommutabilem, divinitatis essentialique et virtutis et glorie incommutabilem Imaginem, primum editum totius creature, qui semper fuit in principio apud Deum, Verbum Deus, juxta quod dictum est in Evangelio, "et Deus erat Verbum," per quem omnia facta sunt, et in quo omnia constant, qui in novissimis diebus descendit de summis, et natus est ex Virgine secundum Scripturas, et agnus factus est, Mediator Dei et hominum, predestinatus fidei nostræ et dux vitæ; dixit quippe, "Non enim descendi de cælo, ut facerem voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem ejus qui me misit." Qui passus est, et resurrexit pro nobis tertia die, et ascendit in cælos, et

sedet in dextra patris, et iterum venturus cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos.

Et in Sanctum Spiritum, qui in paraclesin et sanctificationem et consummationem credentibus datus est, juxta quod et Dominus Jesus Christus ordinavit discipulis, dicens, "Pergite et docete universas gentes, baptizantes eas in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." Manifesta ubique Patris, vere Patris, certaque Filii, vere Filii, notaque Spiritus Sancti, vere Spiritus Sancti; hisque nominibus non simpliciter, neque otiosis propositis, sed significantibus diligenter propriam, uniuscujusque nominatorum substantiam et ordinem et gloriam, ut sint quidem per substantiam tria, per consonantiam vero unum (Gr. τῆ ὑποστάσει τρία, τῆ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν).

HILAR. *de Synodis.*

the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I am baptized into the Holy Ghost, the comforter, who wrought effectually in all the saints from the beginning of the world, and was afterwards sent to the apostles by the Father, according to the promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and after the apostles to all others, who in the holy catholic church believe the resurrection of the flesh, the remission of sins, the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come<sup>4</sup>." It is observable that the title "unbegotten" is carefully restricted to God the Father; the author of the *Constitutions* elsewhere appropriately styles the Son "the only-begotten God."

*Creed of Jerusalem.*—"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, the true God, begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom all things were made; who was incarnate and made man, who was crucified and buried, and the third day he rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and shall come in glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end: and in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who spake by the

<sup>74</sup> Πιστεύω, καὶ βαπτίζομαι, εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον, μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, παντοκράτορα, τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν πάντων, ἔξ οὗ τὰ πάντα· καὶ εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ υἱὸν, τὸν πρωτότοκον πίστεως κτίσεως, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων εὐδοκία τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, [οὐ κτισθέντα, *Deest in al.*] δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, ὁρατὰ τε καὶ ἀράτα, τὸν ἐπ' ἑσχάτων ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἐξ οὐρανῶν, καὶ σάρκα ἀλαβόντα, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου Μαρίας γεννηθέντα, καὶ πολιτευσάμενον ὁσῶς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἀποθανόντα ἰπὲρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεσθῆναι ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ συντε-

λείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μετὰ δόξης κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος· βαπτίζομαι καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τοὔτεστι τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ ἐνεργῆσαν ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἁγίοις, ὕστερον δὲ ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μελλοῦτος αἰῶνος. *Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 41.*—This is the profession of Christian faith, or, as it is entitled, *συνταγὴ πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which was to be made, according to the *Constitutions*, by the Catechumens after their renunciation of the devil and his works (*ἀποταγὴ πρὸς τὸν ἐναντίον*).

prophets: and in one baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins: and in one holy Catholic Church: and in the resurrection of the flesh: and in life everlasting<sup>75</sup>.”

*Creed of Cæsarea in Palestine.*—“ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom all things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and conversed among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended unto the Father, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Spirit<sup>76</sup>.” It is added, “believing every one of these to be and exist. We confess the Father to be truly a Father, the Son truly a Son, the Holy Spirit truly a Holy Spirit, according to what our Lord, when he sent his disciples to preach, said, ‘Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’” This creed Eusebius declares that he received from the bishops who were before him, both when he was catechised, or instructed in the first principles of the faith, and when he was baptized.

<sup>75</sup> Ἡ ἀγία καὶ ἀποστολικὴ πίστις, εἰς ἐπαγγελίαν τοῖς φωτιζομένοις παραδοθεῖσα.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορι, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων· δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· ἐν σαρκὶ παραγενόμενον, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα [ἐκ παρθένου καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου]· σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα· ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς· καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ, κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς ἕν Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις· καὶ εἰς ἕν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Καὶ εἰς μίαν ἀγίαν καθολικὴν

ἐκκλησίαν. Καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν. Καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—*Symbolum Nicenosolytanum, ex variis Cyrillianarum Catecheseon locis collectum; ad calc. Catech. 5, Ed. Bened. Paris, 1720.*

<sup>76</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα. τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἕξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς. Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἕν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. EUSEB. *Epist. ad Ecclesiam Cæsar. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 8.*

*Creed presented by Arius to Constantine*, after his recall from exile, designed as a proof of his orthodoxy.—“ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty. And in Jesus Christ, his Son, our Lord, God the Word, begotten of him before all ages; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and in earth; who came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost; and in the resurrection of the flesh; and in the life of the world to come; and in the kingdom of heaven; and in one Catholic Church of God extended from one end of the earth to the other<sup>77</sup>.” Socrates records this creed as one which was composed by Arius and Euzoios; and represents them as adding that they had derived it from the Gospels, alluding especially to the prescribed form of baptism. They then *professed* to receive the doctrine of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as the whole catholic church received it, and as the Scriptures teach; and they drew up this creed in proof of their affirmation.

*Creed of Antioch*.—“ I believe in one only true God, the Father Almighty, maker of all creatures visible and invisible. And in Jesus Christ our Lord, his only-begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, born of him before all ages, and not made, very God of very God, consubstantial with the Father; by whom the world was framed, and all things made; who for our sakes came, and was born of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried, and the third day rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the living and the dead<sup>78</sup>.”

<sup>77</sup> Ἱστυέομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ εἰς Κίριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰῶνων γεγεννημένον Θεὸν λόγον, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα, καὶ ἀνεληλθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνίστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος

αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων. SOCRATES. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 26.

<sup>78</sup> Textum ergo et fides Antiocheni Symboli hæc est. Credo in unum et solum rerum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium creaturarum. Et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unigenitum, et primogenitum totius creaturæ, ex eo natum ante omnia



*The Roman Creed* is that commonly called the Apostles' Creed.—“I believe in God, the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord; who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the holy church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh. Amen<sup>79</sup>.” For full particulars respecting this venerable confession of our faith, the reader must be referred to the learned and well-known exposition of Bishop Pearson.

*Creed of Aquileia*.—“I believe in God the Father, Almighty, invisible and impassible. And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; he descended into hell, and the third day rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of this flesh<sup>80</sup>.” “The descent into hell,” says Bingham, “is almost peculiar to this creed; for, excepting this and the creed of Sirmium or Ariminum, mentioned by Soerates (lib. ii. cap. 37), this article was not expressly mentioned in any other creed of this age; though Rufinus thinks it was always implied in the word ‘buried,’ which he reckons of the same importance. When it first came into the Roman creed,

sæcula, et non factum, Deum verum ex Deo vero, Homoousion Patri, per quem et sæcula compaginata sunt et omnia facta. Qui propter nos venit et natus est ex Maria Virgine, et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus, et tertia die resurrexit secundum Scripturas, et in caelos ascendit, et iterum veniet judicare vivos et mortuos. CASIAN. *de Incarnat.* lib. 6.

<sup>79</sup> This creed in Latin closely resembles that of Aquileia, reported by Rufin, and quoted in the next note.

<sup>80</sup> Credo in Deum Patrem, Omnipoten-

tem, Invisibilem, et Impassibilem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus, descendit ad inferna. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dextram Patris, inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. RUFIN. *Expos. Symboli.*

the reader may find a particular account in Bishop Pearson, who speaks of it as being done about the year 600." The article "life everlasting" was supposed to be implied in that with which the creeds of Rome and Aquileia conclude, namely, "the resurrection of the flesh<sup>81</sup>."

*Nicene Creed.*—1. *As it was first published by the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325.*—"We believe in one God Almighty, maker of all things, visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance with the Father; by whom all things both in heaven and earth were made; who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and made man, and suffered, and the third day rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. As for those who say there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that he did not exist before he was made, or that he was made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence, or that he is created or mutable,—the catholic and apostolic church anathematizes them<sup>82</sup>."

2. *As completed by the second general Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381.*—The council of Nicæa rehearsed and expounded only so much of the former creeds as bore upon the questions

<sup>81</sup> In symbolo Fidei—post confessionem Trinitatis et unitatem Ecclesie, omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur. ΠΙΕΡΟΝ. *Ep. 61 ad Pammach.*—Qua corporis resurrectione facta a temporis conditione liberali, æterna vita ineffabili charitate et stabilitate sine corruptione perfruemur. AUGUST, *de Fide et Symbolo.*

<sup>82</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, μονογενῆ· τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν

ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὸ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ γῆ· δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα, καὶ ἀνασταίνοντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Τοῖς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν· καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο· ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ἰσοστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι· ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἀγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

then under debate, in connexion with Arian doctrines; "leaving the rest," says Bingham, "to be supplied from the former creeds then generally received in the church." The creed which received the sanction of the second general council of Constantinople, was the same as the Nicene, with the addition of such other articles as were always used by the church in the interrogatories of baptism; and is as follows:—"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of his Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who, for us men and our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life; who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And we believe one Catholic and apostolic church; I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come<sup>83</sup>." This is the confession of faith which has been admitted into our liturgy, under the name

<sup>83</sup> Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὄρατων τε πάντων καὶ ἀόρατων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπή-

σαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν

of the Nicene creed, but with the addition of "and the Son," after the words "who proceedeth from the Father;" an addition made by the Latin church. The first copies of this creed, in the council of Constantinople, and the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, have only the words "proceeding from the Father" (*ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*), without any mention of the Son: but in the Latin councils the word *Filioque* is added; as in the first council of Bracara (A.D. 411), and the third council of Toledo (A.D. 589), where the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan creed is recited.

The Nicene creed was generally used by the Eastern churches in the administration of baptism, from the time of its publication. It was inserted in the daily service of the Oriental churches about the middle of the fifth century. It appears to have been partially introduced into the daily service of the Western churches about the latter end of the sixth century; but this use of it was not fully admitted into the Roman church until the year 1014; when, to use the words of Lupus quoted by Bingham, the Roman church, since she could not bring over the French and Spanish churches to her own way, resolved at last to comply with their custom, that there might be no disagreement between them.

---

*Athanasian Creed.*—It is now generally agreed that the creed once ascribed to Athanasius, and which some even of our own old divines believed to be his<sup>64</sup>, is the production of some later writer. It is assigned, for the most part, to either the fifth or the sixth century; but it was not generally admitted into the offices of the Roman church until the year 930. As a composition, therefore, this creed does not on any account claim a place in a list of ancient confessions; but as its presence in the liturgy of our own church makes it an object of interest, it appears necessary to take some notice of it here; of course, in a purely *historical or critical* point of view<sup>65</sup>.

The reasons which have been adduced for not regarding

βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν προσδοκῶμεν ὑπόστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωῆν τοῦ μελλούτος αἰῶνος. Ἄμην.

<sup>64</sup> Hooker, for example; *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book 5.

<sup>65</sup> A confession of faith, really con-

Athanasius as the author of this creed are abundant and decisive<sup>66</sup>. Among them are the following:—None of the contemporaries of Athanasius, nor any writer of the following century, attributed it to him. It is not found in the earliest and best manuscript copies of his works. The contents also plainly prove that it could not have been written by him. It was originally composed in Latin,—a language in which Athanasius did not write, and with which it is possible that he was, at most, very imperfectly acquainted. The word *ὁμοούσιος*, *consubstantial*, which in the time of Athanasius was the token of distinction between the Catholics and Arians, in their disputes respecting the divine nature, and which was eagerly defended and recommended by Athanasius himself, does not occur in this creed;—an omission which would be most extraordinary, and can hardly be supposed possible, in any confession of this kind really composed by that father. On the other hand, some expressions do occur in this creed, evidently relating to the Nestorian and Eutychian errors, which did not arise until some time after the death of Athanasius. The doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, (commonly called the doctrine of the double procession,) distinctly asserted in this creed, is one which, however scriptural and true, was not held by the Eastern church in the time of Athanasius. Besides all this, it is well known that Athanasius and other Catholics of his day strongly insisted upon the propriety of introducing no other articles of faith whatever after, or in addition to, those of the Nicene creed, relating to the same subject. No mention of the so-called Athanasian creed is found in any author of earlier date than the seventh century; and then it is mentioned by writers of the Latin church. A Greek translation was made several centuries afterwards, and received various alterations and additions from different hands; but the creed has never been admitted by the Greek church.

posed by Athanasius, is prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works; and has been inserted by Dr. Routh, at the end of his *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula*, vol. ii.

observations on the Athanasian creed, I am indebted to SCHROECKER'S *Kirchengeschichte, Zweiter Zeitraum, Drittes Buch*:—vol. xii. pp. 143—146, Leipzig, 1788.

<sup>66</sup> For the substance of the following

This confession, however, was published and received as the work of Athanasius; and under the sanction of his name it gained great currency and respect in the Western church. Its general reception, and its own merits, as containing a luminous statement of the great Christian doctrine concerning the holy and ever blessed Trinity in Unity, have naturally led to many investigations and opinions respecting its real origin and author. But while critics have at length universally agreed in refusing to ascribe it to Athanasius, they have been unable to ascertain with precision from whose pen it really did proceed. Various writers have been named, with more or less confidence, as having a claim to the honour of having given this composition to the church. G. J. Vossius (*Dissertat. de Tribus Symbolis*, p. 37—55; *Ams-terd.* 1642) led the way in the critical investigation of this subject; and succeeded in overthrowing the conjecture or fiction of Baronius, by which it had been pretended that this creed was presented by Athanasius to the Roman bishop Julius. Afterwards it was maintained, with great appearance of probability, by Quesnel (*Dissert. xiv. in Leonis M. opera*), that the real author of the creed was Vigilius, bishop of Thapsus in Africa, who may have written it towards the end of the fifth century, or a little later. That bishop certainly wrote several controversial pieces against heretics, under the borrowed name of earlier Fathers, and (probably) of Athanasius among others; he contended earnestly against the Arians and Eutychians, against whose errors this creed in various places is especially directed; and he lived in an age and country which made it perhaps necessary to conceal his name, from the fear of persecution. Many critics have been induced by these arguments to ascribe the creed in question to Vigilius; but it must be admitted that the proof is far from complete, and that, in fact, it warrants no more than a conjecture. Joseph Antelmy (in *Nova de Symbolo Athanas. Disquisit. Paris*, 1693) took great pains to prove that Vincentius of Lerins, a celebrated monk who flourished in Gaul about the middle of the fifth century, was the real author of the disputed formulary. Montfaucon, who soon afterwards published a learned treatise on this creed, although not entirely satisfied with the proofs offered in support of this opinion, was, however,

inclined to adopt it. Tillemont (*Mémoires*, tome viii. note 34, *sur St. Athanas.* p. 667), after a careful investigation of the various proofs and arguments which had been adduced, declared it as his opinion, that the claims of the different writers were equally supported, and that it was impossible to decide positively in favour of either Vigilius or Vincentius. Muratori, who edited one of the earliest manuscript copies of the creed, and appended to it an exposition which was attributed to Venantius Fortunatus, a French bishop of the sixth century (in *Anecdotes Latinis*, tom. ii. p. 212—217), maintained in a separate Dissertation, that the said bishop was the author of the creed itself. (*Dissert. de Auctore Symboli Quicunque*, p. 217—231.) Lastly, a celebrated divine of our own church, Dr. Waterland, composed an elaborate Treatise on this subject (first published at Cambridge in the year 1724, and again with additions in 1788), in which he endeavoured to prove that the creed in question was really composed by Hilary, bishop of Arles, in France, about the middle of the fifth century; but, like the writers before mentioned, he was unable to adduce any clear and positive proofs in support of his opinion. (WATERLAND, *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed.*)

It is likely, therefore, that the true author of this creed will always remain unknown. All that we know concerning it amounts to this;—that the creed is not the work of Athanasius, although published, and for a long time received, under his name; but that it proceeded from the pen of some writer of the Western church, who flourished probably about the fifth or sixth century, but whose name cannot be ascertained.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### OF BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION.

#### § 1.—VARIOUS NAMES OR APPELLATIONS OF BAPTISM.

“OF the ancient names of baptism,” says Bingham, “some were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others from

the nature and substance of the action; others from the conditions required in the receivers; others from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration." (*Antiquities*, book xi., chap. i, sect. 1.)

1. The common appellation, baptism (*ὁ βαπτισμός, τὸ βάπτισμα*), is drawn from the nature of the action. According to its etymology, it denotes immersion under water; and the choice of this term was doubtless made at a period when the modern practice of sprinkling had not been introduced. In the Old Testament, the words *בָּטַט*, tingo, immergo, Exod. xii. 22, 2 Kings v. 14; and *טָבַע*, submergor, Psalm xix. 16, lxxix. 3, Jerem. xxxviii. 6; *טָבַע*, Chald., tingo, to steep in dye, Dan. iv. 30, v. 23; and other such words, which contain the idea of submersion. In the New Testament, *βάπτω* is used three times, and *βαπτίζω* about thirty times, in the same signification.

2. The laver, or laver of regeneration; with reference to Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5.

3. The water of life; *Dialog. Justin. M.*

4. The fountain, or well (whence the English word *font*); with reference to Isaiah xii. 3; Rev. iv. 7, 17; xxi. 16.

5. The anointing; because the ceremony of confirmation was at first immediately connected with it.

6. The seal; with allusion, perhaps, to Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; John iii. 33; vi. 27; Acts iv. 27; x. 38; 1 Cor. vi. 11; and especially 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. This use of the word is taken from the circumstance, that the stamp or impression of a seal upon anything was regarded as a mark of property, or a token that it belonged to a certain owner,—namely, the person whose seal it bore. Thus Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* 40) calls baptism the seal and sign of sovereignty, or the token that the baptized person was subject to the dominion and governance of God, and lived to obey his will. (TERTULL. *Apolog.* c. 21; *De Spectac.* iv. 24; HERMLE *Past.* lib. iii. simil. 9; *Constit. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 14; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 23; CYRILL. *HEROSOL. Catech.* i. 3; xvii. 35.)

7. Light, or illumination (*φωτισμός, φώτισμα*, sometimes *τὸ φῶς*; *illuminatio*; *sacramentum illuminationis*, or *illustra-*



tionis, lux mentis, oculorum, &c.); on account of the instruction in the Christian religion which was given to the candidates for baptism before they were admitted to the sacred ordinance.

8. The following terms (which are of frequent occurrence) apply to baptism considered as a sacrament, or sacred mystery, and as part of the system of secret instruction:—*μυστηρίον* (arcanum sacramentum); *τελείωσις*, or *τελετή* (perfectio, completion of preparatory instruction); *μύησις* (initiatio); *μυσταγωγία* (introduction to the mysteries); *σύμβολον* (tessera, mark of hospitality, passport); *σύμβολον σωτηριώδες*, or *τῆς σωτηρίας*, and *σύμβολον τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ* (token of salvation or sanctification). When the practice of infant-baptism had generally obtained, these appellations were still retained, but in a metaphysical sense; baptism being regarded as an admission into the covenant of grace.

9. Many other terms were applied to baptism, descriptive of its end or efficacy. Among these the following are of the most frequent occurrence.

i. *Indulgentia, sacramentum indulgentiæ, divina indulgentia*; because remission of sins was connected with this ordinance.

ii. *Absolutio, or sacramentum absolutionis et remissionis peccatorum* (AUGUSTIN. *De Baptism.* lib. v. c. 21); for the same reason.

iii. *Mors peccatorum* (in Tertullian, Cyprian, and other writers); with allusion to the doctrine conveyed in Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12.

iv. *Gratia* (*χάρις, χάρισμα*), and *donum gratiæ*; baptism being regarded as a pledge of the forgiveness of sins, and the grace of God.

v. *Δῶρον*, *donum*, the gift. (GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; conf. BASIL. M. *Hom.* 13, *de Baptism.*)

vi. *Φυλακτήριον*; baptism being regarded as a preservative against the artifices and power of evil spirits.

viii. *Ἐφόδιον*, *viaticum*; *i. e.*, the necessary provision for the journey of life.

viii. *Παλιγγενεσία* (*regeneratio*), *nativitas spiritualis*; because when any one becomes a Christian, he enters upon a real and new spiritual life.

ix. *Σωτηρία* (*salus, salvation*); *Vita, life*; *Virtutum via, the way to virtue*; *Ὁχημα πρὸς Θεὸν, conveyance to God*; *Ἐἴσοδος τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου, entrance upon eternal life*; *Ἀρχὴ ἑτέρου βίου, beginning of another life*; *Ἰιοθεσία, adoption of sons*; *Ἐνδυμα ἀφθαρσίας, putting on of immortality*; *Cœlestis regni comparatio, attainment of the kingdom of heaven*; *Sacramentum novæ vitæ, sacrament of a new life*; *Innocentiæ portus, gate of innocence*; *lavacrum natalis novi, laver of the new birth.*

x. Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, and other writers, gave to this sacrament the name of circumcision, or the great circumcision, as having succeeded to circumcision properly so called, or having been prefigured by the Jewish ordinance. The analogy between these two ordinances is noted in the New Testament; and was frequently referred to by the apostolical fathers.

Ecclesiastical writers frequently bring together many various names and epithets of baptism in their descriptions of the nature and efficacy of the sacrament. (CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* lib. i. c. 6; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Procatech.* sect. 16; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; OPTAT. MILEV. *de Schism. Don.* lib. v.)

## § 2.—PERSONS BAPTIZED.

THE general adoption of the practice of infant-baptism has so far affected the regulations of the church concerning the qualifications and admission of candidates for this sacred ordinance, that what was formerly the rule in these respects has become the exception. The institutions of the church during the first five centuries concerning the preparations for baptism, and all the laws and rules which existed during that period relating to the acceptance or rejection of candidates, necessarily fell into disuse when the baptism of infants was not only permitted, but enjoined as a duty, and almost universally observed. The old rule which prescribed caution in the admission of candidates, and a careful preparation for the rite, was applicable for the most part only to Jewish, heathen, and other proselytes, after the sixth century. In modern practice, all the discipline which was formerly connected with baptism belongs to the rite of confirmation.

It appears, by the testimony of the earliest Christian writers

that the church at first regarded all persons, without any restriction as to nation, sex, or age, as capable of baptism. And it is evident that children were not excluded from a participation in this rite, from a celebrated passage of Irenæus<sup>1</sup>, as well as from allusions to the prevailing practice of the church in the writings of Tertullian (who disapproved of infant-baptism) and Cyprian, as well as from the controversy which arose on the subject in the African church. But, although from a very early period high notions were entertained respecting the supernatural powers and efficacy of baptism, and this sacrament was supposed to imprint an indelible character upon the soul, the church did not lose sight of its moral tendency and virtue, or cease to regard it as an important branch of discipline. And, accordingly, the standing rule of baptizing all applicants was subject to certain limitations and exceptions. Such were the following :—

It was enacted, that none but the living should be baptized :—a law which intimates that a practice of baptizing the dead must have been, more or less, extensively introduced. Such a practice indeed existed in the African church in the fourth century, as appears from a prohibition of the third Council of Carthage, (can. 5,) A. D. 397. Philastrius (*de Hæres.* c. 2) says, that the Cataphrygians or Montanists were in the habit of baptizing the dead ; but, if this be true, it must relate only to the Hyper-Montanists, for we know that it would not have been tolerated by Tertullian. It appears that this superstitious practice was not unknown in other countries. (GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40, *de Bapt.*)

To this practice may be referred also the vicarious baptism

<sup>1</sup> Magister ergo existens magistri quoque habebat ætatem, non reprobandus nec supergrediens hominem : neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis, sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam, quæ ad ipsam erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renascentur in Deum, infantes et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem et infantibus infans factus est, sanc-

tificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiæ et subjectionis. Sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed secundum ætatem sanctificans simul et seniores exemplum ipsis quoque fiens ; deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenita ex mortuis. IRENÆUS *Adv. Hæres.* lib. ii, c. 22.

of the living for the dead, which obtained among various sects, especially the Marcionites, and was severely reprov'd by many of the Fathers. Tertullian speaks of it as a vain practice, introduced in imitation of a heathen rite. (*Adv. Marcion.* lib. v. c. 10.) The practice of the Marcionites, in this particular, is thus represented by Chrysostom (*Hom.* 40, in 1 Cor.):—"When a Catechumen dies, they conceal a living person under the bed of the departed. Then they stand before the bed, and ask the dead person whether or not he is willing to be baptized? Instead of the dead, who is unable to answer, the person under the bed replies in the affirmative. Hereupon they baptize him instead of the deceased; and thus make quite a farce of the whole matter. Such power has Satan over the minds of foolish men! And if you complain of this transaction, they appeal to the words of the apostle Paul, who speaks of being 'baptized for the dead.' (1 Cor. xv. 29.)" The author then proceeds to show that this passage does not sanction the practice of which he complains. Epiphanius also (*Hæres.* xxviii. c. 6) alludes to the same subject, and explains the expression of St. Paul as containing reference to the practice of baptizing any Catechumens who may be near death, without waiting for the completion of their term of probation and preparation. Theodoret and other writers agree in this interpretation.

There is no trace of a custom of administering baptism to the offspring of imperfect or monstrous births, in the early church; the first prohibition on this subject is as late as the thirteenth century. (*Concil. Colon.* A. D. 1281, c. 4; *Conc. Leod.* A. D. 1287, c. 2; *Conc. Trêvir.* A. D. 1310, c. 114.)

It was a matter of debate in the ancient church, whether or not baptism ought to be administered to persons possessed with evil spirits, idiots, and the like. The rule which obtained in this case appears to have excluded such persons from baptism until they were healed of their malady, although, in the mean time they were allowed to attend the preaching of the word and public prayers, under the superintendence of the exorcists, and were ranked in the first class of catechumens. Cyprian (*Ep.* 69, *Ad. Magn.*) gave it as his opinion, that baptism availed to the expulsion of evil spirits; but he appears not to have sanctioned

the administration of the rite, except in the case of sickness or great bodily weakness. Almost all ancient regulations on this subject permitted baptism to take place at the approach of death. (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 32; *Conc. Illiber.* A. D. 305, c. 37; *Conc. Araus.* 1, A. D. 441, c. 15.)

But the strongest proof of the fact that Energumens were sometimes baptized lies in the circumstance that we read of instances in which they were admitted to partake of the Lord's supper. (TIMOTH. ALEX. *Respons.* c. 3; CASSIAN. *Collat.* lib. vii. c. 30.)

A question arose also concerning the baptism of the dumb. This was usually decided in the affirmative; the principles which applied to the baptism of infants and the sick being supposed to apply to this case. Assent to the usual interrogations was either given by signs from the dumb person himself, or in the words of others on his behalf<sup>2</sup>.

Compulsory baptism was not countenanced by the early church<sup>3</sup>, although it was afterwards practised to a considerable extent during the middle ages. GREGOR. TURON. (*Hist. Franc.* lib. vi. c. 17; CAROLI MAGNI *Capitul.* 3, A. D. 769.) The Emperor Constantine did indeed compel his soldiers to receive baptism; and this transaction is mentioned by Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 3), with some degree of approbation. But the practice does not appear to have become by any means prevalent before the sixth or seventh century. Augustin (*De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, c. 22) speaks with approbation of the custom of baptizing the children of heathen parents, whenever opportunity might occur, and in what manner soever, by divine providence, the means of conferring this benefit may have been given to believers.

<sup>2</sup> Subito obmutescens, prout status ejus est, baptizari aut pœnitentiam etiã accipere potest, si voluntatis præteritæ testimonium aliorum verbis habet, aut presentis in suo nutu. *Conc. Araus.* A. D. 441, can. 12.

<sup>3</sup> De Judæis præcipit sancta synodus, nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre. Cui enim vult Deus, miseretur, et quem vult, indurat. Non enim

tales inviti salvendi sunt, sed volentes, ut integra sit forma justitiæ. Sicut enim homo proprii arbitrii voluntate serpenti obediens periit, sic vocante gratia Dei, propriæ mentis conversione homo quisque credendo salvatur. Ergo non vi, sed liberi arbitrii facultate, ut convertantur, suadendi sunt, non potius impellendi. *Conc. Toletan.* 4, A. D. 633, can. 56.

It was enacted, as early as the fourth century, that baptism should be administered in cases where any doubt might exist as to the fact of its having been previously administered. And this regulation was continued and confirmed at later periods. (*Conc. Carthag.* 4, A. D. 398—99, can. 6; LEO MAG. *Ep.* 90, 92, *ad Rustic.* c. 16; GREGOR. II., *Ep.* 1, *ad Bonif.*; *Conc. Worm.* A. D. 868, c. 70; *Conc. Londin.* A. D. 1200, c. 3.)

In general, the early church was so far averse from anything like compulsion in the administration of baptism, that the free will and consent, or rather the request or petition, of the recipients was required as a condition on their parts. Hence, the name *Competentes* was applied to catechumens and candidates for baptism. In the case of infants, the consent and request of their parents or relatives was regarded as their own, until they arrived at years of discretion, when an opportunity was afforded them of confirming their covenant by a voluntary act.

Certain classes of persons were excluded by the ancient church from the privilege of baptism. Such were—

1. Artists or others, who made images of idols, or manufactured any other articles for the purposes of superstition, or heathen worship. (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 32; TERTULL. *De Idololat.* c. 11; *De Spectac.* c. 22; *adr. Hermoq.* c. 7.)

2. Stage-players, and all persons whose services were hired for public amusements. (*Conc. Illiber.* c. 62; *Conc. Carthag.* 3; c. 35; TERTULL. *De Spectac.* c. 22; *Conf.* CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 61, AUGUSTIN. *De Cir. Dei.* ii. 14.)

3. Other persons who were addicted to theatrical exhibitions, hunting, racing, wrestling, and other diversions of that kind. This prohibition is found only in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the writings of Tertullian.

4. Gladiators, wrestlers, and others of the like professions. (*Const. Apost.* 8, c. 32; *Conc. Arelat.* 1, c. 4; HERON. *Vit. Hilar.* c. 13.)

5. Astrologers, augurs, diviners, conjurers, and others who made a trade of superstitious pretensions or practices. (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 36; *Conc. Trull.* c. 61; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 13, *in Ep. ad Ephes.*; *Hom.* 8, *in Ep. ad Coloss.*; *Hom.* 6, *adr. Jud.*; BASIL. M. *in Ps.* 47.)

6. Courtesans, dancers, public singers, or musicians; persons who were guilty of concubinage or polygamy were sometimes excluded. (*Const. Apost.* 8, 32; *Conc. Tolet.* 1, c. 17.)

7. It has been asserted, on the authority of the twelfth canon of the Nicene Council, that soldiers were not admitted to baptism in the early church. But Grotius and others have sufficiently shown, that this regulation extended only to particular cases, and to those soldiers in the army of Licinius who apostatized to idolatry. The *Apostolical Constitutions* mention only the exclusion of such soldiers as may have been guilty of unjust violence, robbery, or the like crimes.

All these persons were denied the privilege of baptism as long as they should continue to follow those occupations, or modes of life, against which the rules were directed. But they were admissible, in the same way as others, upon a renunciation of the prescribed pursuits, (*Conc. Illiber.* c. 62; *Conc. Carthag.* 3, 35;) that is to say, they could be received as catechumens or probationary candidates. The term of the catechumenate, as fixed in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, was three years; but this term was shortened in cases of necessity, or upon urgent occasions.

The reason of these prohibitions lay in the immoral, and even idolatrous, tendency of the practices which they tended to denounce. With respect to the actors in public games and theatres, the church was scarcely more severe than the Roman laws; although the evils to which they ministered were more directly opposed to the laws and spirit of the Gospel than to any civil constitution. "Tertullian observes," says Bingham, "that they who professed these arts were noted with infamy, degraded and denied many privileges, driven from court, from pleading, from the senate, from the order of knighthood, and all other honours in the Roman city and commonwealth. (*De Spectac.* c. 22.) Which is also confirmed by St. Austin, who says, that no actor was ever allowed to enjoy the freedom or any other honourable privilege of a citizen of Rome. (*De Civ. Dei.* lib. ii. c. 14.) Therefore since this was so infamous and scandalous a trade even among the heathen, it is no wonder that the church would admit none of this calling to baptism, without obliging

them first to bid adieu to so ignominious a profession. To have done otherwise, would have been to expose herself to reproach, and to have given occasion to the adversary to blaspheme; if men of such lewd and profligate practices had been admitted to the privileges of the church, who were excluded from the liberties of the city and the honours of the commonwealth. The learned Hieronymus Mercurialis, in his discourse *De Arte Gymnastica*, (lib. i. cap. 3, p. 12.) observes, that ‘the several sorts of heathen games and plays were instituted upon a religious account, in honour of the gods; and men thought they were doing a grateful thing to them, whilst they were engaged in such exercises.’ Therefore a Christian could not be present at them as a spectator, without partaking in some measure of the idolatry of them. Besides, there was a great deal of barbarity and cruelty, as well as lewdness and profaneness, committed in many of them, which it did not become a Christian eye to behold with pleasure and approbation. . . . For these reasons the ancient canons and fathers are so severe in their invectives against all theatrical exercises, not only in the actors, but also in the spectators, declaring them to be incompatible with the piety and purity of a Christian life. And upon this account men were obliged to renounce them before they could be admitted to baptism.” (*Antiq.* book xi. chap. 5, § 6, 9.)

In the case of infant baptism, those who were disqualified for the reception of the rite in their own persons were not admitted as sponsors.

### § 3.—MINISTERS OF BAPTISM.

NOTWITHSTANDING the importance which has always been attached to baptism, as the rite of admission to the Christian church, the performance of this rite has not been made the peculiar office of any minister in the church. It was indeed the special office of John, the forerunner of our Lord, to baptize; he baptized as a messenger preparing the way of the Lord; but when the Messiah had himself entered on his public ministry, John declared that his mission had come to an end. (John iii. 30.)

Our Lord received baptism at the hands of John, declaring



that it became him thus to fulfil all righteousness. He afterwards appointed the same rite as the mode of admission into the Christian church; but we are expressly told, that he "himself baptized not, but his disciples." (John iv. 2.) A tradition exists, in opposition to this statement, that our Saviour baptized St. Peter, and that Peter, having baptized Andrew, James, and John, those disciples administered the holy rite to the others; but this tradition, although admitted by some Roman Catholic writers, rests upon no good foundation. It is recorded in a spurious work, attributed to Clement of Alexandria, (*Hypotyposis*. lib. v.,) and is mentioned on the authority of Evodius in Nicephorus. (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 3.)

In some cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament, we find that the rite was performed under the sanction, and by the immediate order, of the apostles. But it is remarkable that we have no account of the administration of baptism by an apostle. Even on occasion of the baptism of nearly three thousand converts at once, recorded in the second chapter of the Acts, no intimation is given that the apostle who was present officiated; while, on the contrary, it is highly improbable that the ceremony was performed by any one individual. And in the history of the baptism of Cornelius and his family, it is observable that St. Peter did not himself baptize the new converts, but only gave orders for the performance of the rite. He "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." (Acts x. 48.)

In the first epistle to the Corinthians (i. 13—17), St. Paul expressly describes the administration of baptism as a subordinate office in the church. The distinction which the apostle draws in that chapter between the works of preaching and baptizing appears also in the practice of the apostle Peter in the chapter just quoted. If we compare verses 36 and 48, we find that the former represents St. Peter as more immediately concerned with the work of "preaching peace by Jesus Christ;" while, as has been already observed, he assigned to others the task of baptizing in the name of the Lord. Perhaps St. Paul had this circumstance in his mind while he was writing to the Corinthians; a supposition which is in some degree borne out by the previous reference to St. Peter, in 1 Cor. i. 12.

On the whole, we learn from the New Testament the following particulars:—1. That our Lord did not himself baptize, but that he intrusted his apostles and disciples with the administration of this rite. 2. That the apostles, although they administered baptism sometimes, did not however do this always, or regularly, but committed the office to others. 3. It cannot be determined whether other persons, either ministers or laymen, were allowed to baptize without a special commission. 4. Philip the deacon baptized in Samaria men and women, Simon Magus, and the Ethiopian eunuch, (Acts viii. 12, 13, 38,) without having received any special commission, so far, at least, as appears in the history. He appears therefore to have received his authority to baptize, at the ordination recorded in Acts vi. 3—7.

Justin Martyr, in his description of baptism, says nothing concerning the persons by whom the rite was performed. But in speaking of the Lord's supper immediately afterwards, he expressly ascribes the administration of this sacrament, as well as the exposition of Holy Scripture, to the president of the brethren, or the bishop. And hence it appears probable, to say the least, that in his time baptism was not administered by the chief officer of the church.

But we learn by repeated testimonies, that after the second century the bishop was regarded as the regular minister of baptism. In an epistle of Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.*) we find it laid down as a maxim, that it was not lawful either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper, without the bishop (*χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*); an expression which implies, at least, the necessity of the bishop's sanction. Tertullian (*De Bapt.* c. 17) says expressly that the right of administering baptism is vested in the bishop, and then, by his permission, in the presbyters and deacons. His words are, "Baptismum dandi habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, no tamen sine episcopi autoritate propter ecclesie honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est." He adds, "Alioquin etiam laicis jus est," but advises that this power should be executed with a certain degree of modesty and reserve, and only in cases of necessity. But women could not be permitted to baptize. In the *Apostolical*

*Constitutions* (lib. iii. c. 11) the right of administering baptism is denied to readers, singers, and other inferior officers of the church, and is accorded "only to bishops and presbyters, the deacons assisting them" (μόνοις ἐπισκόποις, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, ἐξυπηρετουμένων αὐτοῖς τῶν διακόνων); bishops and presbyters being in this passage placed on an equality, and the deacons regarded as inferior to the higher order. Other testimonies on this subject may be found in the note below<sup>4</sup>. After the sixth century, the presbyter was considered the ordinary minister of baptism. We have no genuine record of the administration of this office by monks before the latter part of the eleventh century.

Justin Martyr. (*Apol.* 1, c. 61) speaks of a certain preparation for the administration, as well as for the reception, of baptism; the prayers and fasting of the officiating minister being represented as concurrent with the same exercises on the part of the candidates. The clergy may, perhaps, have made the same preparation for the solemn and public administration of baptism as for the celebration of the Lord's supper.

We find no express injunction in any early documents concerning the vestment of the minister officiating at baptism; but it appears to be presupposed that he was clothed in white (*HIERON. adv. Pelag.* lib. i.), as the candidates themselves were.

There can be no doubt that lay-baptism was treated as valid by the laws and practice of the early church; but it is equally certain that this practice was only permitted, as an exception to the general rule, in cases of emergency.

<sup>4</sup> Sine episcopi jussione neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habet baptizandi, quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogat, scimus etiam laicis licere. *HIERON. Dial. adv. Lucif.* c. 4.—Reliquis vero temporibus, ubi ægritudinis necessitas consequi unumquemque compellit, specialiter presbytero licentia est, per salutis aque gratiam dare indulgentiam peccatorum, quoniam et minus ipsi licet causa mundationis offerre; diaconis vero nulla licentia invenitur esse concessa, sed quod semel forte contigit, usurpare, per necessitatem dicuntur excusati, nec postea in securitate commissum. *Synod. Roman. ad Gall. Episc. can. 7 ed. Hard.*—Neque coram episcopo licere presbyteris in Baptisterium introire, nec præsentem autistite infantem tingere aut signare. *Conc. Hispal.* 2, A. D. 619.—Omnes presbyteri, qui in parochia sunt, sub potestate episcopi esse debent, et de eorum ordine nullus Presbyter præsumat in illa parochia baptizare, nec missas celebrare, sine jussione episcopi, in cujus parochia est. *Conc. Fern.* A. D. 755, *Capitul. Reg. Franc.* t. i.

In the commencement of the third century, a controversy arose between the churches of Rome and Carthage respecting the validity of baptism by heretics. It was determined that baptism administered in the name of the Holy Trinity (*Conc. Arelat.* 1, c. 8) by any heretics or schismatics, except [some who were expressly named (*Conc. Nic.* c. 8, 19; *Conc. Constant.* 1, c. 7; *Conc. Laodic.* c. 7, 8; *Conc. Trullan.* c. 95), should not be repeated. And this decision was grounded upon the doctrine that the efficacy of the sacrament was not affected by the worthiness or unworthiness of the officiating minister, but proceeded from the supernatural power of the sacrament itself. As a consequence of the establishment of this maxim, women were permitted to baptize cases of necessity, after the eleventh century. And by a decree of Innocent I. (A.D. 417) all baptism (in due form), except that of a man's own self, was declared valid.

The celebrated Athanasius, when a boy, having baptized some of his playfellows for their amusement, according to the rites of the church, the clergy of Alexandria declared this baptism valid and sufficient.

#### § 4.—TIMES OF BAPTISM.

THE prevalence of infant-baptism was instrumental in effecting a great change in the regulations of the church respecting the times of administering the rite. But it would not be correct to ascribe the whole of this change to that one cause. In the apostolic age the majority of candidates for baptism were adults, although children appear not to have been excluded from participation in the rite; but the administration of baptism was not then limited to any particular times or seasons. During the second and third centuries, certain periods were chiefly appointed for the baptism of adults; and these periods continued to be observed after the practice of infant-baptism had become general in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries. Only the number of those periods was increased, especially in the west; a regulation against which some bishops zealously contended, as an innovation upon the ancient practice of the church.

The following is a chronological account of the chief variations which took place in this particular.

1. In the apostolic age, the administration of baptism was not in any degree limited to time or place. (Acts ii. 41; viii. 38; ix. 18, seq.; x. 147; xvi. 33.)

2. From the account of Justin Martyr nothing can be determined with certainty respecting the time at which baptism was performed; but it would seem that the administration of this ordinance in his days was a public and solemn act, capable of being performed in any assembly held for religious worship. Tertullian (*De Bapt.* c. 19) speaks of Easter and Whitsuntide as the two seasons most appropriate to the administration of baptism; but, instead of appealing to tradition or primitive practice, he proceeds to point out the reasons by which this preference might be established. Other writers, however, refer to an apostolical tradition, and an ancient rule of the church. Thus, Leo the Great (*Epist.* 4 *ad Sicil. Ep.*) proclaims baptism at the season of Epiphany to be an innovation, and speaks of baptism at Easter as a custom derived from the days of the apostles. (See also SIRICIUS *Ep. ad Himmer.* c. 2; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 5; AMBROS. *de Myst. Pasche,* c. 5; AUGUSTIN. *Serm. de Temp.* 160.)

3. In the sixth century, Easter and Whitsuntide were fixed by the canons of several councils as the regular periods of baptism, but with an exception in favour of cases of necessity. (See *Conc. Autissiodor.* A.D. 578, c. 18; *Conc. Matiscon.* 2, A.D. 583, c. 3.)

4. At these stated times, baptism was usually administered during the night preceding the great festivals, *i. e.* on the eves of Easter and Whitsuntide; a practice which generally obtained, although not enforced by any law. The time in which the church regarded the Saviour as lying in the grave just before his resurrection, appeared peculiarly fit for the celebration of a sacrament which is typical of the Christian's death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness, and also instrumental, in the way of divine appointment, to that happy change (see Rom. vi. 3); and the illuminations usual on that night have significant reference to a rite with which spiritual light was so intimately connected that the ordinance itself was distinguished by this very name (φῶτισμα, φωτισμὸς, φωτιστήριον; see above sect. 1). And,

as baptism was regarded as peculiarly the sacrament of the Holy Spirit, the season of Whitsuntide was deemed no less eligible for its public and general administration.

5. At an early date, the Feast of Epiphany was added as a third baptismal season. The day on which our Lord received baptism at the hands of John, appeared peculiarly suited to the administration of this holy ordinance. It is probable that this period was not observed at Antioch or Constantinople, from the circumstance that Chrysostom, in a homily on Epiphany, makes no mention of a public baptism as taking place at that time, although he speaks of the administration of the Lord's supper, and also takes occasion to point out the difference between Christian baptism and that of John. On the other hand, it appears from an expression of Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* 40), that he was acquainted with the practice of observing Epiphany as a season for public baptism. We find also traces of this observance in the churches of Jerusalem and Africa. In the west, especially in Italy and France, it did not meet with equal approbation.

In France and Spain it was usual, at a very early period, to hold public baptisms at Christmas, and on the festivals of apostles and martyrs. (*Conc. Matiscon.* 2, A. D. 583, c. 3; *SIRIC. Ep. ad Himer.* c. 2.)

But although the periods above-mentioned, (especially the first two,) were universally observed, we must not suppose that it was considered necessary to the efficacy or completeness of the sacrament that baptism should be administered on those occasions. The observance was not represented as an institution of Christ or his apostles, but as a becoming and useful regulation; and many writers who strongly recommend the established custom maintain, at the same time, the doctrine of Christian liberty in this particular, and teach that the grace of God accompanies baptism administered at any period, as well as when administered according to the institution of the church. Thus Tertullian (*De Bapt.* c. 19), *Cæterum omnis dies Domini est, omnis hora, omne tempus habile baptismo, However, every day is the Lord's, every hour, every season is fit for baptism.* (See also *BASIL. M. Hom.* 13, *Exhortat. ad Bapt.*; *CHRYSOST. Hom.* 1, *in Act.*; *ARGUST. De Quadrages. Serm.* vi.)

After the tenth century, the observance of stated seasons of baptism gradually fell into disuse. It was enacted, that children should be baptized within a month after their birth; or after eight days of age; or as soon as possible. But a certain preference for the ancient seasons remained; which was shown by the custom of baptizing adults, and of consecrating water for after-use, at those periods. And some councils advised the deferring of the baptism of infants until Easter or Whitsuntide, unless there appeared to be danger of their not living so long.

The nocturnal celebration of this solemnity having fallen into discredit and disuse, the hours appointed on the chosen festivals were from three till six o'clock in the afternoon; until, at a still later period, baptism after midday was forbidden. (*Concil. Coloa.* A. D. 1549, c. 14; *Conc. Mogunt.* A. D. 1549, c. 16; *Conc. Osnabrug.* A. D. 1628, *De Bapt.* lib. xiii.)

In Protestant churches no particular hour is appointed for the celebration of baptism; but it is ordered, for the most part, that the ceremony shall take place during divine worship, and in presence of the congregation.

### § 5.—PLACE OF BAPTISM.

WITH regard to the place in which baptism was administered, it will be convenient to make our remarks with reference to the following three distinct periods in the history of this rite.

Period 1. The first ages of Christianity; in which the place, as well as the time, of baptism was indifferent.

Period 2. The space of time during which, for the baptism of adults with great solemnity, a special place was deemed necessary; when baptisteries detached from churches were built with greater or less splendour.

Period 3. In which, after the prevalence of infant baptism, and the disuse of stated seasons for the administration of this sacrament, baptisteries had become superfluous; and churches provided with fonts became the ordinary places of baptism.

1. *Period 1.* We find no account in the New Testament of any place having been set apart for the administration of baptism. John baptized in the river Jordan; and so did the disciples of

Christ. (John iii. 22.) But baptism could be administered at any other river or piece of water, as appears from Acts vii. 36, 37; xvi. 13—16, and other passages. Examples also of baptism in private houses occur in Acts ix. 18; x. 47, 48; xvi. 30, 33, 34. A public baptism of three thousand converts in one day, is recorded in Acts ii. 41, but no account is given of its performance.

We find from the earliest ecclesiastical writers, that the same free choice of place was allowed in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. Justin Martyr, who speaks of baptism as a public transaction, evidently implies, that there was no fixed place to which the administration of it was limited, (*ἔπειτα ἄγονται*, viz. the candidates, *ὕψ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ*, *Apolog.* 1, c. 61;) and the same fact may be inferred from *Recognit.* CLEMENT., lib. iv. c. 32; vi. c. 15; CLEMENT. *Homil.* 9, 19. The same latitude of practice is distinctly asserted in the following words of Tertullian, (*De Bapt.* c. 4:)—“Ideoque nulla distinctio est, mari quis, an stagno, flumine, an fonte, lacu, an alveo diluatur: nec quicquam refert inter eos, quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit; nisi et ille spado, quem Philippus inter vias fortuita aqua tinxit, plus salutis aut minus, retulit,”—language which amounts simply to this, that it matters not where a person is baptized.

2. *Period 2.* The first mention of a baptistery, or a place appropriated to the purposes of baptism, occurs in the *Gesta S. Marcelli*, in *SURI Vit. S.* d. 16 Jan.; and this baptistery was in a private house.

Eusebius, in his descriptions of the churches at Tyre (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. iv.), and at Antioch (*De Vita Const. M.* lib. iii. c. 50), does not use the word *βαπτιστήριον*, or the like; but he probably includes baptisteries under the title *ἐξέδραι*, exedræ, or outer buildings.

Baptisteries are mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, in whose time they were divided into two parts, outer and inner, in the former of which the preparations for baptism were made, and in the latter the sacrament itself was administered. *Catech. Mystag.* i. 2; ii. 1.—See also AMBROS. *De Init.* c. 2, 5; *De Sacram.* lib. iii. c. 2; *Epist.* 33.) Augustin speaks of a part



of the baptistery appropriated to women. (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xxii. c. 8.)

In the fifth and sixth centuries, baptisteries, or baptismal churches (*ecclesiæ baptismales*), were general, and sometimes so spacious that ecclesiastical councils were held in them. We may form an idea of the size of some of these edifices, when we remember that in some places, as Antioch, no less than three thousand persons sometimes received baptism at one time.

It was enacted, by laws both of church and state, that baptism should be performed only in the public baptisteries. In JUSTIN. *Novell.* 58, in which oratories in private houses are allowed, it is forbidden in general to perform any of the sacerdotal offices (*ἱεραὶ λειτουργίαι*) in them; and in *Novell.* 42, c. 2, the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper are expressly interdicted.

Concerning the places dedicated to the administration of baptism, the following remarks are worthy of observation.

i. The usual name of these places is *Βαπτιστήριον*, Lat. *Baptisterium*, *baptistery*, literally, the place of baptism. For baptisteria, Latin writers say also *ecclesiæ baptismales*. (Conf. SUICERI *Thesaur. Eccl.* s. v.; DU CANGE *Glossar. Lat.* s. v. *Baptisterium*.)

ii. Another appellation is *φωτιστήριον* (*illuminatorium*, i. e., *locus illuminationis*), on account of the light or illumination imparted to the baptized.

iii. We sometimes meet with the expression *aula baptismatis*, applied to a large or splendid baptistery.

iv. Instead of *baptisterium* we occasionally find *fontes*, *κολυμβήθρα*, or *piscina* (the font); the part being, by a common figure of speech, put for the whole.

v. For the most part, each diocese had only one baptistery which was connected with the cathedral church. But in some large dioceses and towns, and by the liberality of emperors, the number was sometimes increased; in which cases, however, the cathedral baptistery always retained a certain degree of preference. (*DURANDI Rit. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 19.)

3. *Period 3.* Although it is impossible to determine the precise period at which baptisteries were multiplied, and at

length united to, or rather changed into, parish churches, yet it appears in general that this alteration took place when stated seasons of baptism had ceased, and the right of administering the ordinance was ceded to simple presbyters and (under certain restrictions) to deacons.

Since the fourteenth century, various ecclesiastical laws have insisted upon the celebration of baptism in churches, restricting permission to administer it in private houses to cases of necessity.

### § 6.—MODE AND FORM OF BAPTISM.

UNDER this head we reckon—1. The manner in which the baptized person received the appointed element, water; and 2. The forms or ceremonies observed by the officiating minister, or the person who administered the sacrament. In both these respects, varieties of opinion and practice existed from a very early period; and even to the present day a difference exists between the eastern and western churches in this matter;—a difference, however, which is wisely judged by the latter to be not of an essential or fundamental nature.

1. *Immersion, or Dipping.*—There is no doubt that the usual mode of administering baptism in the early church was by immersion, or plunging the whole body of the person baptized under water. An appeal to the numerous authorities by which this fact is attested would be superfluous; but there are some points in connection with this rite which deserve our more particular attention.

The supposition that the practice of immersion was abandoned as soon as infant-baptism became prevalent, is founded on a mistake. Infant-baptism had become general in the sixth century; but the practice of immersion continued until the thirteenth or fourteenth, and in fact has never been formally abandoned or entirely renounced.

Trine immersion is prescribed in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great:—“Baptizet sacerdos sub trina mersione, tantum S. Trinitatem semel invocans, ita dicendo: baptizo te in nomine Patris, *et mergat* semel, et Filii, *et mergat iterum*, et Spiritus Sancti, *et mergat tertio;*” i. e. “*Let the priest baptize with a trine*

(triple) immersion, but with only one invocation of the Holy Trinity, saying, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father*, (then let him dip the person once,) *and of the Son*, (then let him dip the person a second time,) *and of the Holy Ghost*, (and then let him dip the third time.)” Tertullian alludes to a similar practice as existing in his days; “non semel,” says he, “sed ter, ad singula nomina, in personas tingimur:” i. e. “we receive the water of baptism not merely once, but three times, at the mention of the name of each person of the Holy Trinity,” (*Adv. Prax.* c. 26.) And in his treatise *De Coron. Mil.*, c. 3, he says, “dehinc ter mergitaur,” “hence we are plunged thrice into the water of baptism.” This custom, although not prescribed in the New Testament, was supposed to have been introduced by the apostles; such, at least, is the doctrine of Basil the Great, Jerome, and Ambrose. (BASIL. *M. de Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27; HIERONYM. *adv. Lucif.* c. 4; *Comment. in Ephes.* 4; AMBROS. *de Sacr.* ii. c. 7.)

Some of the fathers suppose the practice of trine immersion to refer, not to the three persons in the Godhead, but to the triple fact of the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. (CYRILL. *HIEROS. Catech. Mystag.* ii. c. 4; GREGOR. NYSSEN. *de Bapt. Chr.*; ATHANAS. *de Parabol. Ser. Quæst.* 94; LEO. *M. Epist. ad Episc. Sic.* c. 3.)

Single immersion, however, was sometimes deemed sufficient to the validity of the sacrament. A controversy having arisen upon this subject in Spain, the matter was referred by the bishops of that country to Gregory the Great; who, in reply, declared baptism by single immersion to be valid, and aptly significant of the unity of the Deity, as triple immersion was emblematic of the three persons subsisting in that unity. This decision was afterwards confirmed by the fourth Council of Toledo, held in the year 633<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> De trina mersione baptismatis nil responderi verius potest, quam quod ipsi sensit: quod in una fide nihil afficit sanctæ ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. Nos autem quod tertio mergimus, triduanæ sepulture sacramenta signamus, ut dum tertio infans ab aquis educitur, resurrectio triduanæ temporis exprimat. Quod si quis forte etiam pro summæ Trinitatis veneratione æstimet fieri, neque ad hoc aliquid obsistit, baptizando semel in aquis mergere; quia dum in tribus personis una substantia est, reprehensibile esse nullatenus potest, infantem in baptismate in aquam vel ter, vel semel, immergere,

In the early centuries, all parties who received baptism were completely undressed, a circumstance which was thought to contribute to the significancy of the rite. (AMBROS. *Serm.* 20; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* ii. 2; CHRYSOSTOM. *Hom.* 6 in *Ep. ad Coloss.*; *Ep. 1 ad Innocent.*; ATHANAS. *Ep. ad Orthod.*; —CONF. VOSS. *de Bapt. Disputat.* 1.) But, in course of time, and by degrees, this custom was discontinued.

2. *Aspersio or Sprinkling.*—In the western churches, although immersion was never renounced by any statute or canon, yet, in practice, aspersion or sprinkling was generally substituted for it, after the lapse of several centuries; and it is agreed by all parties, in those communions, that this particular in the administration of baptism does not affect the validity of the sacrament. This point, however, is strongly contested by the Greek church; which not only retains the primitive practice of immersion, but maintains that it is essential to the nature of true and effectual baptism; nor will it consent to receive into its communion any persons who have been otherwise baptized, unless they submit to a second baptism by immersion. (LEO ALLAT. *De Eccl. Occid. et Orient. Con.* lib. iii. c. 12, § 4; ALEX. DE STOURDZA, *Considérations sur la doctrine et l'esprit de l'Eglise*

quando et in tribus mersionibus personarum Trinitas, et in una potest Divinitatis singularitas, designari. Sed quia nunc hucusque ab hæreticis infans in baptisate tertio mergebatur, fiendum quod vos esse non censeo: ne dum mersiones enumerant, Divinitatem dividant; dumque quod faciebant, faciunt, se morem nostrum vicisse gloriantur. GREGOR. M. *Epist.* lib. i. ep. 41.—The Spanish bishops, to whom this epistle was addressed, had been disposed to abandon the practice of trine immersion, in consequence of the misinterpretation and abuse of that ceremony by the Arians. It is to this that allusion is made in the latter part of the foregoing extract.—Propter vitandum schismatis scandalum, vel hæretici dogmatis usum, simplam teneamus baptismi mersionem, ne videantur apud nos, qui tertio mergunt, hæreti-

corum probare assertionem, dum sequuntur et morem. Et ne forte cuique sit dubium hujus simpli mysterium sacramenti, videat, in eo mortem et resurrectionem Christi significari: nam in aquis mersio, quasi in infernum descensio est, et rursus ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est. Item videat in eo unitatem Divinitatis, et trinitatem personarum ostendi: unitatem, dum semel immergimus; trinitatem, dum nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti baptizamus. CONC. TOLETAN. 4, A.D. 633, can. 5.—Quoties debet puer immergi? Resp. secundum consuetudinem ecclesie vel semel, propter unitatem divinæ essentiae, vel ter, propter trinitatem personarum. GERSON. *Summa Theol.* lib. iv. Conf. STEPH. DURANT. *De Ritib. Eccl. Cath.* lib. i. c. 19.

*Orthodoxe.*) The Western churches (for the most part) practise aspersion, but allow immersion; the Greek church practises immersion, but will not allow aspersion.

Aspersion did not become general in the West until the thirteenth century; although it appears to have been introduced some time before that period. Thomas Aquinas says, (*Summa*, p. 3, quæst. 66, article 7,) “Tutius est baptizare per modum immersionis, quia hoc habet usus communis,”—*i. e.*, “it is safer to baptize by immersion, because this is the general practice.”

3. *The form of words used at Baptism.*—From the time of Justin Martyr and the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* down to the eighteenth century, all the liturgical books of all sects and parties in the church contained only one form of words to be pronounced in the act of administering baptism; namely, “I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” Some teachers and sects indeed there were who did not use these words in the generally received or orthodox sense; but the words themselves remained unaltered. “Facilius inveniuntur hæretici qui omnino non baptizent,” says Augustin, “quam qui non illis verbis baptizent,” (*De Bapt.* lib. vi. c. 25,) *i. e.*, “it would be easier to find heretics who do not baptize at all, than any who do not use this form of words in their baptism.”

It is remarkable that, with respect to this baptismal formulary, the early Christian writers do not appeal to tradition, as in many other particulars relating to the same sacrament, but to the words and institution of Christ himself. The words used by Justin Martyr (*Apolog.* i. c. 61) evidently refer to the passage on this subject in St. Matthew’s Gospel; but this writer does not expressly speak of this form as prescribed for invariable use. Tertullian and Cyprian, however, positively represent the institution of the words as part of the appointment of baptism itself<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Lex tingendi imposita et forma præscripta: ite, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 13.—Et novissime mandans ut tingerent in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, non in unum: nam nec semel, sed ter ad singula nomina, in personas singulas, tingimur. *Id. adv. Præxan.* c. 26.—Dominus post resurrectionem discipulos suos mittens, quemadmodum baptizare deberent, instruxit et docuit, dicens: data mihi est omnis potestas. . . Spiritus Sancti.

The *Apostolical Constitutions* demand the distinct naming of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and the *Apostolical Canons* enact, that “if any bishop or presbyter should not baptize, according to our Lord’s institution, into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, he should be suspended.”

The words *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* (Matt. xxviii. 20) may be rendered *in nomen, into the name of*, instead of *in nomine, in the name of*. It is not easy to determine whether or not the phrase *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, which occurs in Acts ii. 38; x. 48, gave rise to the translation “in nomine,” or whether this was the original rendering of the words *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*. The Vulgate has *in nomine*; for which more modern translations substitute *in nomen*. But it ought to be remarked that Tertullian and Cyprian recognise the phrase *in nomine*; whence it appears that it must have been adopted in the early Latin versions. It is retained also by Ambrose in the following sentence:—“In uno nomine baptizari nos jussit, hoc est in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Noli mirari, quia dixi unum nomen, ubi est una substantia, una divinitas, una majestas, hoc est nomen, de quo dictum, in quo oportet omnes salvari.”

It was also an old practice to leave out the word *ὄνομα* altogether. Thus we read, in the *Apostolical Canons*, c. 49, *βαπτίση εἰς πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, “baptize into, or unto, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Latin writers sometimes make the same omission. Thus Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* c. 26) says simply, *ut tingerent it Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum*. So that this writer must have regarded “in nomine Patris” and “in Patrem” as synonymous. In like manner, Jerome says, (*Comment. in Ephes.* c. 4,) “In Patrem, et in Filium, et in Spiritum Sanctum, baptizamur et ter mergimur,” although he elsewhere uses the form *in nomine*.

Some slight verbal alterations and additions were occasionally made, which although not generally adopted or improved, were not considered injurious to the sacrament<sup>7</sup>.

Insinuat Trinitatem, ejus sacramento gentes baptizarentur. CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 73, *ad Jub.*

et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti:—in nomine sancti Patris, sancti Filii, sancti Spiritus Sancti:—in nomine Patris, Amen; et Filii, Amen; et Spiritus Sancti,

<sup>7</sup> Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris,

But while baptism in the usual form was invariably prescribed in the liturgies of different churches, baptism administered simply "in the name of Christ" was explained as sufficient by Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and Fulgentius, and was declared valid by the decrees of several councils. It is obvious that, in this case, much must depend upon the sense in which the words may be understood; according to the old rule, *Duo cum faciunt idem, non est idem*, *The same thing done by two persons is not the same*. Although this form was declared sufficient, yet the church never intended that it should be generally adopted. A curious clause in a decree of the Council of Nemours, held in the year 1284, forbids the propagation of the opinion, which it confirmed, concerning the validity of baptism in this form<sup>6</sup>.

Bingham admits only two testimonies in favour of the validity of baptism administered simply in the name of Christ.

"Among the writings of the ancients," says he, "I have never yet met with any but two that plainly and directly allow or approve of any other form of baptism, save that which was appointed by Christ at the institution. Gennadius (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* c. 27) mentions one Ursinus, an African monk, who, he says, wrote a book, which is now lost, wherein he asserted, against such as were for rebaptizing all heretics, 'that it was not lawful to rebaptize those who were baptized either simply in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but it was sufficient for both sorts of them, upon confession of the Trinity, to receive the bishop's confirmation, in order to obtain eternal life.' This author plainly distinguishes between the two forms of baptizing, one with explicit mention of the three persons of the Trinity, and the other in the name of Christ alone; both which he makes to be lawful, and equivalent

Amen.—In nomine Patris mergo, et Filii mergo, et Spiritus Sancti mergo.—Baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, in remissionem peccatorum, ut habeas vitam æternam.—Baptizo te credentem in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ut habeas vitam æternam in sæcula sæculorum.—Baptizo te in nomine P., F., et Sp. S., unam habentem substantiam, ut

habeas vitam æternam, et partem cum sanctis.—In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen!—Baptizo te in nomine Jesu Christi.

<sup>6</sup> Dicimus, infantem baptizatum esse, si baptizans dicit, baptizo te in nomine Christi; quod tamen non est laicis exprimentum, ne a forma prædicta statuta per ecclesiam recedatur. *Conc. Nemaur. A.D. 1284, de Bapt.*

in sense, though differing in words from one another. And St. Ambrose, I confess, seems to have been of the same opinion: for he takes all those expressions of Scripture, which speak of being baptized in the name of Christ, to mean the using such a form as this, ‘I baptize thee in the name of Christ,’ without any express mention of the three persons, though the whole Trinity was implied in it. ‘He that is blessed in Christ,’ says he, (*De Spirit. Sancto*, lib. i. cap. 3,) ‘is blessed in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; because the name is one, and the power one. The Ethiopian eunuch, who was baptized in Christ, had the sacrament complete. If a man names only a single person expressly in words, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, so long as he does not deny in his faith either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is complete (*plenum est fidei sacramentum*): as, on the other hand, if a man in words express all the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in his faith diminishes the power either of the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is void (*vacuum est omne sacramentum*).’ He says further, ‘he that names but one person, designs thereby the whole Trinity; he that names Christ only, intends both the Father by whom the Son is anointed, and the Son himself who is anointed, and the Spirit with which he is anointed. And he that names only the Father, does in like manner intend both his Son, and the Spirit of his mouth, if he truly believe them in his heart. (*Qui unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo unctus est Filius, et ipsum qui unctus est Filius, et Spiritum quo unctus est, designati. Et si Patrem dicas, et Filium ejus, et Spiritum oris ejus pariter indicasti, si tamen id etiam corde comprehendas.*)’ So that, according to St. Ambrose, it was a sufficient baptism, though only one person, Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, was expressly mentioned; because in name by an orthodox believer all the rest were implied. But this appears to have been a singular opinion in St. Ambrose, contrary to the general stream and current of the ancient writers.” (*Antiquities*, book xi. chap. 3, sect. 3.)

“Cyprian, Athanasius, and Basil,” adds the same writer, “esteemed it an error and transgression against the first institu-



tion to give baptism only in the name of Christ. They did not understand those passages of Scripture which speak of baptizing in the name of Jesus, or the Lord, or Christ, as new forms of baptizing, different from the original form delivered by Christ; but, as Eulogius in Photius has explained them, ‘to be baptized into Christ Jesus, signifies to be baptized according to the command and tradition of Jesus Christ; that is, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ (EULOG. *ap. Phot. Cod.* 280, p. 1608.) According to which sense it follows, that the form of baptizing delivered by Christ was not changed, as some imagine, but precisely observed even by the apostles, and after them by the general consent and practice of the Catholic church.”

Some sects made such alterations in the form of baptism, that the Catholic church declared their administration of the sacrament null and void, and required that persons so baptized should receive baptism according to the established practice, in order to admission to its communion. (ORSI, *de Bapt. in nomine J. Christi et de hereticis, qui baptismi formam olim adulterarunt*, 1733, 4; JABLONSKI, *Opusc. ed. te Water.* t. iv. 1813, 8.)

The Greek church baptizes in the third person, instead of the first; that is to say, their form, instead of “I baptize thee,” &c. runs thus,—“he, or she, is baptized in the name of,” &c.; a practice in support of which an appeal is made to the writings of Basil and Chrysostom.

#### § 7.—OBSERVANCES AND CEREMONIES CONNECTED WITH BAPTISM.

THE baptism of adults in the early church was always preceded by a solemn preparation. This preparation was two-fold; consisting of, first, a course of catechetical instruction in the leading doctrines of the Christian religion; and, secondly, certain prescribed exercises immediately before the administration of the sacred rite.

1. *Catechetical Instruction.*—This course of teaching corresponded in substance to the instruction given by modern churches

before confirmation; with the addition of certain ceremonies, such as signing with the sign of the cross, imposition of hands, and exorcism. Large accounts of the mode of instruction observed on these occasions may be found in the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem, the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of the Pseudo-Dionysius, and the works of Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustin.

Subscription to the creed appears also to have been required, perhaps with the accompaniment of a seal. (GREGOR. NAZIANZ. *Orat.* 40 *de Bapt.*; AMBROS. *de Sacrament.* lib. i. c. 2; *de Initiat.* c. 2; AUGUSTIN. *de Symbolo ad Catech.* lib. ii. c. 1.) A passage from Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxi. *ad Pop. Antioch.*) has been cited to shew that such subscription was not required; but either that passage refers only to the renunciation made before baptism, which was always simply by word of mouth; or, if it relates to subscription altogether, it must be considered as describing only the local customs of Antioch or Constantinople.

2. *Exorcism.*—The apostles received power and authority to drive out evil spirits by the power of the Spirit (*ἐν πνεύματι*), and in the name of Christ; and we learn from various parts of the evangelical history, that they exercised the power with which they were thus intrusted. It is recorded concerning St. Paul (Acts xix. 12—16) that he possessed the power of driving out evil spirits from persons diseased; and that certain Jewish exorcists were confounded in their attempt at imitating his gifts by calling over them which had evil spirits the name of Jesus. This is the only passage in the New Testament in which the word “exorcist” occurs; while the words exorcism, exorcising (*ἐξορκισμὸς, ἐξόρκωσις*), are not found at all. There is no allusion to baptism in this place: nor do we find any trace of the practice of exorcism, such as was afterwards adopted, either in the history of John’s baptism, or in the narrative of our Saviour’s institution, or in any of the records of baptism, as administered in accordance with that injunction, throughout the New Testament, unless indeed, with some interpreters, we suppose reference to be made to it in 1 Tim. vi. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 21.

But there are two passages in St. Paul's epistles, which have been supposed to contain the first germ of the doctrine and custom of exorcism at baptism. These are 1 Cor. v. 3—5, and 1 Tim. i. 20. The former of these passages relates to the treatment of a grievous offender in the church of Corinth, and is as follows:—"I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." And the other passage contains a similar expression, "Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." Interpreters for the most part explain this "delivering unto Satan" as denoting excommunication or exclusion from Christian fellowship; but it is remarkable that the apostle appears to speak of it as an act of his own, whereas the act of excommunication was performed by the church (1 Cor. v. 13); and many expositors, following Ambrose (*De penitent.* lib. i. c. 12), Augustin (*contra Parmen.* lib. iii. c. 2), and Chrysostom (*Hom. 15 in 1 Ep. ad Corinth.*), explain the expression as referring to some extraordinary punishment inflicted by the miraculous power which had been committed to the apostle, by means of which the offender was deprived of all the benefits of Christianity. But, however this may be, it is at all events evident that the person deprived of the blessings of the gospel is here represented as being under the power of Satan. On the other hand, baptism, as the sacrament of the Holy Ghost, contributes to deliver men from the power of Satan and evil spirits; and hence it appears expedient and right, at the reception of that rite, to renounce the devil and all his works. And when the number of candidates for baptism was multiplied from among the heathen, who are spoken of in Scripture as, in a peculiar sense, sinners (Gal. ii. 15), and who were regarded as being especially under the power of the prince of darkness, it seemed more particularly needful that admission into the Gospel church,—the kingdom of heaven,—should be preceded by a formal abjuration of all heathen and

superstitious practices or worship; in one word, by a renunciation of Satan.

Such appears to be the most natural and simple account of the origin of exorcism at baptism in the Christian church. Justin Martyr, the first uninspired writer who describes Christian baptism, knew nothing of this practice; although he was not unacquainted with the custom of exorcising evil spirits in the case of persons possessed. Tertullian, however, treats expressly of this matter, and says, that the practice of renouncing the devil on occasion of baptism is founded not on Scripture, but on tradition<sup>9</sup>. Cyprian also treats of baptismal exorcism. (*Ep.* 76, *ad Magn.*) At first, indeed, this ceremony was confined to a renunciation of "the devil and all his works," on the part of the person about to be baptized; and it was not until the fourth century that a form of abjuration *by the officiating minister*, commanding the evil spirit to depart from the new servant of Christ, was brought into use. And hence it is that some writers, making a distinction between the renunciation (*ἀποταγή*, *abrenuntiatio*) and exorcism (*ἐξορκισμὸς*), contend that the practice of exorcism was altogether unknown until the fourth, or as others say, the seventh century. The fact, however, appears to be, that these customs are substantially one and the same, differing only in form. And the true state of the case with respect to baptismal exorcism appears to be as follows:—1. In the first century we find no trace of a renunciation of the devil in baptism. 2. In the second and third centuries this practice was in use, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as of later writers who appeal to tradition. 3. In the fourth century the fathers speak of exorcism as not being absolutely necessary, and not enjoined by Scripture, but as being highly expedient, inasmuch as, without it, children would not be free from the influence of evil spirits. (OPTAT. MILEV. *de Schism. Donat.* lib. iv. c. 6; BASIL. M. *De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40.)

<sup>9</sup> Denique, ut a baptismo ingrediar, aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu, contestamur, nos renuntiare diabolo, et pompæ et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter

mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit. TERTULL. *De Corona Mil.* c. 3.

We find mention of baptismal exorcism also in the canons of the Council of Carthage, held in the year 256; and those of the first Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381.

The exorcists, who were concerned at first only with the energumens or persons possessed, were afterwards called upon to assist at the baptism of all adults; but, as infant-baptism gained ground, the duties of this office became superfluous, and they are very rarely mentioned in works posterior to the sixth century.

The first writer in whose pages we find a form of exorcism is Cyril of Jerusalem. From various passages of this author we may infer, that exorcism in his time was twofold; a longer form being used some time previous to baptism, during the candidate's course of preparation, and a shorter immediately before the act of immersion. (*Catech. Mystag.* 1, 2; *Pro-Cateches.* § 5, seqq.; *Catech.* i. § 5; *Catech.* xvi. § 19.)

The observances and ceremonies connected with this exorcism were the following:—

1. Preparatory prayers and fasting. (Or this particular may be reckoned as part of the general introduction to baptism.)

2. Imposition of hands upon the head of the candidate, who was required to stand in a bowing or submissive posture. (AUGUSTIN, *De Fide, ad Catechumen.* ii. 1.)

3. The person to be exorcised put off his upper garments and shoes. (CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. ad Baptiz.*; *Concil. Constant. sub Menn.* A.D. 436, act. 5.)

4. He stood with his face toward the west, which was the symbol of darkness, as the east, on the other hand, was the symbol of light. (CYRILL. HIEROS. *Catech. Mystag.* i. § 2; PSEUDO-DIONYS. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; AMBROS. *De Initiat.* c. 2; *De Myster.* c. 3; HIERON. *in Amos.* vi. 14.)

5. In the eastern churches, the person was required also to stretch out his hands towards the west, as in the act of pushing an object away in that direction, intended as a token of his abhorrence of Satan and his works, and his determination to resist and repel them. (CYRILL. HIEROS.; PSEUDO-DIONYS.; ut supra.)

6. The exorcist breathed upon the candidate, either once or

three times. (But according to Dionysius, who is quite singular in this respect, the person exorcised was commanded thus to breathe, and then to turn round to the east, with his face and hands raised toward heaven.)

7. Some suppose that the candidate held a lighted taper in his hand during the ceremony; but this is doubted by others, and appears to be, on the whole, improbable.

The forms of renunciation recorded in different writers, are substantially the same, with slight verbal alterations. The person about to be baptized renounced the works of the devil and of darkness, especially idolatry, and the vices and follies of the world. But it may not be uninteresting to survey several of the forms, as they are preserved in the works of early writers.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. vii. c. 41), the form runs thus:—"I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps (or shows, *ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ*), and his services, and all things that are his." In TERTULL. *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3, the form is summarily described as consisting in "a renunciation of the devil, his pomp, and his angels." Cyprian speaks of it as "a renouncing of the devil and the world" (*Ep.* 7; *De Lapsis*). Ambrose, addressing a baptized person, says, "Thou hast renounced the devil and his works, the world, its luxury and pleasures" (*De Initiat.* c. 2). In SALVIAN. *De Provul.* lib. vi. we find the following formulary, "I renounce the devil, his pomps, his shows, and his works." The renunciation preserved by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Mystag.* 1, 4) is the same as that in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, except that it is in the form of an address to the evil spirit, "I renounce thee, Satan, and thy works, &c." Jerome (*Comment. in Matth.* 25, 26) gives it thus, "I renounce thee, devil, and thy pomp, and thy vices, and thy world which lieth in iniquity."

This form of renunciation or abjuration was repeated three times, according to the express statement of Pseudo-Dionys., and as may be with great probability inferred from Ambrose (*de Fide*, lib. v. c. 7). The three-fold repetition is prescribed in the Sacramentary of Gregory, and the Ordo Romanus. In the offices of baptism, the renunciation is found in the form of question and answer.

The form of adjuration or exorcism, in the west, was usually as follows, "Adjuro te, immunde spiritus, ut ex eas ab hoc servo Jesu Christi, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti," *i. e.*, "I adjure thee, unclean spirit, that thou come out of this servant of Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" frequently, however, with the addition of "and make way for the Holy Ghost." Variations and amplifications of this form may be found in *ASSEMANI Codex. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 1, sect. 1—5. The form was founded upon Mark v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 27; Matt. xxvi. 63; xii. 43; xiv. 2; Rom. vii. 2; Ephes. ii. 1; 2 Timoth. ii. 26.

The Greeks use the word ἀφορκισμὸς in preference to ἐξορκισμὸς, in order to distinguish this ceremony from any other kind of exorcism.

"Another ceremony of this nature, was the custom of touching the ears of the Catechumens, and saying unto them Ephphata, Be opened: which Petrus Chrysologus (*Serm.* 52) joins with imposition of hands and exorcism; making it to have something of mystical signification in it, to denote the opening of the understanding to receive the instructions of faith. And St. Ambrose, or an author under his name (*De iis qui Initiantur*, c. 1; *De Sacramentis*, lib. i. c. 1), describes [the same custom, deriving the original of it from our Saviour's example, in saying Ephphata, Be opened, when he cured the deaf and the blind. But this custom seems not to have gained any great credit in the practice of the church; for, besides these two authors, there is scarce any other that so much as mentions it; and whether it was used to the first or last order of catechumens, is not very easy to determine." (*BINGHAM, Antiquities*, book x. chap. 2, § 13.) This practice was never adopted by the oriental churches.

3. *Vow or promise of obedience, and profession of faith.*— "The next thing required of men at their baptism, was a vow or covenant of obedience to Christ, which the Greeks call συντάσσεσθαι Χριστῷ, *giving themselves up to the government and conduct of Christ.* This was always an indispensable part of their obligation, before they could be admitted to the ceremony of regeneration. They first renounced the devil, and then immediately promised to live in obedience to the laws of Christ.

. . . . And that this was the ancient rule by which the church proceeded, is evident from all the writers that have spoken of baptism. Justin Martyr, who describes the ceremonies of baptism with the greatest simplicity, says it was only given to those who to their confession of faith added also a promise or vow that they would live according to the rules of Christianity, (*Apol.* ii. p. 93.) And hence came that usual form of words in their profession *συντάττομαί σοι, Χριστέ, I give myself up to thee, O Christ, to be governed by thy laws*; which immediately followed the *ἀπόταξις*, or *renunciation of the devil*, whose service they forsook to choose a new master; as we find it frequently in St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxi. *ad Popul. Antioch.*; *Hom.* vi. *in Coloss.*), St. Basil (*Hom.* xiii. *Exhortat. ad Bapt.*), St. Cyril of Alexandria (*in Joh.* xi. 26), the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (*Constit. Apost.* lib. vii. c. 41), and most of the Greek writers, whose words, as being but one and the same form, I think it needless to repeat upon this occasion. The Latins commonly call it *promissum*, *pactum*, and *rotum*, a *promise*, a *covenant*, and *vow*, which names they apply indifferently to all parts of the Christian engagement, as well the renunciation of the devil, as the profession of faith and obedience to Christ, which do mutually suppose, and are virtually included in, one another. For he that renounces the devil and the world, does thereby profess himself a soldier and servant devoted to Christ. Therefore, St. Ambrose, speaking of the renunciation (*De Sacrament.* lib. i. c. 2), calls it a promise, a caution, an hand-writing or bond given to God, and registered in the court of heaven, because this is a vow made before his ministers, and the angels, who are witnesses to it. Upon which account, he says in another place, (*De Initiatis*, c. 2,) it is recorded, not in the monuments of the dead, but in the book of the living<sup>10</sup>. St. Austin calls it a profession made in the court of angels, and the names of the professors are written in the book of life, not by any man, but by

<sup>10</sup> Respondisti, abrenuntio: memor esto sermonis tui, et nunquam tibi excidat series cautionis tuæ.—Ubi promiseris considera, vel quibus promiseris: Levitan vidisti, sed minister est Christi. Vidisti eum ante altaria

ministrare: ergo chirographum tuum tenetur, non in terra, sed in cœlo. AMEROS. *De Sacrament.* lib. i. c. 2.—Tenetur vox tua, non in tumulto mortuorum, sed in libro viventium. *Id. de Initiatis*, c. 2.



the heavenly powers, (*De Symbolo*, lib. ii. c. 1.) St. Jerome (*Com. in Amos* vi. 14) styles it a covenant made with the sun of righteousness, and a promise of obedience to Christ. And he so speaks of this ceremony as to show it to be a distinct act from the renunciation, though they both tended to the same end, because different rites were used in expressing them. For in renouncing the devil, they had their faces to the west, for symbolical reasons which we have heard before; but in making their covenant with Christ, they turned about to the east, as an emblem of that light which they received from the sun of righteousness, by engaging themselves in his service." (BINGHAM, *Antiquities*, book xi. chap. 7, § 6.)

4. *Signing with the sign of the cross.*—After the ceremony of exorcism had been performed, the candidate for baptism was solemnly signed with the sign of the cross; the officiating minister pronouncing the words, "Receive thou the sign of the cross, on thy forehead and on thy heart." This was, properly speaking, the dedication of the person to Christ, the sign or seal of faith; connected with the formal declaration that the candidate had passed from a state of sin to a state of grace<sup>11</sup>.

The ancients attached great importance, and ascribed a very powerful efficacy, to this signature of the cross in baptism. According to Pseudo-Dionys. (*De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2), this signature was made thrice; but, in the ancient rituals of the Latin church in Mabillon and Muratori, mention is made of only one signature, in connexion with a triple afflation; and the same may be observed concerning an old Gallican Sacramentary, preserved in ASSEMANI *Cod. Liturg.* lib. i. p. 43.

<sup>11</sup> Τὸ ὕδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἀντὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἢ σφραγίς ἀντὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας. *Const. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 17.—Thus, Cyprian speaks of the baptized as renati et signo Christi signati—and adds, quod autem sit hoc signum, et qua in corporis parte positum, manifestat alio in loco Deus, dicens, Transi per mediam Hierusalem, et notabis

signum super frontes virorum. *Ad Demetr.*; *De Unitate Eccl.* Muniatur frons, ut signum Dei incolume servetur. *Ep.* 50, al. 58.—Ego Christianus et de parentibus Christianis natus, et vexillum crucis in mea fronte portans. *ΠΙΕΡΟΝ. Ep.* 113.—Semper cruci baptismata jungitur. (AUGUST.) *Serm. de Temp.* 101.

5. *Uction, or anointing with oil.*—In the *Apostolical Constitutions* and other liturgical writings, a distinction is observed between ἔλαιον (oleum, oil) and μύρον (unguentum, unguent). And we find mention of a double anointing at baptism, one antecedent to the administration of the rite, and the other consequent upon it. The latter is called by way of distinction *χρῖσμα*, and in the Eastern churches it follows immediately upon baptism as a completion of that ceremony, while in the West it is quite separated from baptism, and attached to confirmation.

The first unction (τὸ ἔλαιον) was preparatory, and took place immediately after exorcism, and the signature of the cross. The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* represents it as taking place after the confession of faith (book vii. c. 41); but Cyril of Jerusalem places it between the renunciation and the confession. (*Catech. Mystag.* ii. 3).

This custom does not appear to have existed in the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, if we may judge from their silence on the subject. “For though,” says Bingham, “Tertullian speaks of an unction among the ceremonies of baptism, yet, as Daille rightly observes, it was not this unction preceding baptism, but the unction which followed after it in confirmation, accompanied with imposition of hands. For it is plain from Tertullian that neither of these were given before baptism (*De Bapt.* c. 4), but when men were come out of the water, then they were anointed with the holy unction, and had imposition of hands, in order to receive the Holy Ghost. (*Antiq.* b. xi. ch. 11, § 9.)

Respecting the design or significaney of this unction, ancient writers give the following accounts. Cyril of Jerusalem says, “Men were anointed from head to foot with this consecrated oil, and this made them partakers of the true olive-tree, Jesus Christ. For they being cut out of a wild olive-tree, and ingrafted into a good olive-tree, were made partakers of the fatness of the good olive-tree.” (*Catech. Mystag.* ii. 3.) Pseudo-Ambrosius observes, as a comment on this practice, “Thou wast anointed as a champion (athleta) of Christ, to fight the fight of this world.” (*De Sacram.* lib. i. c. 2.) “The author under the name of Justin Martyr, distinguishing between the two unctions, says, ‘Men

were first anointed with the ancient oil, that they might be Christs, that is, the anointed of God; but they were anointed with the precious ointment, after baptism, in remembrance of him who reputed the anointing of himself with ointment to be his burial.' (JUSTIN. *Respons. ad Orthodox.* p. 137.) The author of the *Constitutions* likewise uses the same distinction; 'Thou shalt first of all anoint him with the holy oil, then baptize him with water, and afterwards sign him with the ointment; that the anointing with oil may be the participation of the Holy Spirit, and the water may be the symbol of death, and the signing with ointment may be the seal of the compact made with God. But if there be neither oil, nor ointment, water is sufficient both for the unction and the seal, and the confession of him with whom we die.' (*Apost. Const.* lib. ii. c. 22.) So that this was only a ceremony of baptism, which might be omitted without any detriment to the substance or essential part of it. To these may be added the words of St. Chrysostom, who says, 'Every person, before he was baptized, was anointed as wrestlers entering the field: and this not as the high-priest was anointed of old, only on the head, or right hand, or ear, but all over his body, because he came not only to be taught, but to exercise himself in a fight or combat.' (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 6 in Coloss.*) This is the account which they give of this unction preceding baptism." (BINGHAM, book XI. chap. ix. § 3.)

This preparatory unction has been retained in the rituals of the Greek and Roman churches.

6. *Use of salt, milk, and honey, at baptism.*—Some writers have referred the use of salt in baptism to a heathen origin. But this, to say the least, is not necessary; for we find several allusions to salt in the New Testament, from which the practice may have been derived. Thus, Mark ix. 49, 50, "For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with [salt. Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another." Compare Matt. v. 13; Luke xiv. 3; Coloss. iv. 6. It is highly probable, however, that the practice

of using salt at baptism. the sacrament of the new birth, arose from the Jewish custom of rubbing salt on the bodies of new-born infants, which is mentioned in Ezek. xvi. 4.—Some suppose that salt was placed on the tongues of catechumens as an emblem of wisdom, and an admonition to the attainment of it.

The practice of tasting milk and honey at baptism appears to have been founded upon the promises made to the Israelites, Exod. iii. 8, 17; xxxiii. 3. With reference to these promises, milk and honey were perhaps regarded as appropriate emblems at the administration of that sacrament by which we are introduced into the land of promise, the kingdom of God under the Gospel. And the tasting of milk may be supposed to refer especially to the words of St. Peter, “As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby” (1 Pet. ii. 2); a passage which was applied to baptism,—whence the name of the Sunday “Quasi modo geniti.” (CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* 5.)

As milk denoted the spiritual nourishment afforded by God’s word, so honey denoted its pleasantness or agreeableness to the mind and heart of a renewed person. (Ps. xix. 11; cxix. 103; Rev. x. 9, 10.) And the use of honey at baptism may, perhaps, have served to remind believers of the superiority of the Christian dispensation to the Jewish, since under the latter there was a law against the use of honey at sacrifices, on account of its liability to corrupt.

The emblems of milk and honey were in use as early as the third and fourth centuries, as appears from Tertullian and Jerome<sup>12</sup>. The Greek fathers also mention the custom<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam prægustamus. TERTULL. *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3.—Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit creatoris, qua suos abluit; nec oleum, quo suos ungit; nec mellis et lactis societatem, qua suos infantat; nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat; etiam in sacramentis propriis egens mendicitatibus creatoris. Id. *adv. Marcion.* lib. i. c. 14.—Deinde egressos lactis et mellis prægustare concordiam ad infantie significationem. HIERON. *contr.*

*Lucifer.* c. 4.—Lac significat innocentiam parvulorum. Qui mos ac typus in Occidentis ecclesiis hodie usque servatur, ut renatis in Christo vinum lacque tribuatur. De quo lacte dicebat et Paulus, Lac vobis potum dedi, non solidum cibum; et Petrus, Quasi modo geniti nati parvuli rationale lac desiderate. Id. *Comment. in Es.* LV. I.

<sup>13</sup> Τῷ γάλακτι, τῇ κυριακῇ τροφῇ, εὐθὺς μὲν ἀποκηθέντες, τιθηνοῦμεθα· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀναγεννηθέντες τετμήμεθα, τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τὴν ἐλπίδα, τὴν ἄνω Ἱερου-

We have no earlier testimony concerning the use of salt than that of Augustin, *Confess.* lib. i. c. 11; “Audiebam adhuc puer de vita æterna nobis promissa . . . et signabar jam signo erucis, et condiebar ejus sale,” i. e. “As a boy, I heard of the eternal life which is promised to us, . . . and I was signed with the sign of the cross, and seasoned with its salt.” Another testimony of about the same date occurs in the fifth canon of the third council of Carthage, held A. D. 397. The practice is mentioned in the rituals of the Latin Church, subsequent to the fifth and sixth centuries. The Sacramentary of Gregory the Great contains a form for the consecration of the salt; and then follows an instruction concerning the use of it<sup>14</sup>.

7. *Ceremonies after Baptism.*—i. As late as the fifth century, we find mention of the kiss of peace as having been usual on this occasion. (AUGUSTIN. *contr. Ep. Pel.* iv. c. 8; CHRYSOST. *Serm.* 50 *de Util. Leg. Script.* See also CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 64, al. 59.) But no traces of this custom are found at a later period; and it appears to have been superseded by the simple salutation, “Pax tecum,” Peace be with thee.

ii. Chrism (τὸ μύρον), or the unction afterwards used at confirmation, and intended as the consignation or seal of the Holy Spirit, was used at first at the conclusion of baptism.

iii. From the fourth century downwards, we find frequent mention of the practice of clothing the newly baptized in white garments. These garments, as emblems of purity, were delivered to them with a solemn charge to keep their robes of innocence unspotted until the day of Christ. Even Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of an exchange of garments at the time of baptism as a well-known custom, (*Catech. Mystag.* iv. § 8.) Other testimonies

σαλήμ, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἐν ἡμελει καὶ γάλα ὀμβρεῖν ἀναγέγραπται διὰ τῆς ἐνύλου, καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν μνηστεύομεν τροφήν. CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* lib. i. c. 6.

<sup>14</sup> Ut per sollempnissimos paschales dies sacramentum catechumenis non detur, nisi solitum sal. *Conc. Carth.* iii. A. D. 397, can. 5.—In the Sacramentary

of Gregory the Great, after a prescribed form for the benediction or consecration of the salt, we read, *Haec oratione expleta accipiat sacerdos de eodem sale, et ponat in ore infantis, dicendo, Accipe sal sapientie in vitam æternam,*—and then follows an *Oratio post datum salem.*

on this head may be found in Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* iv. 62); Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 8); Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 8); Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 39); Palladius (*Vit. Chrysost.* c. 9); Jerome (*Ep.* 57, 78, 128). The Neophytes wore this white dress from Easter Eve until the Sunday after Easter, which was hence called *Dominica in Albis*, i. e., the Sunday in White. (AUGUST. *Serm.* 232.) This garment was usually made of white linen, but sometimes of more costly materials. After the prevalence of infant-baptism, this custom was, in effect, retained; the baptized infant being covered with a white cloth called *σάβανος*, *sabanus*.

iv. Lighted tapers were placed in the hands of the baptized, if adults, or, if they were infants, in the hands of the sponsors. This custom was designed as emblematical of baptism as the sacrament of illumination. (GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; AMBROS. *De Lapsu Virg. Sacr.* c. 5; BARON. *Annal.* A. 401; GREGOR. TURON. *Hist. Franc.* lib. v. c. 11.)

v. The practice of washing the feet (*pedilavium*) prevailed in some countries at various times. (AUGUSTIN (CESAR. ARELAT.) *Serm.* 160 *de Temp.*; ASSEMANI, *Cod. Lit.* lib. ii. p. 42; MABIL-LON, *Mus. Ital.* t. 1, *Sacram. Gallic.*)

vi. Presents in money or jewels, the use of garlands of flowers, and singing of hymns, are sometimes mentioned; banquets (*convivia baptismalia*) given on these occasions are on record as early as the fourth century.

### § 8.—OF SPONSORS.

AT an early period of the church, certain persons were required to be present at the baptism of its members, who should serve as witnesses of the due performance and reception of the rite, and should also be sureties for the fulfilment of the engagements and promises then made.

1. *Their names or appellations.*—These persons were called at first *sponsors*, *sponsors*. This term is applied to them by Tertullian; but it is worthy of remark that he uses the word only with reference to infant-baptism, and that he considers it to allude not only to an answer (*responsum*) given on behalf of the

infant who was unable to speak for itself, but also to a promise and obligation, or the undertaking, on behalf of the infant, of a duty as the sponsor's own. But Augustin seems to restrict the allusion to the response or answer.

They were called also fidejussores, *sureties*; a term which we find for the first time in this sense in Augustin, (*Serm.* 116, *de Temp.*) This title is borrowed immediately from the Roman law.

The Greek term ἀνάδοχοι corresponds to the Latin *offerentes* and *susceptores*, and refers to the assistance rendered to the baptized immediately before and after the act of immersion. The offices performed by those who brought adults to baptism, and assisted them at the performance of the ceremony, are described by Dionys. Areop. (*de Hier. Eccl.* c. 2.) It appears, however, from Chrysostom (*Hom. in Ps.* xiv.) and Basil M. (*Ep.* 128), that the word ἀνάδοχος was used in the sense of surety (promissor, fidejussor); and ἀναδέχομαι is sometimes used by profane writers in the sense of—I promise, or pledge myself to, anything. (XEN. CYROP. lib. i. c. 6; THEOPHRAST. *Ethic.* c. 12.)

The appellation μάρτυρες, testes, witnesses, which became a favourite in later times, was unknown to the ancient church; either because this signification was included in the terms sponsor, fidejussor, ἀνάδοχοι, or because the word was then so strictly applied to those “martyrs,” who laid down their lives in testimony of the truth, that any other application of it in the church would have been thought disrespectful to them, or would have been, at least, inconvenient.

The more modern terms, πατέρες, μητέρες, πατέρες, μητέρες, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου φωτίσματος, compadres, propatres, commatres, promatres, patrini and matrinæ, godfathers and godmothers, are derived from the practice of early times, in which the parents, or, in their absence, the nearest relatives, took the child out of the baptismal water. Perhaps the unclassical and peculiar Latin words, patrinus and matrina, were chosen, in order to prevent any misunderstanding which might arise from a double acceptation of the common words, pater and mater, while yet they were so nearly allied to these terms, as to imply a bond

of intimate relation, and the existence of mutual obligation. When Latin writers use *pater* in this connexion, they generally add *spiritualis*, or *lustricus*; and in the same way they sometimes call a godson *filius lustricus*. Augustin, in one passage, uses the simple terms *patres* and *fili*; but in such a connexion that no mistake could arise. (*Serm.* 116<sup>15</sup>.)

2. *Origin of the office.*—The origin of this office has been traced by some writers to the institutions of Judaism, and by others to those of the Roman civil law. Neither the Old nor the New Testament contains any allusion to the presence of witnesses at circumcision; and it is impossible to say at what time this practice was introduced among the Jews. The passages of Scripture which have been adduced in order to prove the Jewish origin of the sponsor's office, will be found, on examination, to be beside the question, inasmuch as they do not contain any reference to circumcision. (Isa. viii. 2; xlix. 22; lx. 4; lxvi. 20; Matt. xix. 13—15; Mark x. 13; Luke xviii. 15.) In Luke i. 59—63, we find a record of the circumcision and naming of John the Baptist, and mention is there made of friends and neighbours being present; but no intimation is given that any of these persons were there in the capacity of witnesses.

No trace of sponsors or witnesses is to be found in any of the narratives of baptism recorded in the New Testament; nor do the sacred writers ever draw a parallel between baptism and circumcision. And therefore, on the whole, it would be difficult to prove any connexion between the Jewish and Christian customs with respect to the office of sponsors.

But it is easy to account for the presence of sponsors at baptism, if we refer to the customs of the Roman law. Baptism was at an early period regarded in the light of a stipulation, covenant or contract; on all matters of this nature the Roman jurisprudence was very exact and careful in its institutions; and it is likely that the leaders of the early church, many of whom

<sup>15</sup> Quare ita diligere debet homo cum qui se suscepit ex sacro fonte, sicut patrem: quinimo quanto præstantior est spiritus carne, tanto magis spiritalis pater in omnibus est a spiritali filio diligendus. . . Est tamen alia inter eos gratuita et sancta communio, quæ non est dicenda consanguinitas, sed potius habenda spiritalis proximitas. NICOLAUS I. *Consultat. Bulgar.* c. 2.



before their conversion were engaged in the interpretation or administration of the Roman laws, would endeavour to give security and solemnity to the sacred covenant, in a way corresponding to that which they had been accustomed to observe in civil transactions. Tradition says, that the office of sponsors was appointed by Hyginus or Iginus, a Roman bishop, about the year 154. A time of oppression and persecution in the church is likely to have given rise to an institution intended for the attestation and security of the profession of the Christian religion. And we know, as a matter of fact, that the Sponsor's office had been so far introduced during the second and third centuries, that it was in full operation throughout the fourth and fifth.

Perhaps, on the whole, we must conclude that the custom of requiring the presence of sponsors, or sureties at baptism, arose naturally from the practice of infant-baptism, in order that the interrogatories of the church might not be without some answer, and, in fact, the best that could be obtained under the circumstances of the case; or that it originated in the want of some security in addition to a personal confession, in the times of persecution,—men who had made their baptismal promises in the presence of witnesses being supposed less likely to deny their connexion with the church than they might be if no proof of their profession could be adduced,—or at least being supposed to have received an additional fortification against the danger of apostasy. We learn from DIONYS. AREOP. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2, that it was usual to enter in a baptismal register the name of the sponsor or sponsors, as well as that of the person baptized.

3. *Duties of sponsors.*—The duties imposed upon sponsors related entirely to the moral or spiritual instruction and oversight of the baptized.

Bingham observes, “ There were three sorts of sponsors made use of in the primitive church;—1. For children who could not renounce, or profess, or answer for themselves;—2. For such adult persons as, by reason of sickness or infirmity, were in the same condition as children incapacitated to answer for themselves;—3. For all adult persons in general. For the church required sponsors also for those who were otherwise qualified to

make their own responses. Now the office of sponsors was diversified a little in its nature, according to these distinctions.

“They who were sureties or sponsors for children, were obliged first to answer in their names to all the interrogatories that were usually put in baptism, and then to be guardians of their Christian education. Some will also needs have it, that they were obliged to give them a perfect maintenance, and take them, as it were, for their own children by adoption, in case their parents failed, and left them destitute in their minority. But this I take to be a mistake. For whoever were sponsors for children, if ever they became destitute, the burden devolved upon the church in general, and not upon any others. In all cases the church was charged with this care, and not the sponsors, except there was some antecedent obligation. And there was good reason for this; for, as St. Austin observes, ‘children were presented to baptism not so much by those in whose hands they were brought, (though by them too, if they were good and faithful men,) as by the whole society of saints. The whole church was their mother; she brought forth all and every one by this new birth.’ (AUG. *Ep.* 23, *ad Bonifac.*) Two things, indeed, were anciently required of sponsors as their proper duty; first, to answer in their names to all the interrogatories of baptism, (TERTULL. *De Bapt.* c. 18; GENNAD. *De Eccl. Dogmat.* c. 52; AUG. *Ep.* 23, *ad Bonifac.*; AUGUST. *Serm.* 116, *De Temp.*; *Serm.* 14, *De Verb. Apost.* c. 11; *De Peccator. Merit.* lib. i. c. 34;) secondly, to be guardians of their spiritual life for the future; and to take care by good admonition and instruction, that they performed their part of the covenant in which they were engaged. (AUG. *Serm.* 116, 143, *De Temp.*)

“Another sort of sponsors were such as were appointed to make answers for persons who, by reason of some sudden sickness or other infirmity, could not answer for themselves. And if the party happened to recover after such a baptism, it was the sponsor’s duty not only to acquaint him, as a witness, with what was done for him, but also, as a guardian of his behaviour, to induce him to make good the promises which he in his name had made for him.

“The third sort of sponsors were for such adult persons as were able to answer for themselves. For those also had their sponsors, and no persons anciently were baptized without them. (DIONYS. *Eccles. Hierarch.* c. 2; *Constit. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 16; VICTOR. *de Persecut. Vandal.* lib. iii. *Bibl. Patr.* tom. vii. p. 613; PALLAD. *Hist. Lausiaca.* c. 12, *Bibl. Patr.* tom. i. p. 915.) Their duty was, not to answer in the names of the baptized, but only to admonish and instruct them before and after baptism.” (Abridged from BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xi. chap. 8<sup>16</sup>.)

4. *Persons qualified to act as sponsors.*—Respecting the qualifications of sponsors, it will be sufficient in this place to enumerate the various rules and customs which obtained in the church, without entering into all the questions that have been raised in connexion with the subject.

i. It was a general rule that every sponsor must be himself a baptized person, and in full communion with the church. By this regulation all heathen, and all mere catechumens, all reputed heretics, and all excommunicated persons and penitents, were disqualified. All enervated and persons of unsound mind were likewise excluded by an express law. Those reputed heretics whose baptism was accounted valid were, however, allowed to act as sponsors.

ii. Every sponsor was required to be of full age. No minors were admitted to this office, even though they had been baptized and confirmed.

<sup>16</sup> An important passage on this subject occurs in Augustin, or Cæsar Arelat. (*Serm.* 163, *De Temp.*)

Hoc admoneo, ut quoties paschalis solemnitas venit, quicumque viri, quæcumque mulieres de sacro fonte filios spiritualiter exceperunt, cognoscant, se pro ipsis fidejussores apud Deum existisse, et ideo semper illis sollicitudinem veræ caritatis impendant et admoneant, ut custodiant castitatem, virginitatem usque ad nuptias servant, a maledicto vel perjurio linguam refrænent, cantica turpia vel luxuriosa ex ore non proferrant, non superbiant, non invident, iracundiam vel odium in corde non

teneant, auguria non observent, phylacteria et characteres diabolicos nec sibi nec suis aliquando suspendant, incantatores velut ministros Diaboli fugiant, fidem catholicam teneant, ad ecclesiam frequentius currant, contenta verbositate lectiones divinas attentis auribus audiant, peregrinos accipiant, et secundum quod ipsis in baptismo dictum est, hospitem pedes lavent, pacem et ipsi teneant, et discordes ad concordiam revocare contendant, sacerdotibus et parentibus honorem amore veræ caritatis impendant. AUGUSTIN (OR CÆSAR ARELAT.) *Serm. de Tempore*, 163.

iii. Every one who acted in this capacity was supposed to be acquainted with the fundamental truths of Christianity, and to know the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the leading outlines of Christian doctrine and morality. And it appears from DIONYS. AREOP. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2, that every sponsor was required to prepare himself beforehand for the right undertaking of the office. Ecclesiastical laws of a later date exclude persons "qui ignorant rudimenta fidei,"—unacquainted with the first principles of the Christian religion.

iv. In early times monks and nuns were eligible as sponsors, and were frequently chosen to act in that capacity (AUGUST. *Ep.* 23, *ad Bonifac.*; *Vita Epiphani.* c. 8); but in the sixth century this practice was prohibited. (*Conc. Antissiodor.* A. D. 578, c. 25.)

v. Parents were allowed to stand as sponsors to their own children during the earlier centuries; and the first prohibition on record, by which they were disqualified for this office, is contained in a canon of the Council of Mentz. (*Conc. Mogunt.* A. D. 183, c. 55.) But this prohibition has never been universally enforced; and even the *ordo Rom.* i. proposes the alternative, "presbyteri, acceptis infantibus a parentibus vel patrinis eorum baptizent eos," i. e., *presbyters, having received infants at the hands of their parents or sponsors, shall baptize them.*

5. *Number of sponsors.*—At first there was no law respecting the number of sponsors at baptism. In DIONYS. AREOP. *De Hier. Eccl.* c. 2, mention is made of only one ἀνάδοχος; and some persons suppose that the early church was always satisfied with one,—usually the father or mother of the baptized; but, in the absence of all testimony, we may perhaps be permitted to think it more probable, that two or three were required, especially in times of persecution. Of the different canons relating to this subject, some prescribe one sponsor, others demand two or three<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Non plures ad suscipiendum de baptismo infantis accedant, quam unus, sive vir, sive mulier. In confirmatione quoque id ipsum fiat. DECRET. LEON. M. ap. Gratian. P. 3, *De Consecr. Dist.* iv. c. 101.—Infantem nequaquam duo vel plures, sed unus a fonte baptismatis suscipiat. Nam unus Deus, unum baptisma, unus, qui a fonte suscipit, debet esse pater vel mater infantis. *Conc. Meten.* A. D. 888, c. 6.—*Duo vel tres tantum* admittantur ad levandum puerum de baptismo. *Conc. Colon.* A. D. 1281, c. 4.—*Ad elevandum puerum de sacro fonte tres tantum* recipiantur. *Conc. Herbipol.* A. D. 1293, c. 2.—*Ad levandum puerum de fonte tres vel quatuor* admittantur. Quod

The Council of Trent limits the number to one, or two at the most. (*Conc. Trident.* 24, c. 2.)

It was required, at first, that sponsors should be always of the same sex as the persons baptized, perhaps for the sake of decency, just as the deacons were ordered to assist at the baptism of males, and the deaconesses at that of females<sup>18</sup>. In later times it became usual to have two sponsors, one male and one female. When there were three, two of these were male and one female at the baptism of a boy, two female and one male at the baptism of a girl. And this is the prevailing practice in modern times.

It has been supposed that, at some periods, women were entirely excluded from the office of sponsors; but this is a mistake, as appears from AUGUST. *Serm.* 163, *de Temp.*; WAL. STRABO. *De Reb. Eccl.* c. 26.

Some examples of sponsors acting by proxy, may be found. (FRIEDERICI A JESU *Lex. Theol. August. Vind.* 1784, p. 507.)

#### § 9.—OF NAMES GIVEN AT BAPTISM.

THE naming of a child has been deemed a matter of importance among all people, and under various systems of religion; and the customs connected with this ceremony possess at once an historical and a theological interest.

It appears highly probable that the modern practice of giving the name at baptism may have originated with infant-baptism itself, or may even be referred to the customs of Jewish circumcision. But no mention is made of this practice in the New Testament, or in any of the earliest ecclesiastical writers, *e. g.*, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian.

We know that, in the fourth century, baptized adults sometimes retained the names which they had previously borne, as

amplius est, a malo est. *Conc. Trevir.* A. D. 1227, c. 1.—The number was fixed at three by several other councils of the thirteenth century (*Conc. Bajoc.* A. D. 1280, c. 4; *Conc. Vigorniens.* A. D. 1240, c. 5; *Conc. Exoniens.* A. D. 1287, c. 2); but was afterwards limited to one, or two at most, by the

Council of Trent. (*Conc. Trident.* 24, c. 2.)

<sup>18</sup> Viri non teneant in baptismo puellas aut mulieres, neque mulieres teneant masculos; sed potius mulieres teneant puellas, et viri teneant masculos. *Conc. Nicæn.* c. 22.

in the cases of Constantine, Ambrose, Augustin, Gregory, and others. But we find, also, cases in which new names were given to adults at baptism. Thus we read that the bishop Stephanus, in baptizing two young persons, named Adrias and Paulina, gave to the former the new name of Neo, and called the latter Maria. (BARON. *Annal.* A. D. 259.) When the same bishop baptized Nemesius and his daughter, the former retained his old name, but the latter was called by a new name, Lucilla. When the emperor Theodosius was about to marry Athenais, daughter of Leontius the sophist, the intended bride was baptized by the bishop Atticus, and received on that occasion the name Eudokia, by which she is known in history (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 21). When Peter Balsamus was asked his name by the bishop Severus, he replied “*Nomine paterno Balsamus dicor, spirituali vero nomine, quod in baptismo accepi, Petrus dicor.*” i. e., “*My surname is Balsamus, but my spiritual name, which I received at my baptism, is Peter,*” (*Martyr. S. Petri Aul. in SURII Vit. SS. d. 3, Jan.*)

As long as the custom of previous catechetical instruction and preparation continued, the name appears to have been fixed some time before the administration of baptism. And to this may, perhaps, be referred the custom, often mentioned by ecclesiastical writers, of entering the names of candidates in the baptismal register, (CYRIL. HIEROS. *Procatech. and Catech.* 3; GREGOR. NYSS. *Orat. in Eos qui differ. Bapt.*; AUGUST. *Confess.* lib. ix. *de fide et oper.*) According to DIONYS. AREOP. *de Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2, an entry was made of the name of the sponsor, as well as of that of the person to be baptized.

The name was usually fixed and given either by the party baptized, if an adult, or by the parents or sponsors, in case of infant-baptism. The officiating minister possessed the power of a veto, if he disapproved of the name imposed, as appears from several canons.

The church required that the name given in baptism should express some character of the Christian religion, or should relate to some Christian virtue or duty; grounding this requisition upon the practice of our Saviour and his apostles, and with reference to James ii. 7, compared with 1 Peter iv. 14—16.

Chrysostom says (*Hom. 21 in Genes.*) that the names of newly admitted members of the church ought to refer not to their ancestors, however celebrated, but to those holy persons who are the patterns of godliness and virtue. On this principle, the names most commonly given in baptism were those of apostles, saints, and martyrs (NICEPH. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 22); and of these names, Peter, Paul, and John were especial favourites. Other names also, expressive of Christian graces in the abstract, were frequently adopted; such as Eusebius, Eusebia, Pius, Fidus, Fidelis, Charitas, Gratianus, Innocentius. Some names bore reference to the stated seasons of baptism; *e. g.*, Natalis, Epiphanius, Paschasius, Paschalis. It has been supposed that the names of animals, such as †Leo, Asellus, Pecorius, Ursula, Columba, Columbanus, were adopted in token of Christian humility. And perhaps the names of heathen gods, or those referring to them, such as Mercurius, Janus, Venerius, Apollinaris, Minervalis, Palladius, Saturninus, may have been given with a Christian signification, as implying the duty of the baptized to renounce and oppose the principles of idolatry and superstition. But this practice was forbidden by the council of Nicæa (c. 30.)

The decided preference given by the modern church of Rome to the names of the New Testament, or of Christian saints, in contradistinction to names from the Old Testament, arises from the contrary preference manifested by the first reformers among the attempts which they made to abolish the superstitious opinions and practices of their times. (*Conc. Burgidal.* A. D. 1538, c. 9; *Catech. Rom.*)

#### § 10.—OF CONFIRMATION.

1. *Derivation of the rite from the practice of the apostles.*—The rite of confirmation, or imposition of hands with prayer, for the full admission of baptized persons into the church, is observed by nearly all the churches of Christendom at the present day, in imitation (to say the least) of an apostolical practice recorded in the New Testament.

It appears from the sacred history, that the apostles conferred

imposition of hands (*ἐπιθέσις τῶν χειρῶν*) upon persons previously baptized, and no other. Thus when the Samaritans had been converted and baptized by Philip the deacon, the apostles who were at Jerusalem sent unto them Peter and John, “who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus); then they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.” (Acts viii. 14—17.) Thus, also, it is said of the Ephesian disciples, that when they heard what the Apostle Paul said, “they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied.” (Acts xix. 5. 6.) It is, however, evident that in these passages allusion is made to the extraordinary or miraculous gifts of the Spirit imparted by the apostles; as the narratives are explained by Grotius and other interpreters. See Acts v. 12—16. Hence, it is said, immediately after the former of these accounts, “When Simon *saw* that through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost,” (v. 18, 19.) And hence, also, we may perhaps rightly account for the fact, that in many other histories of baptism during the time of the apostles, no mention whatever is made of a subsequent imposition of hands. Thus, in the history of the baptism of three thousand men on the day of Pentecost after the preaching of Peter, although the apostle promised them that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost upon their baptism, yet nothing is said respecting any laying on of hands (Acts ii. 38—42). Nor does this ceremony appear to have taken place at the baptism of Lydia and her household (Acts xvi. 15), or of the Philippian jailor and his family (Acts xvi. 31—33). In Hebrews vi. 2, mention is made of “the doctrine of laying on of hands,” immediately after that of “the doctrine of baptism;” but there is nothing in the passage to prove that these two ceremonies were immediately connected with each other; and many expositors understand this imposition of hands to be that practised in healing the sick, or



in ordination to the ministry, (Mark xvi. 18; Acts vi. 6; ix. 12, 17.)

In Acts xv. 41, we read that St. Paul "went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches." The following remark by Dr. Burton appears to place this transaction in its true light. "The great apostle travelled through Syria and Cilicia; and the expression used by St. Luke of his *confirming the churches* in those countries, proves that he must have planted these churches at an earlier period. He now confirmed them: *i. e.*, he gave them such regulations as were necessary for their welfare. Wherever deacons were wanted, he ordained them; he appointed others to the office of elders; and there can be little doubt, that to some or all of these ministers he imparted those miraculous gifts of the Spirit, which were so useful for the instruction of the converts, and furnished such convincing evidence of the gospel." (BURTON, *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the first Three Centuries*, lect. 6.) We have no proof, however, that the ordination of ministers was included in this act of "confirming the churches;" nor have we any reason to suppose that the ordination or appointment of deacons or presbyters would have waited for an apostolical visit. When St. Paul found a deficiency of ministers in any of the churches which he visited, he, doubtless, recommended those churches to nominate some persons fit for the office, and then probably assisted at their ordination or solemn designation to it, before he proceeded on his journey. But, in the absence of the apostle, the officiating presbyters would themselves have supplied the deficiency, with the consent of their respective churches.

In like manner, the unction or chrism (*χρῖσμα*) of which we read in the New Testament (1 John ii. 27; 2 Cor. i. 21), although interpreted by some as relating to the ceremony of confirmation, cannot be so referred with any degree of certainty; and seems to describe rather a spiritual anointing, or to relate to the kingly and priestly dignity of Christians (1 Pet. ii. 9), if not to the possession of extraordinary and miraculous powers. And the same remark would apply to the Scriptural expression *σφραγίζεσθαι*, to seal (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; 2 Cor. i. 22); which denotes the assurance or consciousness of divine favour and

assistance. Early expositors refer this expression indeed to baptism; but not to confirmation.

The earliest records of ecclesiastical antiquity contain no clear and certain testimony concerning the use of confirmation. Mention of anointing and sealing is indeed found in DIONYS. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2; but there is so little reason to suppose this work genuine, that no appeal can be made to it, as declaring the practices of the apostolic age. In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, it is doubtful whether *σφραγίς*, the seal, refers to baptism or to confirmation. And the same may be said concerning a passage quoted from Clement of Alexandria, in EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 23, in which a bishop is said to have imparted the seal of the Lord (*τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κυρίου*) to the young man committed to his care by St. John.

2. *Confirmation in connexion with baptism.*—At an early period of ecclesiastical history, we find confirmation administered in immediate connexion with baptism.

Tertullian speaks expressly of confirmation as following immediately after the administration of baptism (*De Baptismo*, c. 7, 8); and he appears to refer to the use of chrism and the seal in the celebration of the former rite (*De Resurrect. Carn.* c. 8)<sup>19</sup>. He traces the chrism to the ancient practice of anointing the priests under the Jewish law.

In the writings of Cyprian, we find some passages relating to confirmation, which are especially important, because he applies the term “sacramentum” to this ceremony<sup>20</sup>. But it is evident,

<sup>19</sup> Exinde egressi de lavaero perungimur benedicta unctione, de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant, ex quo Aaron a Moyse unctus est. Unde Christus dicitur a chrismate, quod est unctio, quæ Domino nomen accommodavit, facta spiritalis, quia Spiritu unctus est a Deo Patre.—Sic et in nobis carnaliter currit unctio, sed spiritaliter proficit; quomodo et ipsius baptismi carnalis actus, quod in aqua mergimur, spiritalis effectus, quod delictis liberamur.—Delinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiri-

tum Sanctum. TERTULL. *De Baptismo*, c. 7, 8.

<sup>20</sup> Male ergo sibi quidam interpretantur, quod per manus impositionem Spiritum S. accipiant, et sic recipiantur, cum manifestum sit, utroque sacramento debere eos renasci in ecclesia catholica. . . . Nisi ergo acceperint baptismum salutarem in ecclesia catholica, quæ una est, salvi esse non possunt, sed cum carnalibus in iudicio Domini Christi damnabuntur. CYPRIAN. *Sent. Episcoporum 87 de Hæreticis baptizandis*.—Eos, qui sint foris extra ecclesiam tineti, et apud hæreticos et schismaticos pro-

not only from the general use of the word at the time in which Cyprian wrote, but from the drift of the passages in which it occurs, that sacramentum was used here simply in the sense of "rite" or "ceremony."

In later writers, the testimonies which prove the connexion of confirmation with baptism are numerous and decisive. (TER-TULL. *de Bapt.* c. 7; CYRIL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* iii. 1; *Const. Apost.* lib. vii. c. 43, 44.) There is a curious passage on this subject in OPT. MILEVIT. *de Schism. Donat.* lib. iv.<sup>21</sup>.

Baptism being regarded as a solemn compact or covenant, it was natural to look upon confirmation, immediately following, as the seal by which the contract was ratified or completed. And hence confirmation was usually administered, not by the baptizing presbyters or deacons, but by the bishop, as the chief minister of the church.

At the stated seasons of baptism, the bishop was chiefly engaged in administering the rite of confirmation; but he sometimes commenced the whole solemnity by the baptism of a few individuals with his own hands. When baptism was administered in the absence of the bishop, confirmation was administered at some convenient season afterwards by himself or his repre-

fanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad ecclesiam, quæ una est, venerint, baptizari oportere, eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum S., nisi accipiant et ecclesiæ baptismum. Tunc enim demum plene sanctificari, et esse filii Dei possunt, si *sacramento utroque* nascantur, cum scriptum sit, Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei. CYP. *Ep.* 72 *ad Steph.*

<sup>21</sup> Sed quia filius a patre, Dens a Deo, erat ungenus, secundum quod Filius petiit, Spiritus promissa nuntiavit, et complevit Pater in Jordane, quo cum venisset Filius Dei, salvator noster, a Joanne ostensus est his verbis, Ecce agnus Dei. Hic est, qui tollit peccata mundi! Descendit in aquam, non quia erat quod in Deo mundaretur, sed super venturum oleum

aqua debuit antecedere, ad mysteria initianda et ordinanda et implenda baptismatis: *lotus* cum in Joannis manibus haberetur, secutus est ordo mysterii, et complevit Pater quod rogaverat Filius, et quod nuntiaverat Spiritus Sanctus. Apertum est cœlum Deo patre ungente, spiritale oleum statim in imagine columba descendit, et insedit capiti ejus, et perfudit eum, unde cepit dici *Christus* quando unctus est a Deo Patre. Cui ne manus impositio defuisse videretur, vox audita est Dei de nube dicentis, Hic est Filius meus, de quo bene sensi; hunc audite. Hoc est igitur quod lectum est, Oleum peccatoris non ungat caput meum. Rationem veritatis vel sero addisce, quoniam nunc tempus invenisti descendendum. OR-TAT. MILEV. *De Schism. Donat.* lib. iv. p. 77, *Opp.* t. i. *ed. Oberth.*

sentative. (*Conc. Illiber.* A. D. 305, c. 77; *HIERONYMUS contra Lucifer.* c. 4.) Hence it came to pass that confirmation was often deferred until several years after baptism, especially in those dioceses which were seldom visited, either on account of their great extent, or to suit the convenience and indolence of the bishops.

Even after the prevalence of infant-baptism, confirmation was conferred immediately after the administration of the sacrament; and this practice continued during several centuries. This may be proved, says Bingham, "by plain testimonies of the ancients. Nothing can be plainer than those words of Gennadius, 'If they be infants that are baptized, let those that present them to baptism answer for them according to the common way of baptizing; and then let them be confirmed with imposition of hands and chrism, and so be admitted to partake of the eucharist.' (*GENNAD. de Dogmat. Eccles.* cap. 52.) In like manner, Pope Innocent, in one of his decrees, says, 'Infants are not to be consigned or confirmed by any but the bishop.' (*INNOCENT. Ep.* i. c. 4.) And in the collection of canons made by Martin Braacensis, out of those of the Greek church, this is one, 'That a presbyter may not consign infants in the presence of the bishop, except he be particularly appointed by the bishop to do it,' (cap. 52.) This practice continued in the church for many ages; for it is mentioned by Pope Gregory, both in his sacramentary, and in his epistles; and after him by all the writers in the eighth and ninth centuries. . . . If this matter needed further proof, we might insist upon the known practice and custom in the ancient church of giving the eucharist to infants, which continued in the church for several ages. It is frequently mentioned by Cyprian, Austin, Innocent, and Gennadius, writers from the third to the fifth century. Maldonet confesses it was in the church for six hundred years. And some authorities prove it to have continued two or three ages more, and to have been the common practice beyond the time of Charles the Great." (*Antiq.* book xi. chap. i. § 1, 2.)

The permanent separation of confirmation from baptism, cannot perhaps be assigned to an earlier date than the thirteenth century.

A question was referred by Cyprian to Stephen, bishop of Rome (CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 72 *ad Steph.*), whether it was necessary to rebaptize heretics who sought admission to the catholic church, or it should be deemed sufficient, proceeding upon the acknowledged validity of their baptism, to receive them with the simple ceremony of imposition of hands, and ecclesiastical benediction? The Roman bishop, in reply, acceded to the latter opinion. But the African bishops, on the other hand, declared the baptism of heretics to be null and void, and would not recognise their confirmation at the hands of a catholic bishop as sufficient for their reception into the church. They demanded another baptism, to be followed by the usual confirmation. Notwithstanding this demonstration of their sentiments, the church of Rome persevered in maintaining that the baptism of heretics, provided only that it was administered in due form, was valid and sufficient, and that the sacrament ought not to be repeated. This opinion finally prevailed; and even the African churches at length agreed on this point with those of Rome, Gaul, Spain, and Asia Minor. And hence the practice was generally established, that all heretics or schismatics, except those who did not baptize in the name of the holy Trinity, or who denied the validity of catholic baptism, should be received as members of the catholic church, upon recantation of their former errors, by the mere imposition of hands or confirmation. (*Conc. Constantinop.* I. A.D. 381, can. 7; *Conc. Arausiac.* I. A.D. 441, can. 8; *Conc. Arelat.* II. A.D. 455, can. 26; *Conc. Epaon.* A.D. 517, c. 16; SIRICIUS. *Ep.* 1, c. 1; LEO I. *Ep.* 37, c. 2.) Bingham endeavours to show that the ceremonies used on these occasions are to be considered as distinct from confirmation; but it is generally supposed that confirmation is intended by the ancients when they speak of receiving heretics by imposition of hands and chrism.

It appears that some sects of reputed heretics administered confirmation as well as baptism; but the former was never admitted as valid by the catholic church, although the latter was<sup>22</sup>. The chrism of the Donatists, indeed, was accounted

<sup>22</sup> Spiritus Sanctus quod in sola catholica ecclesia per manus impositionem dari dicitur, nimirum hoc intel-  
ligi majores nostri voluerunt, quod Apostolus ait, Quoniam caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per

good; but imposition of hands was deemed necessary at their reception into the church. (*Conc. Araus. I. c. 8*; *Conf. OPTAT. MILEVIT. de Schism. Donatist. lib. vii.*; *ALCIMI AVITI Ep. 24, ad Steph.*)

3. *Ministers of Confirmation.*—From very early times, the bishop was always regarded as the ordinary minister of confirmation. (*CYPRIAN, Ep. 73 ad Jubaj.*; *CHRYSOSTOM, Hom. 18 in Act. Apost.*; *AUGUSTIN, de Trin. lib. xv. c. 26.*) By the canons of several councils, the inferior clergy were forbidden to confirm, or at least to consecrate the chrism. (*Conc. Illiber. can. 38, 77*; *Conc. Carthag. II. can. 3*; *III. can. 36*; *IV. can. 36*; *Conc. Tolet. I. can. 20.*) And in all liturgical writings, the bishop is either named or implied as the minister of confirmation. (*DIONYS. AREOP. de Hierarch. Eccl. c. 2*; *Sacrament. GELAS. Vigil. Pasch.*)

IN *GELAS. Epist. 9, c. 6*, and *GREGOR. M. Epist. lib. iii. ep. 9*, presbyters are permitted in certain cases to confirm, but they are not allowed to use any chrism except such as may have been consecrated by a bishop. (See also *INNOCENT I. Ep. 1 ad Decent. c. 3.*)

On the whole, the case respecting the minister of confirmation during the first six centuries may be stated thus:—

i. The bishop was, for the most part, the ordinary minister.—The chorepiscopi appear to have administered the rite without any limitation or restriction.

ii. In the earliest times, and in certain places, presbyters appear to have conferred imposition of hands; but their execution of this office was subsequently confined to the following occasions:—1. When the bishop was not present; 2. Or in presence of the bishop only by his express orders or commission; 3. On the conversion of a reputed heretic, if such an one, desirous of being received into the church, was at the point of

Spiritum S., qui datus est nobis. Non autem habent Dei caritatem, qui ecclesie non diligunt unitatem; ac per hoc recte intelligitur dici, non accipi nisi in catholica Spiritus S. Quodlibet hæretici et schismatici accipiant: caritas, quæ cooperit multitudinem pec-

catorum, proprium donum est catholice unitatis et pacis. Manus impositio non, sicut baptismus, repeti non potest: quid est enim aliud, nisi oratio super hominem? *AUGUST. de Bapt. contr. Donat. lib. ii. c. 16.*

death while the bishop was at a distance. (At least, this was permitted in the Spanish and Gallic churches, although the Roman church did not admit such exception.)

iii. Deacons, who administered baptism, were on the same footing as presbyters with respect to the right of confirming; until they were absolutely forbidden to administer this rite by the Council of Toledo, A.D. 400.

In the Greek church, presbyters are allowed to confirm, and even to consecrate the chrism; and an appeal is made in support of the practice to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, book viii. c. 22, which passage ascribes the administration of baptism, and of the subsequent chrism, to either a bishop or a presbyter. But the *Constitutions*, taken alone, do not form sufficient authority; and besides this, it happens that in other parts of them the whole office of baptism is referred to the bishop alone, (lib. iii. c. 16, 17; vii. c. 43.) So that, if the matter is to be decided by reference to ecclesiastical antiquity, there can be no doubt that the practice of the Western church has the greatest support. But if the expediency or necessity of the matter be considered, or if an appeal be made to apostolical authority, the question is different.

4. *Administration of the Rite.*—The close connexion which subsisted between baptism and confirmation in the early church, the latter being considered merely as the conclusion or completion of the former, may easily account for the fact that the act of confirmation was attended with few peculiar ceremonies. The customs now adopted in administering this rite in the Roman church are, for the most part, of no earlier date than the period in which confirmation began to be made distinct from baptism.

After the separation of confirmation from baptism (that is to say, after the beginning of the seventh century), the church required a witness of confirmation, as well as of baptism. Perhaps a baptismal sponsor may have been permitted to act in this capacity; but in case of the death, absence, or disqualification of sponsors, to say the least, a new and independent witness was called for.

Names given in baptism were sometimes changed at con-

firmation. But this was merely an occasional practice of some of the later centuries.

Four principal ceremonies were used in the administration of confirmation; namely, imposition of hands, unction with the chrism, the sign of the cross, and prayer. Bingham places unction first in order, upon the authority of Tertullian (*de Bapt.* c. vii., viii.); but in the old liturgical books, imposition of hands is first mentioned, and in the practice of the church it retains the precedence.

1. *Imposition of hands.*—This ceremony is founded upon the example and practice of the apostles; it was used in various offices of benediction, but more especially at ordination, the reception of penitents into the church, and confirmation. (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; Heb. vi. 2; conf. Gen. xlviii. 13 seq.; TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 7; HIERONYM. *contr. Lucif.* c. 4.) An account of the various customs observed in administering this part of the rite may be seen in ED. MARTENE *de Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. 2, art. 4; ASSEMANI *Cod. Liturg. Eccl. Univers.* lib. 3.

2. *Unction, or anointing with the chrism.*—Some writers have endeavoured to trace the use of chrism in confirmation to the age of the apostles; but there is no proof of the existence of this practice before the third century. It is expressly mentioned by Tertullian and Origen; and in the *Apostolical Constitutions* it is not only recognised, but spoken of in very honourable terms; being called in one place, τὸ μύρον, βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας, chrism, the confirmation of our confession (lib. iii. c. 17); and in another, τὸ μύρον, σφραγὶς τῶν συνθηκῶν, chrism, the seal of the covenants (lib. vii. c. 22); and we find also in the same book, an express form of prayer or thanksgiving, to be used at the application of the sacred unction (εὐχαριστία περὶ τοῦ μυστικοῦ μύρου, lib. vii. c. 44, 45). Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Mystag.* iii.) gives full instructions concerning the administration of chrism. And after his times, the practice was generally adopted in the church, if not before.

As to the matter of the chrism, it consisted at first of olive-oil; but afterwards a more costly compound was used. This substance was consecrated by the bishop, with prayer, exorcism,



and insufflation. It was applied, in the East, to various parts of the body, such as the forehead, ears, nose, and breast; but, in the West, to the forehead only. (CYRILL. HIEROS. *Catech. Mystag.* iii. § 4; *Ordo Confirmat. Eccl. Constant. ap. ASSEMANI Col. Liturg.* lib. iii.; *Sacrament. GELAS.*; AUGUST. *Enarrat. Ps. cxli.*; conf. THOMAS AQUIN. *Summa*, p. 3, quæst. 72, art. 9.)

“When this ceremony was once admitted, it was usually magnified as the symbol, and sometimes as the instrumental cause of very great effects. The consecration of it was supposed to work a mystical change in its nature, answerable to the change wrought in the waters of baptism, and the bread and wine in the eucharist<sup>23</sup>, which Cyril of Jerusalem compares together. It was this unction, as the completion of baptism, to which they ascribed the power of making every Christian, in some sense, partaker of a royal priesthood. To it they also ascribed the noble effects of confirming the soul with the strength of all spiritual grace on God’s part, as well as the confirmation of the professions and covenant made on man’s part.” (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xii. c. 3, § 3.)

3. *Sign of the cross.*—The bishop, in anointing with the chrism, made it with the sign of the cross upon the part, or parts, of the body to which he applied it. (AMBROS. *de Sacram.* lib. vi. c. 3.) The name consignation, which is often used by Latin writers to denote confirmation, seems to have especial reference to this part of the ceremony; as well as the Greek word *σφραγίς*, sign, seal. (INNOCENT. *Ep. 1 ad Decent.* c. 3; MARTIN. BRACAREN. can. 52; *Conc. Constant.* I. A. D. 381, c. 7; *Const. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 7; DIONYS. AREOP. *de Hier. Eccl.* c. 5.)

4. *Prayer.*—The form of words prescribed by the first Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, to be used at administering the chrism, was simply *Σφραγίς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου. ἀμήν*;—The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Amen. “But besides this shorter form, which was only an implicit prayer, as if they had said, Let this unction be unto thee the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit, they had also some larger forms, which were more express prayers; one of which is in the author of the *Apostolical*

<sup>23</sup> Remarkable traces of doctrinal corruption.—No change is wrought in any of these elements.

*Constitutions* (referred to above), where the bishop is ordered to anoint the party baptized, saying these words, ‘O Lord God, the Unbegotten, who hast no Lord, who art Lord of all, who madest the sweet savour of the knowledge of the Gospel to go forth among all nations, grant now that this chrism may be effectual in this baptized person, that the sweet savour of thy Christ may remain firm and stable in him, and that he, being dead with him, may rise again, and live with him.’” (BINGHAM.)

The ceremony was concluded by a benediction from the bishop, accompanied with a slight blow on the cheek of the person confirmed, intended, perhaps, as a substitute for the kiss of peace, given in the early church. But no trace of this last-mentioned ceremony occurs at an earlier date than the thirteenth century.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

#### § 1.—NAMES OR APPELLATIONS OF THIS SACRAMENT.

THE sacrament of the Lord's supper has always been justly regarded as the most solemn rite of Christian worship. A proof of the importance attached to this sacred institution, if it were needed, might be found in the numerous and violent controversies which have from time to time arisen, concerning doctrines and practices more or less closely connected with it. It is indeed, painful and humiliating to reflect that a sacrament of love has become an occasion of bitterness and hatred; but this feeling of regret may be in some degree mitigated when we trace many of the disputes to a sincere, though mistaken, respect for holy things, and to the dictates of a tender and scrupulous, though unenlightened, conscience. Blameworthy as the temper and conduct of many controversialists may be, and mischievous as have been the consequences of their disputes, it must be remembered that even concord and agreement itself, if arising from mere indifference or apathy, would have been an evil of still greater magnitude, inasmuch as it would have been the grave of all religious sentiment.

All parties (with a few very trifling exceptions in modern times) agree in regarding this sacrament as the characteristic and centre of Christian worship.

The various names by which the Lord's supper has been distinguished, if their significancy and bearings be duly considered, furnish almost a complete history of the sacrament itself, with the doctrines and usages connected with it; and may at all events be profitably examined by way of introduction to our view of the whole subject. The reason of these various appellations lies, for the most part, either in some peculiar views relating to the doctrine of the sacrament, or in a preference for some peculiar mode of administration.

1. The term *δεῖπνον κυριακόν*, *sacra cœna*, *cœna Domini*, *Lord's Supper*, has an historical reference to the institution of the rite by our blessed Lord on the night in which he was betrayed (Matt. xxvi. 20, 31; 1 Cor. xi. 20); and so it intimates merely that the observance is to be regarded as a commemoration of our Saviour, and a repetition of his last intercourse with his disciples before his passion. Some critics maintain that this phrase, in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the only passage of Scripture in which it occurs, is not to be regarded as signifying the Lord's supper, strictly so called, or in its modern acceptance; but denotes rather the feast which accompanied the distribution and partaking of the consecrated elements. This position, however, has not been established; and it has been abundantly shown that the early Christian writers applied this term as we do. (See SUICERI *Observat. sacr.* p. 91; CASAUB. *Exercit.* 16 *ad Baronii Annal.* p. 450 seq.; GERHARDI *Loc. Theol.* t. x. p. 3.)

2. The synonymous expressions *τράπεζα Κυρίου*, *mensa Dei*, *the Lord's table*, have immediate reference to the idea of a convivium Dominicum, as Tertullian expresses himself, *ad Uxor.*, lib. ii. c. 4. In 1 Cor. xi. 21, we find *τράπεζα Κυρίου* (opposed to *τράπεζα δαιμονίων*, i. e. the table on which sacrifices were offered to idols) not alone, but in connexion with *ποτήριον Κυρίου* (opposed to *ποτήριον δαιμονίων*).

But this term does not convey the idea of a common dining-

table, or a table used for ordinary purposes, as well as for the purposes of the holy sacrament. The opposition between the expressions "table of the Lord," and "table of demons," at once marks it out as a table set apart for its sacred purpose; not to mention that the apostle had just before spoken of *θυσιαστήριον*, as synonymous with it. The "table" of show-bread, mentioned in Heb. ix. 2, was set apart entirely for its sacred purpose. And therefore the ancients were quite justified in denominating this table "*mensa mystica*," i. e. *a table sacred to the purposes of celebrating the Lord's supper.*

3. With the foregoing terms are connected the following scriptural expressions, partly literal and partly figurative:—*Bread, the breaking of bread* (Acts ii. 42: xx. 7, conf. xxvii. 35; Luke xxiv. 35); *the eating of bread* (John vi. 23); *the Lord's body, or his flesh* (John vi. 53); *the cup of the Lord* (1 Cor. x. 21); *the cup of the New Testament* (Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25); *blood* (John vi. 53). On these phrases have been founded the custom of breaking the bread in this sacrament, and the mistaken practice of administering the communion in one kind.

4. It has been debated whether or not the phrase *new covenant* (*ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου*, Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25) is, strictly speaking, an appellation of the Lord's supper. (See GERHARD. *Loc. Theol.* t. x. p. 4, 5.)

5. The name by which this sacrament has been most generally designated, is *The Communion* (*κοινωνία*, *communicatio*, *communio*). This term has been in current use in all ages of the church, and among all parties. It has been used both in a doctrinal or mystical sense, and in an historical and ecclesiastical signification.

Doctrinally speaking, *communion* denotes a sacramental union and fellowship, which exists exclusively in and by the ordinance which it designates. It is so called, say some, because it unites us with God; (*quia nobis conjunctionem cum Deo conciliat, nosque regni ipsius consortes ac participes reddit*, ISIDOR. PELUS. *Ep.* 228). Others understand this communion especially of union and fellowship with the Saviour; and refer it either to the (supposed) connexion of his sacred body and blood with the

elements of bread and wine; or to the union of the communicants with their head; or to their union among themselves in the bonds of holy love.

In 1 Cor. x. 6, the expressions *κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος*, *communion of the blood*, and *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *communion of the body of Christ*, may be taken in either of these senses; and accordingly, interpreters differ in opinion as to whether the apostle speaks in this passage of a physical or of a moral union with Christ, and whether or not the expression *κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ* is synonymous with it.

In an historical and ecclesiastical sense, *communio* means a partaking in all the mysteries of the Christian religion, and so church fellowship, in its fullest sense, with all its accompanying rights and privileges. Hence the term excommunication.

In a liturgical sense, *communio* denotes sometimes the administration of the sacrament, and sometimes the partaking of it.

6. In the early church, the Lord's supper was undoubtedly denoted by the term *ἀγάπη*, *ἀγάπη*, or rather by the plural *αἱ ἀγάπαι*. But it is doubtful, first, whether the expression *αἱ ἀγάπαι*, Jude 12, and 2 Pet. ii. 13, refers to the Lord's supper itself, or to the feast which accompanied its celebration; and, secondly, whether the administration of the sacrament followed the agape, and was regarded as the close of it, or whether it preceded. See more on this subject below.

7. The very ancient and general appellation *εὐχαριστία*, *eucharistia*, *The Eucharist*, does not itself occur in the New Testament; but it is founded upon the sacred phraseology. In the history of the institution, Matt. xxvi. 27, Mark xiv. 23, and Luke xxii. 19, the evangelists use the expression *εὐχαριστήσας*, which is repeated by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 24. And with evident allusion to this, the sacred ordinance is termed *εὐχαριστία*, in JUSTIN. MART. *Apol.* i. 65, 66; IREN. *adv. Hæres.* iv. 34; CLEM. ALEX. *Pædagog.* ii. 2; because, according to the explanation of ancient writers, gratitude for the divine mercy and grace is the chief requisite in those who partake of the Lord's supper.

8. The same may be said of the term *εὐλογία* (*celebratio laudis*, *benedictio*); because *εὐλογήσας* is used as synonymous

with εὐχαριστήσας, Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22; and the apostle says, 1 Cor. x. 16, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, ὃ εὐλογούμεν, *the cup of blessing, which we bless*. Ecclesiastical writers, down to Cyril of Alexandria and Chrysostom, use εὐλογία as synonymous with εὐχαριστία. But, after the fifth century, the term was appropriated to the consecrated bread, or the bread set apart from the oblations for the poor and the ministers of the church.

9. Προσφορά, oblatio, *oblation*. The original signification of this word, is the bringing of a gift or present, and especially of the matter for a sacrifice. It corresponds to the Hebrew מִנְחָה, minchah, and the Syriac word corban; and came to be used as synonymous with ἱεὶς, and θυσία, *a sacrifice*. It is usually applied, in Christian antiquity, of the elements or “species” in the Lord’s supper. The later Greek writers sometimes use ἀναφορά as synonymous with προσφορά; more frequently, however, as equivalent to the Latin elevatio, but in a moral and spiritual, rather than physical, sense, and with allusion to the exhortation “Lift up your hearts!” In the Latin word offertorium, *offertory*, the leading idea is that of a gift brought as an offering; but it appears to have been applied especially to the consecrated bread. (*Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 13.)

10. It is not by any means evident that the word θυσία, *sacrifice*, is applied to the Lord’s supper, by the writers of the New Testament. The two passages, Heb. xiii. 9, xv. 16, and 1 Pet. ii. 5, cannot be referred to this subject without great violence; and it appears that Chrysostom (*Hom. 27 in Gen.*), understood them of “prayer, fasting, and almsgiving.” But the expressions “sacrifice of praise,” “spiritual sacrifices,” may be very significantly and very properly applied to the solemn commemoration of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ once offered for the sins of the world. The early ecclesiastical writers use the expression in this sense, and frequently employ other synonymous words and phrases, to denote the Lord’s supper, such as sacrificium spirituale, sanctum, mysticum, rationale (λατρεία λογικῆ), and, most frequently, θυσία ἀναίμακτος, *the unbloody sacrifice*.

11. Μυστήριον, *mystery*. This term was not applied to the

Lord's supper by Justin Martyr, as Gerhard asserts (*Loc. Theol.* x. p. 8); but it is frequently so used by Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzum, with the epithets *φρικτὸν*, *φρικῶδες*, *φρικῶδέστατον*, *tremendous*, *awful*. But this expression seems to have been used by those writers with reference rather to the ritual than to doctrine.—The eucharist was the last and highest point of the secret discipline (whence PSEUDO-DIONYS. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 3, calls it *τελετὴν τελετῶν*); and the name which it received on this account was retained while the superstitious doctrine of the miraculous presence of the body and blood of Christ continually gained ground, and when it had settled into the theory of transubstantiation.

12. The term *μυσταγωγία*, of frequent occurrence especially in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, and Theodoret, was still more intimately connected with the secret discipline; and fell into disuse with the termination of that system.

13. *Σύναξις* (*i. e.* *συναγωγή*), *congregatio*, *cœtus*, *conventus sacer*, *sacred assembly*, is a term of the same general import as *communio*; but it contains the additional idea of a solemn and public transaction. It points to the principle and practice of the primitive church of regarding the Lord's supper an an integral, and indeed the chief, part of public worship.

14. *Ἱερουργία*, *operatio sacra*, *sacred ministratio*. This term was applied to the celebration of the eucharist, perhaps with reference to Rom. xv. 16, *ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*; and in the same general and figurative sense as that in which the apostle uses the expression.

15. The term *λειτουργία*, *liturgy* (with its cognates *λειτουργεῖν*, *λειτουργικὸς*, *λειτουργὸς*) was at one time exclusively applied to the Lord's supper. Some Roman Catholic writers have endeavoured to prove that this use of the term is found in the New Testament; but the fact is, that it is there used with reference to public worship in general, not with allusion to this ordinance in particular. And even in the earliest ecclesiastical writings, as in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the works of Theodoret and Chrysostom, and even in the Novels of Justinian, the term *λειτουργία* is applied, in general, to all the parts and formularies of religious worship. Bingham observes that this

word, even with the epithet *mystica*, was applied to the sacrament of baptism as well as to the Lord's supper, by those writers. It became, however, the practice both in the Western and Eastern churches, to apply the term *liturgy* exclusively to the Lord's supper; by the same synecdoche as that which had place with the words *μυστήριον, μυσταγωγία θυσία, εὐχαριστία*. In the West, this appellation of the sacrament retained its ground until it was superseded by that which has since obtained,—the *mass*.

16. Among all the words which have passed, in course of time, from a simple origin and meaning, to a use and signification entirely different, none are more remarkable than the word *mass*, which has been a source of so much offence and controversy in the Christian church.

It was the fashion with Roman Catholic writers, at one time, to derive this term from the Hebrew Scriptures; but this point has long since been abandoned. (BONA *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 1.) Other false derivations have been assigned, and refuted; which, as well as the former, it would be lost labour to consider more particularly.

The word *missa* is undoubtedly derived a missione seu dimissione populi. *Missa* stands for *missio* or *dimissio* (populi); either as the Romans said *missa uxor* (*i. e.*, *dimissa*), *legiones missæ*, &c.; or so that *missa* is a noun substantive for *missio*, as *remissa*, *æ*, for *remissio*, or *offensa*, *æ*, for *offensio*.

But even the right derivation does not exclude a wrong interpretation, as appears, for example, in the writings of Hugo de St. Victor., Thomas Aquinas, and Alcuin, according to whom *missa* is the same as *transmissa* or *transmissio*, because the faithful, deeming themselves unworthy to approach the majesty of heaven, *transmit* their prayers and offerings by the ministry of the priest; or the term *missa* is used, because Christ is to us “*hostia a Deo missa*.” See GERIARD *Loc. Theol.* x. p. 10; and BONA *Rer. Liturg.* lib. i. c. 1, where mention is made of the opinion of Peter Lombard, that the “*missa*” is so called “*quod angelus a Deo mittatur, ut adsistat sacrificio*,” on account of the mission of an angel from God to assist at the sacrifice!

During the existence of the *disciplina arcani*, the catechu-



mens were not allowed to partake of the Lord's supper with the faithful; they were allowed to take part in public worship, from the introit to the offertory; but, the offertory being ended, a deacon used to give the signal for the catechumens to leave the church, by saying "Ite, missa est, (sc. ecclesia,)" *i. e.*, depart, the assembly is dismissed. And hence we read of a twofold missa, namely, the missa catechumenorum and the missa fidelium; the former denoting that portion of public worship which was performed before the dismissal of the catechumens, and the latter that other portion which was continued until the communicants went away<sup>1</sup>.

This term has always been in disrepute with Protestants, in consequence of the abuses which were connected with the administration of the sacrament during the period in which this name was associated with the sacred ordinance. But, while they rejected the name which had become current in connexion with corrupt and superstitious practice, they protested against the charge of a want of affection for the real missa or mass of the primitive Christian church<sup>2</sup>.

17. *Sacrament of the Altar* is a phrase used in common by

<sup>1</sup> Missa tempore sacrificii est, quando catechumeni foras mittuntur, clamante Levita, *Si quis catechumenus remansit, foras exeat*; et inde missa, quia sacramentis altaris interesse non possunt, qui nondum regenerati noscuntur. ISIDOR. HISPAL. *Etymol.* lib. vi. c. 19.—Idem igitur mos a nostris etiam servatur, ut peractis sacris per Diaconum pronuntietur, *Ite, missa est!* quod idem est ac illicet, hoc est, Ire licet. POLYDOR. VERGIL. *de Rer. Invent.* c. 12.—Missa Catechumenorum est ab introitu atque post offertorium, quæ missa ab emittendo dicitur, quoniam quando sacerdos incipit consecrare eucharistiam, catechumeni foras de ecclesia mittuntur. Missa Fidelium est ab offertorio usque ad post communionem, et dicitur missa illa a dimittendo, quia ea expleta ad propria quisque fidelium dimittitur. GUIL. DURAND. *Rat. Div. Off.* lib. iv. c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Falso accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod missam aboleant; retinetur enim missa apud nos, et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitate ceremoniæ fere omnes, præterquam quod Latinis cantionibus admiscetur aliæubi Germanicæ, quæ additæ sunt ad docendum populum. AUG. CONF. *abus.* a. iii. p. 23.—Cum autem missa sit talis communicatio sacramenti, servatur apud nos una communis missa singulis feriis atque aliis etiam diebus, si qui sacramento velint uti, ubi porrigitur sacramentum his, qui petunt. Neque hic mos in ecclesia novus est. *Ibid.* p. 26.—Quod vero tantum sit apud nos publica missa, seu communis, nihil fit contra catholicam ecclesiam. Nam in Græcis parochiis ne hodie quidem fiunt privatæ missæ, sed fit una publica missa, idque tantum Dominicis diebus et festis. AROLOG. AUG. CONF. art. 12, p. 250.

the Greek, Roman, and Lutheran churches. The Reformed abstained from the use of this expression, even in an allegorical sense, on account of their strong objection to denominate the Lord's table an altar. Their hesitation on this ground has decreased in modern times.

But, without the addition of altar, the word *Sacrament* alone has been generally employed to signify the Lord's supper, by way of emphasis, that ordinance being the chief among the sacraments.

18. In addition to these usual and peculiar appellations, we find many of a more general character in less frequent use. Some of these occur in [liturgical, doctrinal, and historical writings; and are not without their importance, as conveying ideas respecting the nature, and dignity, and efficacy of the sacrament which they describe.

Most of these refer to the sacred elements considered as the body and blood of Christ, bread and wine. In this point of view the holy supper is represented as "spiritual nourishment,"—the food of the soul, the strengthening of the body and soul. In earlier times we find it spoken of as "*body and blood*;" *meat and drink*, *bread and wine*; but after the practice of administering in only one kind had gained ground, the prevailing form of speech was "*Body, Food, or Bread*" alone, "*Blood, Drink, Wine*," being but rarely added. The following are the chief of the expressions here referred to:—

- i. *Corpus Christi*, i. e., the body of Christ.
- ii. *Cibus Dei, s. Domini*, the food of God, or of the Lord.
- iii. *Cibus cœlestis*, heavenly food.
- iv. *Cibus angelorum*, angels' food.
- v. *Cibus viatorum, mortalium, ægrotorum*, food of travellers, mortals, the sick, &c.
- vi. *Manna cœlestis*, heavenly manna.
- vii. *Panis Dei, s. Domini*, bread of God, or of the Lord.
- viii. *Panis cœlestis*, heavenly bread.
- ix. *Panis vitæ, or vitalis*, bread of life.
- x. *Panis supersubstantialis*, with allusion to the ancient custom of applying those words in the Lord's Prayer, *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον*, to the consecrated bread

xi. Ἐφόδιον, viaticum, with reference to the communion of the sick, and to a custom (afterwards abandoned by the church) of putting the sacred elements into the coffins of the dead.

xii. Μετάληψις, synonymous with κοινώνια, communion.

xiii. Ἀρράβων, earnest or pledge, and ἀρράβων τῆς μελλούσης ζωῆς, earnest of the life to come; with reference to 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 6, and Eph. i. 14.

xiv. Φάρμακον ἀθανασίας (Ignatius), medicamentum, medicina corporis et mentis, purgatorium, amuletum, and other phrases of the kind, signifying “the medicine of immortality, medicine or preservative of the soul.”

xv. Μυστήριον τῆς εἰρήνης, sacrament of peace, a favourite expression of Chrysostom.

xvi. The terms applied to baptism were often transferred to the Lord's supper; such were (besides ἱερουργία, μυστήριον, already mentioned,)

a. τὸ φῶς, light or illumination.

b. ἡ ζωὴ, life, equivalent to “bread of life.”

c. ἡ σωτηρία, salus, salvation.

d. ἡ ἐλπὶς, spes vitæ æternæ, hope of eternal life.

e. ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῆς πατρῆσις, access to the Father by Christ, with the assurance of adoption.

f. ὁ καθαρισμὸς, purgatio, purification, (2 Pet. i. 9; Heb. i. 3.)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The following sentence in COSTERI *Institut. Chr.* lib. i. c. 6, consists of extracts from various writers, chiefly from Bernhard of Clairvaux:—Eucharistia est medicina ægrotis, peregrinantibus via; debiles confortat, valentes delectat, languorem sanat, sanitatem servat; fit homo mansuetior ad correctionem, potentior ad laborem, ardentior ad amorem, sagacior ad cautelam, ad obedientiam promptior, ad gratiarum cationes devotior; hic dimittuntur peccata quotidiana, expelluntur potestates Satanae, dantur vires ad ipsum etiam martyrium subeundum; minuitur in minimis peccatis sensus, in gravioribus

tollitur omnino consensus, denique afferuntur omnia bona; quia homo communicans in id transit, quod sumit.—The following expressions are from the language of the Council of Trent (*Conc. Trident.* Sess. xiii. p. 77—86, ed. Lugd. 1677-8);—Eucharistia est symbolum unitatis et caritatis, qua Christus omnes Christianos inter se conjunctos et copulatos esse voluit.—Symbolum rei sacrae, et invisibilis gratiae forma visibilis.—Spiritualis animarum cibus.—Panis Angelorum.—Animæ vita, perpetua sanitas mentis.—Antidotum liberans a culpis et peccatis.—Pignus future gloriæ.

§ 2.—CELEBRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN SUCCESSIVE PERIODS OF THE CHURCH.

1. *Accounts given in the New Testament.*—The Gospels, in which the institution of the Lord's supper is recorded, do not affix to it any particular name or title. Neither "the Passover," (Matt. xxvi. 2, 17—19,) nor "the New Covenant" can be regarded in this light. For in 1 Cor. v. 7, Christ himself, and not the holy supper, is called "the Passover," as being the Lamb offered in sacrifice. And the term "Covenant" is of a wider acceptation, and refers to the whole Gospel dispensation.

In the first Epistle to the Corinthians we find this sacrament mentioned under the names of "the Lord's supper," 1 Cor. xi. 20, "the table of the Lord," 1 Cor. x. 21, and "communion," 1 Cor. x. 16; the use and signification of which appellations have already been described. Whether or not certain other expressions found in the New Testament, "feasts of charity, the breaking of bread, holy kiss, or kiss of charity, gathering together in one place," refer directly to the celebration of the Lord's supper, cannot now be determined.

Our Saviour instituted the holy supper on occasion of the passover feast. But it is evident that it was separated from the paschal solemnity, and celebrated as a separate and independent ordinance, during the times of the apostles, and with their sanction. Thus, in 1 Cor. xi. the apostle makes no mention of the passover in connection with it, but speaks of the celebration as often as the disciples assembled in the church. It does not appear that the Lord's supper is referred to in 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. But it is probable that this sacrament was celebrated annually in connexion with the passover by those Jewish Christians who for many years kept up the Mosaic institution. (EPIPHANIUS *Hæres.* 70.) And it appears from the concurrent testimony of ancient writers that the Lord's supper was celebrated with peculiar solemnity at the festival of Easter, which took the place of the Jewish passover.

But from the circumstance of the original institution appears to have been derived the practice of celebrating this sacrament

as an integral and concluding part of the whole course of divine worship, not as a separate or isolated service.

It may appear singular, at first thought, that the evangelist St. John does not record the institution of the Lord's supper in his Gospel. This apostle was not only the favourite disciple and bosom friend of our Lord, (John xiii. 23,) but it was he who, in conjunction with St. Peter, received our Saviour's instructions to go and make ready the passover. (Luke xxii. 8.) And therefore we might naturally have expected to receive from his pen an express and particular account of the whole transaction. But this omission is satisfactorily explained, if we regard the Gospel of St. John as a supplement to the other three previously written, and designed for the completion of their narratives. This appears, for many reasons, to be the right way of viewing his Gospel. (See EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 24; and lib. vi. c. 14.) With respect to the paschal feast at which the Lord's supper was instituted, he says enough concerning it to show that he intentionally omits the narrative of the transaction, as one which it was not necessary to report or call to mind; and he proceeds at once to detail the accessory circumstances not recorded elsewhere. "Is it possible," says Hug, (*Introduct. to New Testament*, vol. ii. § 52,) "to pass over such an affecting and important event with more evident appearance of design? Could he more distinctly signify, that he regarded it as already sufficiently reported, and left on imperishable record?"

— Many interpreters, however, both ancient and modern, consider that the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel contains an evident allusion to the doctrine of this sacrament.

The account given by St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 20—34; conf. v. 16, seqq.) is of great importance, not only as harmonizing with and confirming the narratives of the three evangelists, but also because, while it records the institution of the sacrament, it represents it as an established ordinance in the churches, and designed for perpetual observance. Certain abuses had arisen in the Church of Corinth, connected with the celebration of this sacred rite; which appear to have consisted partly in the formation of separate parties or companies among the recipients, and

partly in an immoderate use of the elements ; and, in particular, the separation of the rich from the poor on these occasions led to a breach of charity and Christian fellowship. And the apostle intimates that by abuses such as these the whole scope and design of the Lord's supper was defeated; "This," says he, "is not to eat the Lord's supper." He urges the necessity of celebrating it according to the intention of its divine founder. And with this view he introduces the precise words of the institution, by which he requires the Corinthians to be governed, if they would not partake "unworthily." That the apostle regarded this supper as a rite to be observed with a certain order, prescribed form, or ceremony, appears from his instructions to the Corinthians to *wait* for one another; and from the significant clause, "The rest will I set in order when I come."

It is worthy of remark that, in recording the words of institution, St. Paul agrees with St. Luke, the companion of his labours, in adding, "Do this in remembrance of me;" which words are omitted by the other evangelists St. Matthew and St. Mark.

Our blessed Lord not only instituted or appointed the holy supper, but was himself the first to administer it to his disciples. To use modern terms, he both consecrated and distributed the elements. The words of consecration are not recorded: "Having given thanks," is the only expression which refers to them; and from this we gather that, having taken the bread and cup into his hands, he uttered a thanksgiving, either in his own words, or in the form used by the Jews; and then gave the bread and the wine to the disciples, saying, Take, eat—and drink this—with the other well-known words descriptive of the significancy of the action.

It has been debated whether or not our blessed Lord himself partook of the sacred elements on this occasion. This point is left quite undetermined in the narrative; except so far as the nature of the case may lead us to conclude that our Lord, who punctually observed all the Mosaic ordinances, was not likely to omit in his own person any part of the ceremony connected with

the celebration of the passover; and therefore he doubtless partook of the bread and wine together with the apostles, unless this whole transaction was something superadded to the usual meal, which was completed independently of it. It is impossible to decide in a matter such as this, when the narrative is silent. Among early ecclesiastical writers we find Augustin (*de Doctr. Christ.*, lib. ii. c. 9,) and Chrysostom (*Hom. 83 in Matth.*) maintaining that our Lord partook of the elements, and appealing to Luke xxii. 18, in confirmation of their opinion. But Jerome affirms that this passage does not relate to the sacramental cup; and in this view later writers coincide<sup>4</sup>.

In modern times the views of different parties relating to this question have been influenced by doctrinal prepossessions; and the affirmative or negative has been maintained according as it appeared to make for or against some particular set of opinions concerning the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. Advocates for the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation have naturally laboured to prove that our Lord did not himself partake of the elements; while the opponents of these systems take it for granted that he did.

It has been asked (but this also with reference to a controverted point,—the reception of unworthy communicants at the Lord's table), whether or not the traitor Judas partook of the bread and wine which our Saviour distributed.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. v. c. 14), it is affirmed that when the holy supper was instituted Judas was absent; and later advocates of this opinion appeal to John xiii. 30, in confirmation of the statement. Others, including Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustin, the scholastic writers, the Romish and Lutheran divines, who maintain that the traitor was present and partook of the sacred elements, contend that this verse proves nothing to the purpose, and refer to Luke xxii. 19—21, as expressly asserting the fact for which they plead. Calvin supposes that Judas

<sup>4</sup> Verba illa, Non bibam amplius de germine vitis etc., non pertinent ad qui datus fuit post agni paschalis manducationem.—BELLARMIN. *De Eucharistia*, lib. i. c. 2.

partook indeed of the bread and wine, but not of the body and blood of Christ, and appeals to Augustin (*Serm.* 61, and *De Baptism. c. Donat.* lib. 5) in support of this view of the matter<sup>5</sup>. In Luke xxii. 14, we read, “he sat down, and *the twelve apostles* with him;” and, in delivering the cup, our Lord said, “Drink ye *all* of this.”

The bread used at the passover was unleavened; and such, no doubt, was that which our Lord distributed at the institution of the supper; for, in Matt. xxvi. 26, we read that “as they were eating, Jesus took τὸν ἄρτον, *the bread*, or the loaf, and blessed it, and brake it.” But it is to be observed that the New Testament does not lay any stress on the *nature or kind* of the bread, but on the significant fact of its being *broken*, and thus being a representation of the body of Christ, “wounded for our transgressions.”

The wine used at the paschal feast was usually pure or unmixed; and therefore it was probably such on this occasion. No trace of the custom of mixing it with water at the celebration of the Lord's supper is to be found in the New Testament. Perhaps the mention of water and blood (1 John v. 6, 8) was supposed to give countenance to the practice in aftertimes.

It is probable that the eucharist was celebrated at first in the evening,—the time of day at which it was instituted. See 1 Cor. x. 23 and Acts xx. 7. But the New Testament does not contain any rule or prescription on this head.

2. *Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers.*—Polycarp does not make any mention of the sacrament of the Lord's supper. In the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians we might have

<sup>5</sup> Hinc celebre Augustini dictum, *reliquos discipulos panem Dominum manducasse, Judam vero panem Domini*, quo incredulos clare excludit a participatione corporis et sanguinis. Quid miraris, si datus est Judæ panis Christi, per quem manciparetur Diabolo, quum

videas e contrario datum Paulo Angelum Diaboli, per quem perficeretur in Christo! CALVIN. *Instit. Chr. Rel.* lib. iv. c. 17, § 34.—The reference is to AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 61, and *De Baptism. c. Donat.* lib. v.



expected to find some allusion to an ordinance of which St. Paul had so expressly treated in his first epistle to that church, with allusion to the disorders and controversies that had arisen in connexion with its celebration; and it would have been gratifying to learn what results had attended the regulations which the apostle promised to make on the occasion of his next visit to Corinth. But no mention is made of these things by Clement; nor is the Lord's supper even named in his epistle, unless we suppose, which cannot be at all proved, that he alludes especially to this institution under the very general and comprehensive terms *προσφοραὶ, λειτουργίαι*, religious offerings and services. Unless, therefore, we regard Clement as the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, we must reckon him among the fathers who do not mention the Lord's supper in any writing now extant. But that composition was evidently the work of another hand; and is to be treated of in its place as a separate and independent document.

Ignatius is the only one of the apostolical fathers in whose works we find any reference to the eucharist. But, even setting aside all doubts respecting the genuineness of the epistles of Ignatius in general, and especially of those to the Ephesians, Philadelphians, and Smyrnæans, we do not find much information on this subject in his works.

In the epistle to the Ephesians we find the following passage "Breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, a remedy against death and means of living in God by Jesus Christ, a purifier, and protection from all evil<sup>6</sup>." "Bread" is here used, by synecdoche, for the elements of bread and wine, after the manner of St. Paul.

In the epistle to the Philadelphians we have another passage of some importance which has been made the subject of needless controversy. The following is a literal translation:—"Entreating you to use one faith, and one preaching, and one eucharist. For the body of the Lord Jesus is one, and his blood shed for us is one; one bread (or loaf) also is broken in pieces for all, and one cup is distributed to all, there is one altar for the whole

<sup>6</sup> Ἐνα ἄρτον κλώντες, ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός. [IGNAT.] *Ep. ad Ephes.*

church<sup>7</sup>." Here is evidently an allusion to Eph. iv. 2—7; and the object of the exhortation is to promote unanimity and concord. That no countenance is given by these words to the doctrine of transubstantiation and the practice of communion under one kind, has been easily proved by Chemnitz, Peter Martyr, Scultet, and other Protestant writers, against Baronius, Bellarmine, and other advocates of the church of Rome. In fact, this passage is in the highest degree unfavourable to the practice of the Roman Catholic church, inasmuch as it represents, beyond all doubt, the custom of administering the wine to all the communicants. Bellarmine, indeed, (*de sacr. Euchar.* lib. iv. c. 26.) denies the genuineness of the Greek text, and maintains the correctness of the old Latin version, "Unus calix solius ecclesie," one cup for the whole church. According to Baronius (*Annales ad a.* 109, n. 25), the words ἐν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη, must be rendered, not (as we should naturally translate them), *one cup is distributed to all*, but *one cup is distributed for all*. That is to say,—the cup was originally instituted for all, and its efficacy or benefit extends to all; but yet the vicarious distribution of it among the priests alone may have place, and the actual withholding from the laity of the cup, which, according to the appointment of the church for the prevention of abuses, the priest alone receives on behalf of all, may be justified.

The words ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐθρύφθη, intimate not merely that the bread was at that time *broken*, according to the original institution, but that it was afterwards given to each individual communicant. This seems to be strongly implied in the use of the word θρύπτω, *to break into small pieces*, instead of the (New Testament) word κλάω, *to break*; and it is put out of all doubt by the addition of τοῖς πᾶσιν, *to all, to the whole number of communicants*. The use of θρύπτω in this place may remind us of the words of Augustin (*Ep.* 59, *ad Paulin.*) "Cum benedicitur et sanetificatur, et ad distribuendum commi-

<sup>7</sup> Παρακαλῶν ὑμᾶς μὴ πίστει, καὶ ἐκχυθὲν εἰς καὶ ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐθρύφθη, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενε-  
 ἐν κηρύγματι, καὶ μὴ εὐχαριστία χρῆσ-  
 θαι. Μία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου  
 μῆθη, ἐν θουσιαστήριον πάση τῇ ἐκκλη-  
 Ἰησου, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῦ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν  
 σία.—[IGNAT.] *Ep.* ad *Philadelph.* c.

nuitur," "when it is consecrated, and broken into small pieces for distribution."

Another passage from the writings of Ignatius will be found in the note<sup>8</sup>. It appears to have been interpolated from the *Apostolical Constitutions* (2, c. 26, 27); but, if it be genuine, it contains the earliest intimation on record that the elements could be consecrated only by the bishop, or under his immediate superintendence.

3. *Testimony of Justin Martyr.*—It is remarkable that most of the early apologists of Christianity make no mention of the Lord's supper, which was yet at all times regarded as the most sacred ordinance of religion. This is the case with respect to Minucius Felix, whose only words which could possibly be supposed to bear even a remote allusion to the eucharist are the following:—convivia non tantum pudica colimus, sed et sobria, *our entertainments are not only chaste but temperate.* Not a word with reference to this subject is found in the apologies of Athenagoras and Tatian. Theophilus of Antioch says nothing respecting it. And Arnobius, who lived at a later period, is so silent respecting baptism, the Lord's supper, and other institutions in the church, that Jerome even supposes him to have composed his work *Against the Gentiles* before he was himself admitted into the church. We cannot, however, suppose him either to have been unacquainted with the Christian sacraments, or to have undervalued them; and we must regard his silence as intentional, and as a specimen of that "reticentia sacrorum" of which we find so many other instances. If we assign a later date to the introduction of the system of secret discipline, *i. e.*, the exclusion of catechumens from the Lord's table, (which was at its height in the fourth and fifth centuries, when persecution had ceased,) still it must be remembered that the Christians held it unlawful to impart a knowledge of the sacred mysteries to unbelievers.

<sup>8</sup> Ἐκεῖνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ . . . Οὐκ ἔξὼν ἐστὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε προσφέ-  
 ρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δο-  
 χὴν ἐπιτελεῖν.—[IGNAT.] *Ep. ad Smyru.*  
 § 8. This passage was probably taken  
 from *Const. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 26, 27.

This appears most evidently in the writings of Tertullian, who discountenances mixed marriages on this ground, and instances particularly in the matter of the eucharist<sup>9</sup>. A departure from this rule seems to have been permitted only when silence on these subjects would imply an admission of guilt, or when a magistrate should demand an explanation. And some (especially among the Montanists) went so far as to choose to suffer martyrdom rather than to make such disclosure even to the magistrate.

Justin Martyr, however, happily for us, considering that a declaration of the nature of the sacraments would be serviceable to the cause of Christianity, gives, in his larger *Apology*, a particular description of the ceremonies connected with the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper. Reference to these passages has been made in another portion of this work, which it is not necessary to repeat in this place; but some few remarks may here be added respecting this writer's description of the eucharist.

Justin gives two descriptions of this ordinance, immediately following each other, and nearly in the same words. Either the second of these accounts is a mere recapitulation of the former; or, which is more probable, the former relates to the eucharist administered immediately after baptism, called the first communion, and the latter to the ordinary administration of the sacrament on the Lord's day, in connexion with the Agapæ. This supposition is supported by the allusion made to the distribution of the oblation among the absent, the sick, and the poor.

Justin does not record the precise words of consecration used in his time, neither does he mention any form which may have accompanied the distribution. But on the former of these matters his brief account tends to throw some light. He speaks of a "thanksgiving to the Father of the Universe, through, or in,

<sup>9</sup> Hoc est igitur delictum, quod Gentiles nostra noverunt, quod sub conscientia justorum sumus, quod beneficiorum eorum est, si quid operamur.— Margarita vestra sunt quotidiana conversationis insignia, quanto curaveris ea occultare, tanto suspectiora fueris et magis cavenda gentili curiositati.

. . . . Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes, et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur, et hæc ignorans quisque rationem simpliciter sustinebit, sine gemitu, sine suspicione panis, an veneni? TERTULLI. *ad Uxorem*, lib. ii. c. 8.

the name of his Son, and the Holy Ghost;" whence it appears that the consecration was made in the name of the sacred Trinity in Unity, and that mention was made of the third person, although the *ἐπίκλησις τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, *the calling upon the Holy Spirit*, may have been no special and distinct act or part of the solemnity. Here is mention, also, of a particular thanksgiving, whence the name *εὐχαριστία*.

The eucharist is mentioned, also, in the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, usually ascribed to Justin Martyr; and which, if not written by him, as some modern critics suppose, must yet be assigned to a date very little later than his, and is therefore, at all events, to be reckoned among the earliest records of the church. "The offering of wheaten flour (*ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορά*) was a type of the bread of thanksgiving (*τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας*), which our Lord Jesus Christ appointed in remembrance of his sufferings." (c. 41.) Again, "God will no longer accept the offerings of these Jews, being angry on account of their unbelief; but he has promised to accept the offering presented by us in every place, namely, the offering of the bread of thanksgiving, and the cup of thanksgiving. By these, which the Jews revile, God is glorified." (*Ib.*) And again, "All offerings presented in his (God's) name, according to the instruction of Jesus Christ, namely, those which are presented by Christians everywhere in the eucharistic meal of bread and wine, he accepts, and testifies that they are well pleasing to him. But yours he rejects. . . . I maintain that only those prayers and thanksgivings which are put up by worthy persons (*ὑπο τῶν ἄξιων γινόμεναι*) are perfect and acceptable to God. Christians are taught to prepare such alone, namely, at their memorial of dry and liquid food, (*τροφή ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρὴ* here evidently denote the bread and wine,) with which they commemorate the sufferings once endured by the Son of God." (c. 117.)

These passages do not furnish any information respecting the mode of administering the Lord's supper; but they are important as being the first instances in which the terms *προσφορά* and *θυσία* are used with reference to this sacrament.

4. *Testimony of Irenæus.*—This first controversialist of the Christian church contributed very materially to bring into current use the words *προσφορά* (oblatio) and *θυσία* (sacrificium), which Justin had already introduced. In various parts of his works he treats of the eucharist, against the heretics of his day; but more with regard to the doctrine of the sacrament, than to its ritual. The history of Christian doctrine does not enter into the plan of this work; but it may deserve to be remarked, that Irenæus appears to have insisted on regarding the eucharist as a sacrifice chiefly in opposition to the Gnostics, who taught that the obligation of the Old Testament had ceased, and that all sacrifices had been entirely done away. Irenæus seeks to show, on the contrary, that the one great sacrifice of the New Testament is to be regarded as a continuation, but with vast improvement, of the sacrifices under the law<sup>10</sup>.

From a passage in the fragments of Irenæus, collected by Pfaff, it appears that this writer was acquainted with the doctrine of the symbolical presence of Christ in the eucharist, which received his sanction; and that he *distinguished* the Lord's supper from Jewish sacrifices. Here, also, we find the first mention of that which has occasioned so much controversy,—the *ἐπίκλησις* (or *ἐκκλησις*, IREN. *Adv. Hæc.* iv. 18, § 5,) *τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, *invocation of the Holy Spirit*<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Ecclesie oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is, qui offert, glorificatur ipse in eo, quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus. Per munus enim erga regem et honor et affectio ostenditur: quod in omni simplicitate et innocentia Dominus volens nos offerre predicavit. . . . Et non *genus oblationum* reprobatum est; oblationes enim illic, oblationes autem et hic; sacrificia in populo (Israel), sacrificia in ecclesia (Christiana); sed *species* immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis offeratur. Unus enim et idem Dominus; proprium autem character servilis oblationis, et proprium libero-

rum, uti et per oblationes ostendatur indicium libertatis. IRENÆUS. *Adv. Hæc.* lib. iv. c. 18.—Suis discipulis (Christus) dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum, qui ex natura panis est, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens, Hoc est corpus meum. Et calicem similiter, quæ est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et N. T. novam docuit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei, qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in novo Testamento, de quo Malachias, i. 10, 11. *Ibid.* c. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Προσφέρομεν τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας· εὐχαρισ-

In another place, where Irenæus treats of certain abuses which had been introduced by an impostor, we find allusion to the practice of mixing the wine with water<sup>12</sup>. Reference to that practice is made also in another part of the same book. (*Adv. Hær.* lib. i. chap. 2, § 8.)

5. *Testimony of Clement of Alexandria and Origen.*—The works of these writers, while they contain much important matter relating to the doctrine of the eucharist, afford however but little information concerning the history of its administration.

Clement (*Pædag.* lib. ii.) refers to the mixing of the wine with water, and speaks of this custom as pointing to the blood of Christ as of a twofold nature,—bodily and spiritual<sup>13</sup>. He also speaks of the bread and wine which Melchisedek presented to Abraham as being designed for a type of the eucharist, *εἰς τύπον τῆς εὐχαριστίας*, (*Stromat.* lib. iv.)

From Origen we learn that in his time great care was taken lest any of the consecrated bread should fall on the ground, or be wasted. This is the first trace of a reverent custom, which became afterwards a matter of superstitious observance. “You,” says Origen, “who frequent our sacred mysteries, know very well that, when you receive the body of the Lord, you take care, with all reverent caution, lest any part of it, however small, should fall to the ground,—lest any portion of the consecrated gift should be wasted. If any part of it should fall through your negligence, you think yourselves guilty, and think rightly. If then you use so much caution, and that with so much reason, in this matter,

τοῖντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε ἐκφύσαι τοὺς κυρτοὺς τούτους εἰς τροφήν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελεσιάντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, ὅπως ἀποφίγη τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ πετήριον, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. IRENÆI *Fragmenta Anecdota*, ed. Chr. M. Pfaff, Hag. Com. 1715, 8, fragment. ii. pp. 26—28.

<sup>12</sup> Ποτήρια οἶνον κεκράμενα προσποιούμενος εὐχαριστεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπίκλησεως πορφύρα καὶ ἐρυθρὰ ἀναφαίνεσθαι ποιεῖ. IREN. *Adv. Hær.* lib. i. c. 13.

<sup>13</sup> Δίττον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὸ μὲν σαρκικόν, τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν.—Ἀναλόγως τοῖνον κρίναται . . . ἢ δὲ ἀμφὸν αἵθις κρᾶσις, πότον καὶ λόγον, εὐχαριστία κέκληται. CLEM. ALEX. *Pædagog.*

who can you esteem it a lighter sin to slight the word of God than to neglect his body<sup>14</sup>?"

6. *Testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian.*—Tertullian's general description of the Lord's supper and the Agapæ has been given in another place.

In his treatise *De Corona Militis* (c. 3) this author has some remarks concerning the administration of this sacrament which deserve attention. One of these remarks relates to the time of celebration, and the mode of distribution; by which we learn that the sacrament was administered early in the morning before daylight, and was received at the hands of the presiding ministers alone. In another place we find allusion to the careful preservation of the elements mentioned by Origen. And Tertullian expressly affirms that the warrant for these practices rests, not upon any passage of Scripture, but upon the sole authority of tradition<sup>15</sup>.

Cyprian most expressly and copiously treats of the Old Testament types of the Lord's supper, and of the sacred elements. One of his epistles treats directly of the custom of using water instead of wine. (*Epist. 63 ad Cecilium de sacramento Dominici calicis.*) In his time, several sects held the use of wine to be

<sup>14</sup> Volo vos admonere religionis vestræ exemplis. Nostis, qui divinis mysteriis interesse consuestis, quomodo cum suscipitis corpus Domini, cum omni cautela et veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decadat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid dilabatur. Reos enim vos creditis, si quid inde per negligentiam decedat. Quod si circa corpus ejus conservandum tanta utimini cautela, et merito utimini, quomodo putatis minoris esse piaculi verbum Dei negligere, quam corpus ejus? ORIGEN. *Hom. in Exod. II.* 13.

<sup>15</sup> Tertullian makes some important remarks concerning the administration of the Lord's supper in his time, in his treatise *De Corona Militis*, c. 3. One relates to the time of celebration, and the distribution of the elements:—

Eucharistæ sacramentum et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam *antelucanis catibus*, nec de aliorum manu quam *presidentium* sumimus. —Another refers to the care which was taken lest any portion of the consecrated elements should fall to the ground:—*Calicis aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur.* —It is uncertain whether by the "oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus," he means prayers or oblations; but another passage (*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 1) seems to favour the latter interpretation.—Concerning all these matters, however, Tertullian expressly declares:—*Sine ullius Scripture instrumento, solius traditionis titulo, et exinde consuetudinis patrocini vindicamus.*



unlawful, even in the Lord's supper. Cyprian strongly maintains that water alone cannot represent the blood of Christ; and teaches that wine must be mixed with it for this purpose<sup>16</sup>.

Many other interesting notices respecting the administration of the eucharist are found in the writings of Cyprian. The practice of *daily communion* is incidentally mentioned<sup>17</sup>. The custom of administering the sacraments to infants is recognised, in the history of a child who, after having partaken of some idolatrous sacrifices, started back from the reception of the sacred elements, and when forced to partake of them, could not retain them<sup>18</sup>. An instance is recorded in which the sacrament was

<sup>16</sup> Admonitos autem nos scias, ut in calice offerenda Dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis, quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecerit, ut calix, qui in commemorationem ejus offertur, mixtus vino offeratur. Nam cum dicat Christus, Ego sum vitis vera, sanguis Christi non aqua est utique, sed vinum. Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quando vinum desit calicis, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur, qui Scripturarum omnium sacramento ac testimonio predicetur. . . . Miror satis, unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in Dominico calice, quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere. . . . Nam si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis. Si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo. Quando autem utrumque miscetur, et adunatione confusa sibi invicem copulatur, tunc sacramentum spiritale et cæleste perficitur. Sic vero calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum, nisi utrumque sibi miscetur, quomodo nec corpus Domini potest esse farina sola aut aqua sola, nisi utrumque adunatum fuerit et copulatum, et panis unius compage solidatum. . . . Si quis de antecessoribus nostris, vel ignoranter vel simpliciter,

non hoc observavit et tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo et magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi. Nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus, ut calicem vino mixtum, secundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus, et de hoc quoque ad collegas nostras literas dirigamus, ut ubique lex evangelica et traditio Dominica servetur, et ab eo, quod Christus docuit et fecit, non recedatur. CYPRIAN. *Ep. 63 ad Cæcilium, de Sacrament. Dominici calicis.*

<sup>17</sup> Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti (al. absentes) et non communicantes a cælesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur. CYPRIAN. *De Orat. Domini.*

<sup>18</sup> In corpore atque ore violato eucharistia permanere non potuit. Sanctificatus in Domini sanguine potus de pollutis visceribus erupit: tanta est potestas Domini, tanta majestas. Secreta tenebrarum sub ejus luce detecta sunt, sacerdotem Dei nec occulta crimina fefellerunt. Hoc circa infantem, quæ ad eloquendum alienum circa se crimen needum habuit ætatem. CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis.*

administered by a female enthusiast<sup>19</sup>. We meet with some examples of the practice of sending the eucharist to the absent members of the church; and even of the practice of communicants at the Lord's table taking home with them some portion of the sacred elements<sup>20</sup>. And lastly, from a passage in one of Cyprian's epistles, it is evident that in his time the communicants took the elements from the officiating minister *with their hands*<sup>21</sup>.

7. *Testimony of the Apostolical Constitutions.*—This work, the origin and contents of which have been treated of in another place, (book i. chap. 22,) cannot, by any means, be regarded as a production of the first or second century, in its present form; and is referred, with the greatest probability, to the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. At the same time, it cannot be doubted that it contains fragments of the second century; and that it is by far the oldest liturgical document now extant in the church. The liturgy contained in this work does not appear to have been in actual use in any of the churches, either of the East or the West; but it is evident that it served as the model of the liturgies of Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Chrysostom, Gelasius, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and others, which are in substance the same as this, with certain additions and amplifications, omissions and abbreviations, according to the varying circumstances of time and place.

This work contains many passages which refer to the admi-

<sup>19</sup> In a letter addressed by Firmilian to Cyprian, preserved among Cyprian's Epistles (*Ep.* 75), concerning a certain woman who had undertaken to administer the Lord's supper (*mulier, quæ in ecstasi constituta, prophetem se præferret, et quasi sancto Spiritu pleno plena sic ageret*), we read,—*Atqui illa mulier, quæ prius, per præstigijs et fallacias Dæmonis, multa ad deceptionem fidelium moliebatur, inter cetera quibus plurimos deceperat, etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se*

*panem et Eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solite præcationis offerret; baptizaret quoque multos.*

<sup>20</sup> JUSTIN, M. *De bono Patientia.*—CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis.*

<sup>21</sup> *Armemus et dextram gladio spiritali, ut sacrificia funesta fortiter respuat, et eucharistiæ memor, quæ Domini corpus accepit, ipsum complectatur, postea a Domino sumtura præmium cælestium coronarum.* CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 58.

nistration of the Lord's supper. Brief descriptions of the agapæ and eucharist are found in lib. ii. c. 28, c. 57; lib. iii. c. 10; lib. v. c. 19. In lib. vii. c. 25, and lib. viii. c. 12—15, we have complete formularies or liturgies for this service (*εὐχαριστία μυστικὴ, μυστικὴ λατρεία*).

In connexion with these formularies, the following particulars are especially worthy of remark.

The agapæ are distinguished from the eucharist.

The exclusion of catechumens, penitents, and heterodox persons is treated as a point of great importance;—as much so as the exclusion of unbelievers.

All persons admissible to the table of the Lord are supposed to partake of the sacrament.

The sexes were distinguished, and received the consecrated elements separately, for the sake of decency and order.

No express regulations are made respecting place; but it appears to be understood that the sacrament was administered at the usual time of divine worship (the morning), and in the ordinary place of assembly. There is here no trace of a nightly celebration of the ordinance.

At the commencement of the service, all persons who were not communicants retired, and the doors were shut and watched.

The consecration of the elements was performed by the *ἀρχιερεὺς, chief-priest*; but for this title that of *ἐπίσκοπος* appears to be sometimes used as synonymous. And from this circumstance, if we do not admit the hypothesis of the identity of bishops and presbyters, and of teaching and governing bishops, we must collect that a presbyter was permitted to consecrate, especially in the absence of the bishop.

The bread was distributed by the bishop or priest who had consecrated it, and the cup was handed by the deacons. (The latter, according to Justin Martyr, distributed both the bread and the wine.)

The consecrating minister offered up a prayer for himself in particular, as well as more general petitions.

Mention is made of a splendid vestment for the chief minister; and of his making the sign of the cross upon his forehead.

The form attending the distribution of the sacred elements

consists simply in the words, “the body of Christ, the blood of Christ, the cup of life,” to which the communicant responded by a simple “Amen.” The brevity of this part of the ceremony is strikingly contrasted with the length of the other prayers and forms of which it was composed.

During the communion, the thirty-fourth psalm was sung. (In later times, the forty-second, and hundred and thirty-ninth, were added.)

The three elements,—bread, wine, and water,—are distinctly mentioned; and the two latter are described as being mixed together in one vessel. It is not said whether the water was warm or cold. The breaking of the bread is particularly named. The remnants were carefully preserved.

Two deacons stood at the sides of the table, holding fans, with which they drove away flies from the wine.

Respecting the posture of the communicants, it is to be observed that they are directed sometimes to stand,—sometimes to kneel, and with bent heads to receive the blessing,—and sometimes to rise up.

### § 3.—TIMES OF CELEBRATION.

RESPECTING the times of administering the Lord’s supper, two questions are to be examined; first, at what hour or part of the day,—and secondly, how often, and on what days in particular,—did it take place?—History, however, does not present us with any uniformity of practice, or any general rules, in these particulars.

1. *The time of day.*—The institution of this sacrament by our blessed Lord took place in the evening, or at night, (Matt. xxvi. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23); and it seems that it was celebrated at this time by the apostles on some occasions (Acts xx. 7), but perhaps not always (Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xvi. 2)<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>22</sup> Traditio Judæorum est, Christum nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. media nocte venturum, in similitudinem Ægyptii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est, et exterminator venit, et Dominus super tabernacula transit, et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. Unde reor et traditionem Apostolicam permansisse, ut in die Vigiliarum Pasche ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat, expectantes adventum Christi. *HERON. Comment. in*

From Justin Martyr nothing can be concluded on this subject. He does not mention the evening or night as the time of celebration; but neither is there any expression in his writings which intimates that it took place by day.

In writings of a later date, we find mention of a nightly administration of the Lord's supper on certain occasions only, and as an exception to the general rule. According to Ambrose (*Serm. 8 in Ps. cxviii.*), this sacrament was celebrated at the end of the day, *during a fast*. Augustin also speaks of an evening communion on the Thursday before Easter,—the time of the institution (*Ep. 118 ad Jan. c. 5—7*). In later times the sacrament was administered in the morning, even on that day.

Tertullian speaks of the administration of this sacrament on Easter Eve, i. e., in the night; and it appears, from many concurrent testimonies, that that eve was the most solemn period for the celebration of baptism and the Lord's supper, during the fourth and fifth centuries. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, this celebration was transferred to the evening, and then to the afternoon, of the day before Easter; and, at a later period, even to the morning.

The nocturnal celebration which retained its ground in the church to the latest period, was that which took place on Christmas Eve. A synod assembled at Valentia, A. D. 1258, decreed that “*Missam ultra meridiem nullus cantet, nisi in vigilia Paschæ, nec de nocte, nisi in Nativitate,*” i. e., *none should celebrate mass (the eucharist) after mid-day, except on Easter Eve, nor by night, except on Christmas Eve.*

The use of lighted tapers at the eucharist is to be traced to the ancient custom of nocturnal celebration; although in later times it has been regarded as emblematical of spiritual illumination, or rejoicing. (See *Canones Apost. c. 3*; HIERONYMUS *contra Vigilant. c. 4, 7*; INNOCENT III. *De Myster. Miss. lib. ii. c. 21.*)

The practice of burning tapers or candles at the time of celebrating the Lord's supper was discarded by Protestants at the time of the Reformation, as savouring too much of Romish

*Matt. xxv. 6.*—Conf. LACTANT. *Instit.* | a nobis propter adventum regis ac Dei  
*Div. lib. vii. c. 19,* Hæc est nox, quæ | nostri pervigilio celebratur.

superstition ;—but it might be fully justified as containing a memorial of the time and circumstances of the original institution of the sacrament by our blessed Lord *on the night* before he was betrayed.

By the Roman laws, nocturnal assemblies, even for the purpose of religious worship, were forbidden. This was probably the reason of a practice introduced among the early Christians of assembling in the morning before day-light, mentioned by Pliny in his celebrated letter to Trajan, and by Tertullian (*De Cor. Mil.* c. 3). By meeting in the dark, but not at a suspicious or forbidden hour, they preserved all that was essential in the preference which otherwise would have been given to the night or evening, without violating the law. In later times, the morning was deemed a fit time for the celebration of the Lord's supper, as bearing an emblematical reference to Christ as the sun of righteousness, the light that came into the world, the day star that arises in a Christian heart.

Nine o'clock in the morning soon became the canonical hour for the celebration of this sacrament. Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* lib. v. Ep. 17) mentions this hour as usual in his time; whence we must conclude that it was introduced as early as the fifth century. The testimony of Gregory of Tours is to the same effect. The third council of Orleans, A. D. 538, (c. 14,) fixes this hour for the commencement of the solemnity on high festivals. In the year 797 we find Theodulph, bishop of Orleans, saying “*hora tertia canonicè fiunt missæ,*” i. e., *the canonical hour for the celebration of the mass (eucharist) is nine o'clock.* It was finally settled that the sacrament should be celebrated at nine o'clock on Sundays and high festivals; and at twelve on other days<sup>23</sup>.

In Protestant churches, the hour has not been fixed by law; but the holy sacrament is usually administered as part of the morning service.

2. *Days and seasons.*—In the primitive church, it was an

<sup>23</sup> *Missa conventualis et solennis sequenti ordine dici debet:—in festis duplicibus et semiduplicibus, in Dominicis et infra Octavas dicta in choro hora tertia, in festis simplicibus et feriis per annum dicta sexta. Missale Roman. Rubr. Gen. c. 15.*

universal custom to administer the Lord's supper on Thursday in Easter week, as being the day of its institution. A party in the church urged the propriety of celebrating this sacrament on that day alone in the course of the year, with a view probably to preserve respect for the ordinance, and to indicate its superior sanctity. But the sense of the majority of the church was against this practice, and frequent communion was considered expedient for the strengthening and refreshing of faith, and in compliance with the command of our Saviour, and the injunction of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Ecclesiastical history exhibits evident traces of the observance of the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath, very early in the second century, and of the celebration of the Lord's supper regularly on that day. This is probably the "status dies," "certain fixed or appointed day," of Pliny. Although Tertullian, in treating of the Lord's supper, does not expressly mention this day as appointed for its celebration, yet from other parts of his works the observance of the Lord's day in his time may be abundantly shown. (See especially TERTULL. *ad Nation.* lib. i. c. 13.) The testimony of Justin Martyr (*Apologia.* i. c. 67) is important,—“On Sunday,” says he, “we all meet together.” And the reason of the selection of this day is laid in the circumstance that on the first day of the week light was created, and our Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead. In later times, Sunday continued to be preferred for the administration of the Lord's supper; whence it was called *dies panis*,—the day of bread. At the Reformation, the celebration of the eucharist on every Lord's day was earnestly recommended, although not ordered by any law or positive enactment.

But we must not suppose that the celebration of this sacrament was absolutely restricted to the Lord's day in the ancient church. On the contrary, a daily celebration appears to have been recommended, and to a certain extent practised. It is probably to this that allusion is made in Acts ii. 42, 46. Irenæus says (*adv. Hæc.* lib. iv. c. 34), “Sic et ideo nos quoque offerre Dominus vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione,”—i. e., “Thus also it is the will of our Lord that we should make our offering at his altar, frequently, and without intermission.” See

also express testimonies on this subject in TERTULL. *de Jejun.* c. 14; *de Idol.* c. 7; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 54; AMBROS. *Ep.* 14 *ad Marcell. sor.* There was, however, no fixed and general law with reference to this particular; and, in fact, there was a great variety of observance<sup>24</sup>. After the fifth century, a preference for certain days was generally established.

In the primitive church, the eucharist was administered immediately after baptism to persons newly admitted into the church by that rite; who, it is to be remembered, were adults, and had gone through a preparatory course of instruction and discipline. The two eves of Easter and Whitsuntide were the times appointed for the administration of baptism; and hence they became also two principal seasons of the administration of the Lord's supper. On Christmas Eve also there was a great and solemn communion; although at that time there was no administration of baptism, a circumstance which is to be accounted for by taking into consideration the later establishment of that festival, or the near approach of Epiphany, which was sometimes

<sup>24</sup> Alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Dominico; alii certis diebus accipiunt; alibi nullus dies intermittitur, quo non offeratur; alibi Sabbato tantum et Dominico. Et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes; nec disciplina nulla est in his melior gravi [forsit. gnavo] prudentique Christiano, quam ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit ecclesiam ad quantumque forte devenit: quod enim neque contra fidem, neque contra bonos mores, injungitur, indifferenter est habendum, et pro eorum, inter quos vivitur, societate servandum est. AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 118 *ad Januar.* c. 2.—Dixerit aliquis, non quotidie accipiendam eucharistiam. Quæsieris quare? Quoniam, inquit, eligendi sunt dies, quibus purius homo continentiusque vivat, quo ad tantum sacramentum dignius accedat. . . . Alius contra, Imo, inquit, si tanta est plaga peccati atque impetus morbi, ut

medicamenta talia differenda sint, auctoritate antistitis debet quisque ab altari removeri ad agendam pœnitentiam, et eadem auctoritate reconciliari. Hoc est enim indigne accipere, si eo tempore accipiat, quo debet agere pœnitentiam, non ut arbitrio suo, cum libet, vel auferat se communioni, vel reddat. Ceterum si peccata tantum non sunt, ut excommunicandus quisquam homo judicetur, non se debet a quotidiana medicina Domini corporis separare. Rectius inter eos fortasse quisquam dirimit litem, qui monet, ut præcipue in Christi pace permaneat. Faciat autem unusquisque, quod secundum fidem suam pie credit esse faciendum. Neuter enim eorum exhonorat corpus et sanguinem Domini, si saluberrimum sacramentum certatim honorare contendunt. . . . *Nam et ille honorando non audeat quotidie sumere, et ille honorando non audeat ullo die præmittere.* *Ibid.* c. 3.



regarded as a season of public baptism.—But when the observance of vigils had been abolished or altered, and the seasons of public baptism, after the introduction of infant-baptism, had ceased to be observed, a change took place also with respect to the celebration of the holy communion, so far as that the evening service was transferred to morning, and the forenoon of the then greater festivals became the seasons of preference and distinction. It was afterwards enacted by the canons of councils that the laity should partake of the holy communion three times a year at least, the festivals of the Nativity, Easter, and Whitsuntide, being expressly named. (*Concil. Agath.* A. D. 506, can. 18; *Conc. Turon.* III. c. 50.)

From the idea of an *opus operatum*, and the doctrine that a real sacrifice is offered to God in this sacrament, arose the opinion that the performance of the rite may be available to believers without their actual presence and participation; and hence came the practice of private masses, which were unknown in the early church alike in principle and in performance.

Protestant divines recommend a monthly, or, if possible, weekly, administration of the holy communion<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> Calvin thought it right that the eucharist “sepiissime et singulis ad minimum hebdomadibus proponeretur ecclesie.” *Instit. Rel. Chr.* lib. iv. c. 17, § 43.—Abrogata igitur commentitia illa immolatione, communionem restitimus, que maxima in parte obsoluerat. Modo enim semel quotannis accederent homines ad mensam Domini, toto anni cursu satis putabant esse, si spectarent, quod a sacerdote agebatur: cœnæ quidem Dominicæ prætextu, sed ita ut nullum illic cœnæ vestigium exstaret. Quæ enim sunt Domini verba? Accipite, inquit, et distribuite inter vos. In missa vero, pro receptione, oblationis simulatio; distributio nulla, ac ne invitatio quidem: sacerdos enim, quasi resectum a reliquo corpore membrum, soli sibi parat, et solus sumit. CALV. *De Neces-*

*sitate Reform. Eccl.*—*Singulis mensibus cœnam celebrare maxime nobis placeat: modo ne usus frequentior negligentiam pariat. Nam dum major pars a communione abstinet, quodammodo dissipatur ecclesia. Malimus tamen singulis mensibus invitari ecclesiam, quam quater dumtaxat in singulos annos, ut apud nos fieri solet. Quum huc primum venire, non distribuebatur nisi ter quotannis: et quidem ut inter cœnam Pentecostes et Natalis Christi septem toti menses intercederent. Mihi placebant singuli menses: sed quum minime persuaderem, satius visum est populi infirmitati ignoscere, quam pertinacius contendere. Curavi tamen referri in acta publica, vitiosum esse morem nostrum, ut posteris facillior esset et liberior correctio. CALV. *Respons. de Quibusdam Eccl. Rit.**

## § 4.—PLACE OF CELEBRATION.

THIS sacrament was instituted by our Lord himself in a private house, in which he celebrated the passover with his disciples.—And the places of Christian assembly of which we read in the Acts of the Apostles as the scene of “breaking of bread,” were also the private houses of the believers. (Acts ii. 46; xx. 7, 8.)

But in 1 Cor. xi. 10, 22, we find that a place had been set apart for the celebration of public worship and administration of the Lord’s supper among the Corinthians, and that, being appropriated to its sacred purpose, it was distinguished from private “houses to eat and drink in.”

In times of persecution the Lord’s supper was administered in retired places, in caves and the like; but this was done as a matter of necessity, not upon any other principle. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 22; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 4.) And, at other times, the consecrated elements were sent by the hands of deacons to sick persons, who were unable to attend the public administration of the sacrament. But the rule which was observed from the beginning, as far as possible, was, that the whole administration of this ordinance, including the consecration and distribution of the sacred elements, should be performed in the place of public assembly, or the church.

It appears probable, although it cannot be established as a matter beyond doubt, that, in early times, several churches of a district, or all the churches in a diocese, possessed but one common table or altar, where the bishop consecrated the elements, which were sent to the several officiating ministers in other places for distribution.

The custom of covering the communion-table with a white linen cloth, at the time of the administration of the Lord’s supper, is very ancient. The earliest writer who expressly mentions this practice is Optatus<sup>26</sup>, (*De Schismat. Donat.* lib. vi.

<sup>26</sup> Quis fidelium nescit, in peragendis mysteriis ipsa ligna linteamine cooperiri? Inter ipsa sacramenta velamen potuit tangi, non lignum. Aut si tactu penetrari possunt ligna, penetratur et terra. Si a vobis lignum raditur, et terra, quæ subter est, foditur, altam facite scrobem, dum pro vestro arbitrio queritis paritatem. . . Non vereor Christianus dicere,

c. 1, *seq.*) We find allusions to this covering also in VICTOR. *De Persec. Vandal.* lib. i.; ISIDOR. PELUS. lib. i. *Ep.* 123; PALLAD. *Hist. Laus. Theod.* i. 31.

### § 5.—MINISTERS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE New Testament does not contain any rule or order concerning the persons by whom the sacrament of the Lord's supper may be administered. Our Saviour himself administered it at the time of its institution; and it appears probable, from the sacred history, that the apostles afterwards officiated in the same manner. (Acts xx. 7—11; ii. 42, 46; 1 Cor. x. 14, *seqq.*; xi. 23, *seqq.*)

The earliest documents of the second and third century make mention of the bishop or presiding minister as the administrator of the eucharist. According to Justin Martyr (*Apolog.* i. c. 65), the president (ὁ προεστὼς τῶν ἀδελφῶν) pronounced the form of thanksgiving and praise over the elements, or, as we should say, consecrated them, and the deacons distributed them among the communicants who were present, and conveyed them to those who were absent. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Smyrn.*) speaks of the presence of a bishop as essential to the administration of the sacrament. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 13), the administrator is called sometimes ἀρχιερεὺς, chief priest, and sometimes ἐπίσκοπος, bishop, and he is directed to stand before the altar, with the presbyters and deacons, and consecrate the bread and wine. The same is required in CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* cat. 5; PSEUDO-DIONYS. AREOP. *De Hier. Ecc.* c. 3.

It was long observed as a rule, that a presbyter should not consecrate the elements in presence of the bishop; and that, if several bishops were present, either the oldest among them, or

quod vobis postulantis gentilis ex-  
cutio non potuit ignorare: velamina et  
instrumenta Dominica extorsistis, quæ  
jamdudum fuerant in commune pos-  
sessa: extorsistis cum codicibus pallas:  
judicio superbiæ vestræ utraque arbi-  
trati estis esse polluta. Nisi fallor, hæc

purificare properastis; lavistis procul  
dubio pallas; indicatè quid de codi-  
cibus feceristis; in omnibus judicium  
providentiæ vestræ debet esse equale.  
OPTAT. MILEVIT. *De Schism. Donat.*  
lib. vi. c. 1, 5.

one specially elected for the purpose, should perform the sacred office.

During the seventh and eighth centuries, the bishops ordinarily presided on these occasions. But in the middle ages we find them more rarely present. Their presence at the administration of the sacrament became less frequent, partly perhaps in consequence of the continually increasing extent of their dioceses and amount of their duties, and partly on account of the prevailing opinion, that the superior dignity of their rank and office did not accord with the performance of common offices of religion,—an opinion which stands in striking contrast with the holy zeal and constancy with which bishops of earlier and better times performed their sacred duties at the Lord's table. At last, it became the practice for bishops to administer the Lord's supper only at the high festivals, or on other particular occasions.

The general rule respecting the consecration and distribution of the sacred elements which obtained in the early centuries, may be described as follows:—The bishop consecrated, the presbyter administered the bread, and the deacons the wine; or, if a bishop were not present, a presbyter, acting as his representative, consecrated, and the deacons administered both elements. We find that during the fourth century deacons sometimes took upon themselves the work of consecration, as well as that of distribution; but this practice was regarded as wholly inconsistent with their office, and was expressly forbidden by several councils. (*Conc. Arlat.* A.D. 314, c. 15; *Conc. Nic.* A.D. 325, c. 18, *HIERONYM. Dialog. contr. Lucif.; Epist.* 85; *AUGUSTIN, Quest. V. et N. T.* c. 46.)

As early as the second and third centuries, we find examples of a special preparation for the administration of the Lord's supper on the part of those who were about to officiate. It was afterwards established as a rule by the canons of councils, that administration should be preceded by confession, and by private prayer. Fasting also was enjoined as preparatory to both the administration and the reception of the holy communion. The use of tobacco, in the form of snuff, or in smoking, has been likewise forbidden by several councils of modern date. (*Conc. Colon.* A.D. 1651, p. 2, c. 5; *Statut. Synod. Trerirens.* A.D. 1678,

§ ii. c. 6, 7.) It was an ancient practice for the clergy to wash their hands before they proceeded to administration. (CYRILL. HIEROS. *Catech. Mystag.* v. § 2; *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 11.) Many testimonies are collected in DURANTI *De Rit. Eccl. Cath.* lib. ii. c. 28.

### § 6.—OF THE COMMUNICANTS.

RESPECTING the communicants we must consider—

1. The persons who were admitted to partake of the Lord's supper.
2. Their preparation for the solemn ordinance.
3. The part which they took in it, or their acts and conduct during the administration of the sacrament.

1. *Persons admitted to the holy communion.*—The *Apostolical Constitutions*, in several places, but especially in book vii. chap. 11, 12, mention the persons who were allowed to be present at the celebration of the eucharist. We learn that after the doors of the church were carefully shut and watched, the deacon made a proclamation describing the classes of persons who were not suffered to remain as communicants. These were,—1. The *κατηχουμένοι*, catechumens, (i. e., the first class of them.) 2. The *ἀκρωμένοι*, hearers, (the second class.) 3. The *ἄπιστοι*, unbelievers, (Jews and heathens.) 4. The *ἑτεροδόξοι*, either reputed heretics or false teachers, separatists, or penitents. The penitents and ensergumens are not expressly mentioned in this catalogue; but we know from other authorities that these persons were not admitted to the Lord's table; at which, in fact, none but the *πιστοὶ*, (*μεμνημένοι*, *τέλειοι*, fideles,) the faithful, or persons in full communion with the church, were received.

At first, all the faithful, without exception, partook of this sacred ordinance. There are no traces of a selection of communicants either in the New Testament, in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, or any other very early writer. All persons present at the conse-

eration of the eucharist communicated; and, according to Justin, the sacred elements were sent, by the hands of the deacons, even to the sick and other absent members of the church. In the writings of Ambrose we find it stated as a rule, “*Omnes Christiani omni Dominica debent offerre,*” i. e., All Christians ought to celebrate the Lord’s supper every Lord’s day. In the *Apostolical Canons* (can. 10) mention is made of certain among the πιστοὶ who came to church without communicating, and who are on this account threatened with excommunication as introducing disorder into the church<sup>27</sup>. This was repeated by the Council of Antioch, (c. 2.)

But, during the fourth and fifth centuries, it became a general practice for members of the church to withdraw at the beginning of the celebration of the eucharist, at which, according to the rules of the church, they had a right, and were even required, to be present. This practice was strongly condemned by the clergy. (Cyrusost. *Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Ephes.*; CESARIUS ARELAT. *Serm. 5.*)

In the sixth century, the faithful who did not communicate retired from the assembly before the celebration of the Lord’s supper began; but not without receiving the blessing of the officiating minister. (*Conc. Agath. A. D. 506, can. 44; Conc. Aurelian. I. A. D. 511, can. 28.*) A kind of sanction was thus given to the practice of not communicating; and a foundation was laid of the division of the fideles into two classes—communicantes and non-communicantes; of which the church knew nothing in earlier and better times. To this also may be traced the introduction of the eulogia, a sort of consecrated bread, received by those who either could not, or would not, be present at the eucharist, and supposed to supply its place. The Council of Nante, about A. D. 890, enacted that the presbyters should keep some portions of the oblations in a proper vessel, in order that, after the eucharistical service was ended, those persons who were not prepared to communicate, might, on every Lord’s day and

<sup>27</sup> Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας πιστοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραμένοντας δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ μετα- λήψει, ὡς ἂν ἀταξίαν ἐμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή. *Canones Apostol. can. 7.—Conf. Conc. Antioch. c. 2.*

festival, receive some of this eulogia, previously blessed with a proper benediction. To this custom it is easy to refer the origin of private masses, and of communion in one kind.

According to the original laws and customs of the church, the communicants consisted of all persons who had been admitted as members of the church by baptism. "No man," says Justin Martyr, "has a right to partake of the eucharist, except he who believes our doctrine, who has received baptism of the forgiveness of sins and of regeneration, and who lives in obedience to the commandments of Christ." In this case, however, adult-baptism was supposed. But infant-baptism came into use as early as the second and third centuries, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and Cyprian, the former of whom inveighs against the practice (*De Baptism.* c. 18), while the latter defends it. (*Epist.* 64.) And, on the ground that want of age formed no impediment to the efficacy of the sacraments, the Lord's supper was administered to infants previously baptized. (CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis; Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 12, 13; DIONYS. AREOP. *De Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 7, § 11.)

In the fifth century, we find Augustin not only speaking of this practice as common and well known, but strongly recommending it. (*Epist.* 23, 106, *ad Bonif.*; *Epist. contra duas Epist. Pelag.* lib. i. c. 22; *Serm.* 8, *De Verb. Apost.*; *De Peccat. Merit.*, lib. i. c. 20.) The practice continued in the church during several centuries. The Council of Trent decreed that the reception of the eucharist by infants is not necessary to salvation, adding, that it "did not intend hereby to condemn antiquity for observing this custom in some places. For as those holy fathers had a probable reason, considering the state of the times they lived in, for their practice, so it is certainly and without all controversy to be believed, that they did not do it upon any opinion of its being necessary to salvation." The reception of the Lord's supper was, however, evidently regarded as necessary to salvation, in the case of infants; as appears from the express language of Augustin, in a passage above referred to, and from the mode in which the practice was observed. (See BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xv. chap. 4, § 7.)

In the Greek church, the administration of this sacrament, as

well as of confirmation, to infants immediately after baptism, is still scrupulously practised. “L’Eglise orthodoxe administre les sacramens aux enfans à la mamelle, désirant les sanctifier dès le berceau. Celle d’occident n’accorde la communion qu’à un âge plus avancé. Il y a plus de foi dans le premier de ces usages ; dans l’autre il y a plus de raisonnement.” ALEX. STOURDZA, *Considérat. sur la Doctrine et l’Esprit de l’Eglise Orthodoxe*, 1816.

A custom of administering the eucharist to the dead was introduced at an early period into the African churches, and some others. It was deservedly censured both by fathers and councils. (CHRYSOSTOM. *Hom.* 40, in 1 Cor.; *Conc. Carth.* 3, can. 6; *Cod. African.* can. 18; *Conc. Antissidor.* can. 12; *Conc. Trull.* can. 83.) Another corrupt practice, of the same order, also prevailed to a considerable extent, namely, that of burying the consecrated elements with the dead, especially the clergy; a practice, equally with the other, without precedent in the primitive church, and prohibited by ecclesiastical laws.

The consecrated elements were sent from the church to absent members, especially the sick and those in prison, by the hands of the deacons. (*Conc. Nic.* c. 13; *Agath.* c. 15; *Tolet.* ii. c. 11; *Carthag.* iv. c. 76, 77; *Araus.* i. c. 3.) But it was rarely, and as an exception to the general rule, that consecration took place in a private house. (CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 5; GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 19, § 11; PHILOST. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 3.)

2. *Preparation of the Communicants.*—No special preparation was required by the early church for the first communion which followed immediately after baptism; the course of instruction and discipline which the candidate for baptism had undergone being considered a sufficient introduction to both sacraments at once. But, for every subsequent participation, especially at the high festivals, the communicants were required to prepare themselves by self-examination and private prayer for the forgiveness of sins,—by obtaining absolution, or the removal of all ecclesiastical censures and penalties,—and by fasting and watching. These regulations may be referred, for the most part, to the fourth century; but fasting is mentioned by Tertullian.



Veils (usually white), called *Dominicalia*, were worn by women at the time of receiving the eucharist. (*Conc. Antissidor.* A.D. 578, c. 36, 42.) And mention is made by Augustin (or rather Cæsar. Arelat.) of the practice of previously washing the hands as common to both male and female communicants (*Serm.* 152, *al.* 229, *de Temp.*)

The fathers frequently insist upon sanctity and purity of soul as the one great, and only true, preparation for the worthy receiving of the Lord's supper. "I observe many," says Chrysostom, "who are partakers of the Lord's body inconsiderately, and at all adventures, more out of custom, than by any rule, or reason and understanding. If the holy season of Lent comes, or the day of Christ's Epiphany, or Nativity, then they partake of the holy mysteries, whatever their condition may be. But Epiphany is not the time of approaching; neither does Lent make men worthy to come; but the sincerity and purity of their souls. With this come at all times; without it come never. Consider those who were partakers of the sacrifices under the old law; what abstinence did they not use,—what did they not do and perform,—to purify themselves in every respect? And dost thou, when thou comest to the sacrifice at which even angels are amazed and tremble, measure the business by the revolutions and periods of certain times and seasons? How wilt thou stand before the tribunal of Christ, who darest to touch his body with polluted hands and lips? Thou wouldst not presume to kiss the king with impure breath; and dost thou kiss the King of Heaven with an impure and noisome soul? That is the highest affront which can really be offered to Him. Tell me, wouldst thou choose to come to the sacrifice with unwashed hands? I suppose not;—I suppose thou wouldst rather not come at all than with unclean hands. Since, therefore, thou art so scrupulous and religious in a small matter, how darest thou to come and touch the sacrifice with a polluted soul? And yet thy hands only hold it for a time, but it is wholly dissolved into thy soul. At other times ye come not to it, though ye be clean; but at Easter ye come, although ye be defiled with sin. Oh custom! oh prejudice!" (*Chrysost. Hom.* 3, *in Ephes.*)—The particular duties more especially required in order to a worthy participation

are described by the same pious and eloquent father, in various homilies, as the following:—faith, repentance and obedience, integrity and justice, peace and unity, charity and beneficence, forgiveness of injuries, and a devout and reverent behaviour at the Lord's table.

Many of the exhortations of Chrysostom relating to the true preparation for a worthy partaking in the Lord's supper, and corresponding conduct afterwards, are admirable at once for piety of sentiment, and for energy of thought and expression. In Chrysostom's time, many erroneous notions with regard to the real nature of the eucharist had become prevalent; nor was that eminent bishop himself exempt from mistaken impressions on the subject. We live in a time and country in which Christianity is far better understood, and is received with a much smaller admixture of error and superstition, than it was at Constantinople in the fourth century; but it will be well for every individual member of the church, at this more enlightened period, if his heart and practice respond to such appeals as the following, which were addressed to Christians of those earlier days. It were surely far better to live under the influence of a sincere and humble piety, such as is here recommended, even though mingled with all the superstitions and ecclesiastical follies of the fourth century, than to be in possession of better knowledge, and to have a clearer and more correct perception of gospel truth, but yet, at the same time, to be strangers to the humility, devotion, and godly love, which belonged to many of those half-informed Christians, whose crude notions and low views we cannot but lament.

“Let us now become eagles,” says Chrysostom<sup>28</sup>, “and fly up to the Lord in heaven; let us have nothing to do with the earth, but look upward to the Sun of Righteousness. Let us not receive him with polluted hands, but come to him with reverence and all imaginable purity; saying, By this body I am no longer earth and ashes; I am no longer a captive, but free: for this I hope to receive heaven and all the good things therein, immortal life, the condition of angels, the society of Christ. Cleanse, therefore, and wash thy soul; prepare thy mind for the reception

<sup>28</sup> These extracts are from Bingham.

of these mysteries. If the son of a king in all his splendid robes, his purple and his diadem, were put into thy hands to carry, thou wouldst contemn all inferior things. But now thou receivest not the son of a mortal king, but the only-begotten Son of God; and art thou not afraid still to retain the love of worldly things? Why is not this ornament alone sufficient for thee, but that thou must yet look to the earth, and be in love with riches? Knowest thou not that thy Lord is averse from all the pomp and magnificence of this life? Was he not therefore born of a poor mother, and at his birth laid in a manger? And did he not make this answer to the man who sought to make a gain of his service: 'The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head?' Let us, therefore, imitate him. Overlooking the beauty of pillars and marbles, let us seek for mansions in heaven above; and trampling upon all worldly pride and the love of riches, let us take to ourselves lofty souls, and mind the things that are above." (*Hom. 24 in Ep. ad Cor.*) Again,—“When you come to the holy table and sacred mysteries, do it with fear and reverence, with a pure conscience, with fasting and prayer. Consider what a sacrifice you partake of, what a table you approach unto. Consider that thou, who art but dust and ashes, receivest the body and blood of Christ. God calls thee to his own table, and sets before thee his Son: where the angelic powers stand about with fear and trembling, and the cherubim cover their faces, and the seraphim cry with reverence, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Hosts! Let us therefore come with the greatest reverence also, and give thanks, and fall down and confess our sins, and with tears bewail our offences, and offer up fervent prayers to God. And so, purifying ourselves in quietness and decent order, let us come as to a heavenly king; and, receiving the holy and immaculate sacrifice, let us kiss and embrace it with our mouths and eyes, and therewith warm our souls; that we come not together to judgment and condemnation, but to create in us sobriety of mind, charity, and virtue, to reconcile ourselves to God, and to obtain a lasting peace, together with whatever other blessings arise thence; that we may both sanctify ourselves and edify our neighbours.” (*Hom. 31, de Natic. Christi.*)—“Thou fastest before thou dost communicate, that thou mayest appear worthy;

and dost thou destroy all after communicating, when thou oughtest to be more temperate? I do not enjoin thee to fast, but to abstain from luxury, and all the evil effects of it, immoderate laughter, disorderly words, pernicious jesting, foolish and vain discourse, and whatever a Christian ought not to speak, who has been entertained at Christ's table, and touched his flesh with his tongue<sup>29</sup>: whoever thou art, therefore, purify thy hands, thy lips, and thy tongue, which have been the gates at which Christ entered into thee." (*Hom. 27 in Ep. ad Cor.*)—"When thou sittest down to a common table, remember that spiritual table, and call to mind that supper of the Lord. Consider what words thy mouth hath spoken, words worthy of such a table, what things thy mouth hath touched and tasted, what meat it has fed upon. Dost thou think it no harm with that mouth to speak evil of and revile thy brother? How canst thou call him brother? If he is not thy brother, how couldst thou say 'Our Father?'—for that implies more persons than one. Consider with whom thou stoodest in the time of the holy mysteries; with cherubim and seraphim. But the cherubim use no reviling. Their mouth is filled with one office, glorifying and praising God. How then canst thou say with them, Holy, Holy, Holy, who usest thy mouth to reviling? Tell me, if there were a royal vessel, always filled with royal dainties, and set apart only for this use, and one of the servants should use it for mean purposes, would he afterwards dare to place it, filled with that which is vile and refuse, among the other vessels appointed for royal use? No, certainly. Yet this is the very case of railing and reviling. You say at the holy table, 'Our Father,' and then immediately add, 'which art in heaven.' This word raises you up, and gives wings to your

<sup>29</sup> It is easy to read these words as a mere hyperbole, or some rhetorical figure. But the phraseology is incorrect, to say the least. It may tend to destroy, in the minds of some men, a really religious veneration of sacred things. In fact, to the ears of a Protestant churchman, who has been instructed in Scriptural truth, and recalled, by divine mercy, to the contemplation of the earliest Christian

antiquity, it seems little less than profane. Let us take care, however, that, while our views of the Lord's supper are more in accordance with Scripture and reason than those which prevailed in the fourth century, our reverent and faithful regard of Him whom we remember in that ordinance, be likewise, if possible, proportionably greater.

soul, and shows that you have a Father in heaven. Therefore do nothing, speak nothing, of earthly things. He hath placed you in the order of spirits above, and appointed you a station in that choir. Why then do you draw yourself downward? You stand by the royal throne, and do you revile your brother? How are you not afraid lest the king should take it as an affront offered to himself? If a servant beats or reviles another in our presence, who are but his fellow-servants, though he does it justly, we rebuke him for it. And dare you stand before the royal throne, and revile your brother? See you not these holy vessels? Are they not always appropriated to one peculiar use? Dares any one put them to any other? But you are more holy than these vessels, yea, much more holy. Why then do you pollute and defile yourself? You stand in heaven, and do you still use railing? You converse with angels, and do you yet revile? You are admitted to the Lord's holy kiss, and do you yet revile? God hath honoured and adorned your mouth so many ways, by angelical hymns, by food, not angelical, but super-angelical, by his own kisses, and by his own embraces, and do you after all these revile? Do not, I beseech you. Let that which is the cause of so many evils be far from the soul of a Christian." (*Hom. 14 in Ep. ad Ephes.*)—"Be grateful to thy benefactor by an excellent conversation; consider the greatness of the sacrifice, and let that engage thee to adorn every member of thy body. Consider what thou takest in thy hand, and never after endure to strike any man; do not disgrace that hand by the sin of fighting and quarrelling, which has been honoured with the reception of so great a gift. Consider what thou takest in thy hand, and keep thy hand free from all robbery and injustice. Think again, how thou not only receivest it in thy hand, but puttest it to thy mouth; and keep thy tongue pure from all filthy and contumelious speech, from blasphemy and perjury, and all words of the like nature. For it is a most pernicious thing that the tongue, which ministers in such tremendous mysteries, and is dyed with the purple of such precious blood, and made a golden sword, should be put to the vile practice of railing and reviling, and scurrilous and abusive language. Regard with veneration the honour wherewith God has honoured it; and do

not debase it to such mean offices of sin. Consider again, that, after thy hand and thy tongue, thy heart receives that tremendous mystery:—then never devise any fraud or deceit against thy neighbour, but keep thy mind pure from all malicious designs. And after the same manner guard thy eyes and thy ears.” (*Hom. 21 ad Pop. Antioch.*)

3. *Acts and conduct of the Communicants.*—The conduct of the communicants in partaking of the holy eucharist was subject to certain fixed rules.

They were required to bring certain oblations (*προσφοραὶ*) or presents (*δῶρα*) of bread and wine. These were sometimes presented by persons who did not communicate. The bread and wine were enveloped in a white linen cloth, called *Fago*; the wine being contained in a vessel called *Ama* or *Amula*.

After the deacon had said, “Let us pray,” the communicants carried their offerings towards the altar, which were usually taken by a deacon, and, having been delivered or presented to the bishop, were laid upon the altar, or upon a separate table provided for their reception (*Constit. Apost.* viii. 12). This custom of offering oblations ceased generally during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The communicants *stood* during the administration of the sacrament (*Constit. Apost.* viii. 12; ii. 57; conf. AUGUSTIN. *de Serm. Dom. in Monte*, lib. ii. c. 5), with their faces towards the east (BASIL. M. *de Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27).

The clergy (according to their different degrees) communicated first; then the men, and lastly the women (*Constit. Apost.* viii. 13). They advanced to the table two by two.

After the middle of the fourth century, lay communicants were for the most part forbidden to approach close to the table, or to go within the rails (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 19), a right which was retained as the exclusive privilege of the clergy. The right of the laity, however, in this respect, appears to have been preserved in some places.

The elements were received by the communicants sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, but never sitting. They took the

bread and the cup in their hands. The women used a part of the dominical as a napkin, but the men received with the bare hand (previously washed). After the officiating minister had pronounced the words of distribution, they said Amen, in testimony that they believed themselves to be partakers of the body and blood of Christ. (PSEUDO-AMBROS. *de Sacram.* lib. iv. c. 5; AUGUSTIN. *contr. Faust.* lib. xii. c. 10; *Serm. de Verb. Apost.* c. 29; EUSEB. *H. E.* vii. 9; *conf.* vi. 43.) After the ninth century, the bread was not delivered into the hands of the communicants, but placed in their mouths, in order to prevent the abuse of carrying the sacred element home.

Communicants were required to be careful not to waste the least crumb of the consecrated bread, or a drop of the wine. (CYRIL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystagog.* 5, § 21, 22; BASIL. M. *Ep.* 279; CHRYSOST. *ad Popul. Antioch. Hom.* 21; AUGUSTIN. *contra lit. Petil.* lib. ii. c. 23; *Serm. de Temp.* 252; *Concil. Tolet.* i. c. 14.)

At the close of the communion, the people knelt down, and received the priest's blessing. (*Const. Apost.* viii. c. 14, 15.) After the blessing, the assembly was dismissed with the words, "Depart in peace."

The practice of the people's kneeling during the consecration and distribution of the sacred elements was introduced during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but did not become general until a still later period. (BASNAGE, *L'Histoire de l'Eglise*, lib. xvii. c. 1.; COTTA *Supplem. ad Jo. Gerhard Lec. Theol.* t. 10.)

## § 7.—OF THE ELEMENTS.

### 1. *Of the Bread.*

1. *Quality of the bread.*—A great dispute has existed between the Greek and Latin churches respecting the kind of bread which ought to be used in the eucharist; the former contending for the propriety of using leavened, the latter urging the necessity of employing unleavened, bread for the purpose. Protestant writers have taken part with the Greek church in this controversy. It is foreign to the purpose of this work to enumerate the arguments

which have been advanced by both parties in support of their respective opinions and practice; but the following historical facts must not be omitted.

i. Early Christian writers make no mention of the use of unleavened bread in this sacrament.

ii. The bread was consecrated from the oblations brought by the people, and the unconsecrated remainder was used in the *agapæ*, or appropriated to the support of the poor or the ministers of the church. This circumstance has been advanced, not without reason, in favour of the use of common bread.

iii. A passage in which Epiphanius describes the practice of the Ebionites, and an expression in a treatise, *De Sacramentis*, attributed to Ambrose, appear to favour the opinion that leavened bread was in general use at the time when those authors wrote<sup>30</sup>.

iv. Until the middle of the eleventh century, no controversy existed respecting the use of leavened or unleavened bread.

v. A difference of practice had, indeed, previously obtained. Platina (who wrote in the fifteenth century) ascribes the introduction of unleavened bread to Alexander I., a Roman bishop of the second century. This testimony is of little weight. But it is certain that from the seventh century unleavened bread was used at Rome, and leavened at Constantinople. Photius, however, a Greek controversialist of the tenth century, who made many complaints against the Latin church in other particulars, did not reckon this practice among his grounds of accusation; which is a proof that the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the eucharist was, at that period, rightly regarded as a thing indifferent.

vi. Michael Cæcarius, patriarch of Constantinople, originated this controversy (*ἀρτομαχία*), in the year 1053.

vii. The Latin church has frequently asserted men's liberty in this particular; while the Greek church has positively condemned the use of unleavened bread.

viii. Protestants regard the use of leavened or unleavened

<sup>30</sup> Μυστήρια δὲ δῆθεν τελοῦσι κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπὸ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, διὰ Ἀζύμων, καὶ τὸ ἄλλο μέρος τοῦ μυστηρίου δι' ὕδατος μόνου. ΕΡΡΙΨΑΝ. *Hæres.* xxx. §. 16.—

Tu forte dicis, Meus panis est usitatus; sed panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum; ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. (ΑΜΠΡΟΣ.) *de Sacramentis*, lib. iv. c. 4.



bread as indifferent. For the most part, they discontinued the use of unleavened bread at the Reformation; but the Lutherans retain it<sup>21</sup>.

2. *Form of the Bread.*—The eucharistic bread in the church of Rome (called, after consecration, *hostia*, the *host*) consists of cakes of meal and water, small, round, and thin, in the shape of wafers. (*Panes eucharistici*, or *sacramentales*; *panes orbiculares*, or *rotundi*; *panes tessellati*; *panes reticulati*; *placentæ*, *placentæ orbiculares*, *placentæ missales*; *nebula*, or *spuma*, *panis*; *crustula farraea*; *coronæ*, or *rotundæ*; *panes numularii*; *denaria sacramentorum*.) This shape appears to have been brought into general use soon after the rise of the controversy with the Greek church in 1053. At the Reformation, the use of these thin cakes was discarded by most of the Reformed, but retained by the Lutheran churches.

<sup>21</sup> *Panis sit fermentatus, an azymus; vinum rubrum, an album, nihil refert.*—Fermentatum et vulgarem panem fuisse ante tempus Alexandri Romani Episcopi, narrant historiae; qui primus azymo pane delectatus est; qua id ratione, non video, nisi ut plebis oculos novo spectaculo in admirationem traheret magis, quam ut animos proba religione institueret. Omnes objuro, qui vel levi aliquo pietatis studio tanguntur, ammon evidentem perspiciant, et quanto præclarius Dei gloria hic resplendeat, et quanto affluentior spiritalis consolationis suavitas ad fideles transeat, quam in istis frigidis et histrionicis nugis, quæ nullum alium usum afferunt, nisi ut stupentis populi sensum fallunt. CALVIN. *Inst. Chr. Rel.* lib. iv. c. 17, § 43.—Panis azymus ne sit an fermentatus, non magnopere putamus laborandum. BEZA. *Ep. 12, ad Anglic. Eccl. Patres.*—Odiosa excitata est contentio super materia cœnæ dominicæ, contententibus his, pane azymo, aliis vero fermentato esse utendum. Atqui apud veteres quondam

de his nullæ movebantur rixæ. Nam ecclesie pro libertate sua utebantur utroque. Videtur quidem Dominus in prima illa cœna usus esse pane azymo, in mensa ex veteri more celebrandi Paschatis relicto, unde non paucæ ecclesie infermentato pane usæ sunt, quæ tamen fermentato pane utentes, non damnabant hæreseos. BULLINGER, *ap. Gerhard. Loc. Theol.* x. —Fermentati æque ac azymi panis in Eucharistia liber usus est, dum modo ne alteruter ceu necessarius et nullo casu mutabilis præscribatur. Uterque analogiam quandum fundit: ille nutritionis plenioris; hic sinceritatis et sanetitatis, ad quam Eucharistia obligat, majoris. Nostræ ecclesie usum azymi a Zuinglio, externorum ejusmodi plane incurioso et interiorum atque spiritualium tenacissimo, retentum, ceu fractioni et distributioni opportunior, ut mutaret, hactenus induci non potuerunt, novandi periculum metuentes. HEIDEGGER. *Corp. Theol. Christ. Loc.* xxv. § 78.

## II. *Of the Wine.*

1. *Colour of the wine.*—It is probable that the wine used by our Saviour at the institution of the eucharist was of a red or dark colour. (See BOCHART, *Hieroz.* p. 1, lib. ii. c. 12; BUXTORF, *Dissert. de Cena Domini Thes.* 20; BYNÆI, *De morte Jesu Christi*, lib. i. c. 8, § 31.) In the churches both of the East and the West the colour of the wine has been treated as indifferent. A preference has been usually given to red, on account of its greater resemblance to that which it represents; but white wine has been sometimes preferred, on account of its greater clearness and apparent purity. The use of white wine prevails in the Greek church, and in some Protestant churches on the continent.

2. *On the mixture of water with wine.*—It was the universal practice of the early church to mingle water with the sacramental wine. This mixture was called κρᾶμα (mixtum, temperatum); which we find first in the writings of Justin Martyr and Irenæus; and frequently in authors of later date. We find also κρᾶσις; which, however, denotes properly the act of mixing. Cyprian and Augustin speak of this mixing of water with the wine as an express precept of Christ (CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 63 *ad Cecilium de Sacramento Dominici Calicis*; AUGUSTIN, *De Doctr. Christ.* lib. iv. 21). Many early writers, both Greek and Latin, and various councils, appeal to the institution itself as a sufficient warrant for the practice (See, for example, IRENÆUS *adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 57; *Conc. Carthag.* 3, A. D. 397, c. 24). Numerous testimonies on this head have been collected by BELLARMIN, *De Sacram. Euchar.* lib. iv. c. 10; VOSSIUS, *Thes. Theol.* p. 308, ed. 1658; KLUGE, *De more vinum aqua diluendi*. The Council of Trent speaks of this practice as enjoined by ecclesiastical law, but not by a divine command (*Sess.* 22, c. 7; *cf.* c. 9). It unquestionably received the sanction of the church during many ages (See *Conc. Carthag.* 3, A. D. 397, c. 24; *Conc. Bracar.* 3 (*al.* 4) 1; c. 1; *Conc. Antissidor.* c. 8; *Conc. Wormat.* c. 4; *Conc. Tribur.* c. 19; *Conc. Trullan.* 2, A. D. 692, c. 32).

The Eneratitæ or Hydroparastatæ, who used water alone, and the Armenians, who used wine alone (in order hereby to denote

the unity of Christ's nature, which they maintained), were regarded as heretics. The practice of the Armenians is severely condemned by Theophylact (*Comment. in Jo.* 19) and Nicephorus (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. xviii. c. 53).

At the Reformation, Protestants agreed in abandoning this ancient practice of the church, not as being unlawful or inexpedient in itself, but because Roman Catholics declared it necessary, on the ground of mere ecclesiastical (*i. e.*, human) authority. They refused, in this respect, as well as in others, to acknowledge any laws not contained in Scripture as binding upon the conscience<sup>32</sup>.

It has usually been taken for granted that the wine used at the passover was mixed with water; but it appears, from testi-

<sup>32</sup> Nondum constitui necum, miscenda ne sit aqua vino, quanquam huc inclino, ut merum potius vinum pareatur absque aquæ mixtura, quod significatio me male habeat, quam Esa. i. 22, ponit: Vinum tuum, inquit, mixtum est aqua. LUTHER. *de forma Missæ*.—Imo si allegoriis liberet ludere, mixtio aquæ cum vino de adulteratione cœnæ Dominicæ exponi posset. Notum enim est quid Esaias intelligat, quando inquit, Vinum tuum mixtum est aqua. Simplicissimum igitur et certissimum est, inhærere manifestis verbis institutionis cœnæ; et ea, quæ necessaria et substantialia sunt, distinguere ab aliis vel accidentibus vel circumstantiis. MART. CHEMNIT. *Evangel. Conc. Trident.* p. 2.—Non simpliciter damnamus ut pugnantes contra Christi institutionem, qui vinum aqua temperatum in administratione Eucharistiæ usurpant; nec judicamus Eucharistiæ integritati vel efficaciæ quidquam decedere, si vinum aqua sit mixtum, quod ab *οἰνοκαπήλοις* sæpius fieri constat. Si ergo Pontificii mixtionem illam ut consuetudinem adaphoram, quæ verbo Dei nec mandata, nec prohibita sit, sed rationem habeat vero non dissimilem, servarent et proponerent, nulla, ut de re indifferente,

esset controversia. Quæstio autem est, an hæc mixtio aquæ cum vino, 1, in ipsa cœnæ Dominicæ administratione necessaria sit? 2, et quidem hoc fide, ut unio fidelium cum Christo non solum representetur, sed etiam, 3, efficiatur? Pontificii affirmant: . . . nos in negativam concedimus.

The grounds upon which the negative is maintained are thus stated: —1. Ex verbis institutionis non potest probari mixtionis illius necessitas. 2. Mixtio aquæ potius aliquid addit institutionis, quia Evangelistæ solius merique vini mentionem faciunt. Matt. xxvi. 29; Marc. xiv. 25; Luc. xxii. 18. Chrysostomus, *Hom.* 33 in *Matth.* ait; Ex germine vitis, quæ certe vinum, non aquam, producit. 3. Mixtio illa nititur sola traditione et consuetudine. Jam vero consuetudo libera et traditio incerta non possunt necessarium quendam fidei articulum constituere. 4. Mixtio illa non respondet typo Melchisedeci, qui panem et vinum, non autem vinum aqua mixtum Abraham et militibus obtulit. 5. Qualis sit mixtionis necessitas adhuc apud ipsos Pontificios incertum est. 6. Mixtio hæc labyrinthum disputationum parit. GERNARD. *Loc. Theol.* t. 10

monies collected by Buxtorf, Schöttgen, and Lightfoot, that this was not necessarily the case.

The proportion of water mixed with wine, by those who adhere to the ancient practice, is very small. In the Western church a third part of water is the largest quantity allowed; but a few drops in the cup are deemed sufficient.

In the Western church the mixture of (cold) water takes place only once, before the consecration, wine being first poured into the cup, and the water added. But in the Oriental church a two-fold mixing takes place. There is the first mixture of cold water in the cup before consecration, and then a second mixture of warm water, after consecration, and immediately before distribution. This is said to have been designed to represent at once the water which flowed from our Saviour's side, and the fire of the Holy Spirit. See JAC. GOARI *Eucholog. Gr. ad missam Chrysost.* n. 167; ARCEIDI *Concord.* lib. iii. c. 39; *Conf. THOM. AQUIN. Summa, P. 3, Quæst. 83, art. 6*; BONA *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 9, § 4.

#### § 8.—OBSERVANCES AND CEREMONIES CONNECTED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. *Consecration of the Elements.*—The Eastern churches, following herein the old liturgies, have always regarded the invocation of the Holy Spirit as essential to the consecration of the elements in the Lord's supper; but the churches of the West, for the most part, have declared this unnecessary, and have confined themselves chiefly to the words of institution. In this particular Protestants and Romanists are agreed. But it is remarkable that in the English first book of *Common Prayer*, in the reign of Edward the sixth, the form of consecration ran thus:—"Audi nos, pater misericors, te precamur, et Sancto Spiritu tuo dignare benedicere et sanctificare hæc dona et creaturas panis et vini, ut sint nobis corpus et sanguis carissimi filii tui Jesus Christ, qui ea nocte, qua proditus fuit, accepit panem, &c.;" which was afterwards altered, chiefly at the suggestion of Bucer, to the present form:—"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread

and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood. Who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread," &c. Some English divines have since contended for the propriety of adopting the ancient solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit.

No high antiquity can be claimed for the elevation and adoration of the consecrated elements. A practice of this kind appears to have existed in the Eastern churches as early (perhaps) as the fourth century; originating probably in the system of secret discipline, and in the irregularities of the Markosites, or other erroneous sects. The first traces of this custom in the West appears in a Life of Alphege, Archbishop of Canterbury, who lived in the beginning of the eleventh century; but the account is of doubtful authority. It existed in France in the beginning of the twelfth century; but it appears not to have been introduced in Germany before the thirteenth, and the same may be said respecting Italy.

Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura speak only of the elevation of the host, or consecrated bread; the elevation of the cup was introduced at a subsequent period.

The custom of ringing little bells during the ceremony arose in France, where it was introduced by William of Paris. The general observance of this custom was enjoined by Gregory XI.

## 2. *Distribution of the elements.*—i. *Communion in both kinds.*

The communion was universally administered in both kinds to both clergy and laity, until about the twelfth century; when the cup began to be gradually withdrawn from the laity, in the Western church, on account (as was affirmed) of the disorders to which the use of it had given rise<sup>33</sup>. The Greek church

<sup>33</sup> Certum est, omnes passim clericos et laicos, viros et mulieres, sub utraque specie sacra mysteria antiquitus sumsisse, cum solemnī eorum celebrationi aderant et offerebant et de oblatiis participabant. Extra sacrificium vero

et extra ecclesiam semper et ubique commūio sub una specie in usu fuit. Primæ parti assertionis consentiunt omnes, tam catholici quam sectarii; nec eam negare potest, qui vel levis-sima rerum ecclesiasticarum notitia

retains the ancient custom. The Councils of Constance, Basle, and Trent, asserted the right of the church to administer to the laity in one kind only, as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, and maintained the sufficiency and validity of such administration; but without claiming any other ground for this practice than the occasion which had arisen for the exercise of this supposed authority. They held that, under the sanction of the church, the reception of both elements was not necessary to the perfection of the sacrament. Protestants, on the other hand, maintained the indispensable duty of adhering to our Saviour's institution; and argued that, although the abuse of the original practice ought to be done away, the practice itself ought to be continued.

ii. *Order of distribution.*—It was an old rule of the church, as appears from the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the canons of the Council of Laodicea, that the consecrated elements were received first by the clergy present at the celebration of the

imbutus sit. Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesie primordiis usque ad sæculum XII sub specie panis et vin communicarunt fideles; cœpitque paulatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo intercedentibus ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis, quod inevitabile erat aucta fidelium multitudine, in qua deesse non poterant minus cauti et attenti et parum religiosi. . . . Paulatim introducta est communio sub sola specie panis, posteaquam intolerandi abusus religiosos antistites ad abrogandum communem calicis usum induxerunt. Moribus enim immutatis leges quoque mutandæ sunt, quæ aliquando utiles atque optimæ fuerunt. Hæc autem mutatio facta est primum a diversis episcopis in suis ecclesiis, deinde a Synodo Constantiensi canonica sanctione pro omnibus stabilita. *BOXA Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 18, § 1.—Ab ecclesie exordio ad sæculum usque XII eucharistiam etiam laicis sub utraque specie in publico solemnique eucharistie ministerio fuisse ministratam

(etsi non semper et necessario), nullus est inter catholicos qui ignorat, si vel levissima rerum ecclesiasticarum notitia sit imbutus. Verum crescente indies fidelium numero, cum sanguis non raro a populo minus cauto et parum religioso fuerit effusus, primum introducta fuit consuetudo, ut ope tubuli vel fistulæ ejusdem sumeretur, quæ fundo calicis, teste Lindano, quandoque fuit ferruminata, ne ob incultioris populi rusticitatem tam facile effundi posset. Ast cum et hæc praxis sua haberet incommoda, cœperunt sacerdotes populo panem eucharisticam pretioso sanguine intinctum distribuere: qui mos sæculo XI et XII multis ecclesiis fuit familiaris. Verum cum illum reprobarint ecclesie aliæ, nec inconvenientis satis iretur obviam, calicis usus sæc XIII semper semperque minui, et tandem sæc. XIV fere generaliter obsolescere cœpit, donec sæc. XV post exortam Hussitarum hæresin calix publico ecclesie decreto laicis omnibus fuerit sublatus. *KRAZER De Liturg.* p. 567.

eucharist, according to their several degrees, and then by the laity, the men in the first instance, and the women afterwards.

As early as the fourth century, the laity were forbidden to communicate at the altar. It was afterwards observed as a general rule, that the clergy only should communicate within the chancel. In the Eastern church, admittance was granted to the emperors; but even this was denied in the West.

iii. *Form of distribution.*—It is remarkable that the primitive church does not appear to have accompanied the act of distribution to individual communicants with any set form of words. Perhaps this omission may be accounted for, by remembering that the words of institution were always rehearsed during the consecration of the elements.

The earliest formulary, and also the shortest, which we find, is contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book viii. chap. 13). At the delivery of the bread, the bishop (or presbyter) is there directed to say, “The body of Christ;” at the giving of the cup the deacon is instructed to say, “The blood of Christ, the cup of life.” The communicant is directed on each occasion to answer, “Amen.” This answer was universally given in the early church, and was regarded as of considerable importance. (TERTULL. *De Spectac.* c. 25; EUSEB. *H. E.* vi. 43; CYRILL. *HIEROS. Catech. Mystagog.* 5, § 18; AMBROS. *De Sacram.* lib. iv. c. 5; *De Init.* c. 9; AUGUST. *contra Faust.* lib. xii. c. 10.) By degrees the communicants omitted this response, and the word was pronounced by the clergy alone; but it is not easy to fix the date of the introduction of this practice.

In the time of Gregory the Great the church adopted a longer and more express form,—“The body (or blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul.” By the time of Charlemagne it was extended to, “The body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.”

During a practice (introductory to that of the administration in one kind only) of dipping the bread into the wine, the form of distribution ran thus:—“The body of our Lord Jesus Christ dipped in his blood, preserve your soul unto everlasting life. Amen.” (MURATORI, *Antiq. Ital. Med. cri.* t. iv. p. 178.)

The variations in the Greek church are but slight. (RENAUDOT, *Liturg. Orient.* t. ii. p. 42, 118, 614; CHR. ANGELUS *De Status et Ritib. Eccl. Græcæ.* c. 23.) The Syriac church retained the oldest and most simple form.

Protestants usually add the words of institution, "Take, eat, —Drink this."

iv. *Method of distribution.*—In the primitive church, the sacred elements were administered distinctly, the bread first, and the wine afterwards, as appears from the testimonies of Justin Martyr, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and Cyril of Jerusalem. Difficulties connected with the administration of the wine arose in the middle ages; in order to meet which the use of "fistulæ eucharisticæ" was first introduced, and subsequently the practice of dipping the bread in the wine, so that both elements were administered together. But this arrangement not being deemed sufficient, the Latin church, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, adopted the system of withdrawing the wine from the laity altogether, while the Greek church mingled both elements, and administered them together in a kind of spoon, (*λάβις* or *λαβίδιον*; *ὄργανον λειτουργικόν.*) Protestants reverted to the ancient practice of administering the bread and wine successively.

At first, the elements were delivered into *the hands* of the communicants. In the sixth, eighth, and ninth centuries some traces may be discovered of the practice, which has universally obtained in the Latin church since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of placing the consecrated elements in *the mouth* of the receiver. The custom of putting the cup to the lips of the communicants; without delivering it into their hands, appears to have prevailed at an earlier period,—an arrangement, probably, intended merely to guard against the contingency of any consecrated wine being spilt. The chief reason of ceasing to deliver the bread into the receiver's hand, was an intention to remove the possibility of its being carried home and superstitiously employed,—an abuse which crept into the church at an early period, as we learn from Tertullian and others. (TERTULL. *De Orat.* c. 14; *ad Uxor.* ii. 5; CYPRIAN. *De Laps.* c. 7; BASIL. M.



*Ep.* 289; HIERON. *Ep.* 50; *Conc. Cæsaraugust.* A. D. 301, c. 3; *Tolet.* 1, A. D. 400, c. 14; *Tolet.* 11, A. D. 675, c. 11.) Bona supposes that the modern custom began with the introduction of the use of unleavened bread and wafers, and was designed to guard against the danger of any particle, however small, falling to the ground or being wasted. (*Rec. Liturgic.* lib. ii. cap. 17, n. 7.) Protestants, for the most part, have returned to the ancient practice in this particular; but the Lutherans conform to the more modern usage of the church of Rome.

As to the posture of the communicants, it would appear from the *direct* testimonies which are extant, that for the most part, if not always, they received the consecrated elements standing. It may be *inferred* also, with some show of probability, but not in a very satisfactory or decisive manner, that they sometimes knelt on these occasions. But there is not any trace or remote appearance in ecclesiastical history, that communicants maintained a sitting posture in the ancient church.

It was a custom in the ancient church for the people to sing certain psalms during the time of distribution.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 13), the thirty-third (our thirty-fourth) Psalm is appointed for this purpose. It was selected chiefly on account of the words, "O taste and see that the Lord is gracious," which were esteemed peculiarly appropriate to the occasion. (CYRILL. HIEROS. *Catech. Mystagog.* 5, § 17; HIERONYM. *Ep.* 28.)

The forty-fifth Psalm also was used at this part of divine worship; and Jerome seems to intimate (says Bingham) that they sung both the thirty-fourth and the forty-fifth, when he says, "they received the eucharist always with a good conscience, hearing the psalmist sing, 'O taste and see that the Lord is gracious,' and singing with him, 'My heart is inditing of a good matter, I sing of the things which I have made unto the king.' This being a psalm peculiarly setting forth the praises of Christ, and the affection of the church toward him: 'Hearken, O daughter, and consider, incline thine ear, forget also thine own people and thy father's house; so shall the king have pleasure in thy beauty, for he is thy Lord God, and worship thou him.'"

The hundred and thirty-third Psalm, beginning with

‘Behold, how good and pleasant a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity,’ was, probably, sung on this occasion. Tertulian says that Christians used to sing this psalm, “when they supped together;” and Augustin observes, that it was well known, even to persons otherwise unacquainted with the Psalter, as being in general and constant use. (TERTULL. *De Jejun.* c. 13; AUGUSTIN *Tract. in Ps.* 133.)

The Alexandrian Liturgy prescribes the forty-second psalm for use at the Lord’s supper. According to Cotelierius (*ad Const. Ap.* viii. c. 13), the hundred and thirty-ninth was appointed in the appendix to the Sacramentary of Gregory. In the liturgy of Chrysostom, it is ordered that a psalm be sung; but no particular psalm is pointed out. Chrysostom himself explains the hundred and forty-fifth psalm as peculiarly appropriate to “the spiritual table,” especially on account of verses 15—17. The forty-third psalm, still used in the Roman liturgy, with the introit taken from it (v. 4), is also of long standing in this connexion. (MICROLOGUS, c. 23.)

The hymn *Agnus Dei* is generally supposed to have been introduced into the Roman service by Pope Sergius I. (subsequently to the year 687); but the fact appears to be, that this pontiff ordered that hymn to be sung by both clergy and people (ANASTASIUS, *Vita Sergii*), whereas, before his time, it had been repeated by the clergy alone. This form of solemn invocation is found in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, which must have been composed about a century before the ordinance of Sergius. Notwithstanding the regulation of Sergius, the chanting of the *Agnus Dei* was afterwards left entirely to the choir. In the twelfth century, the threefold repetition of this form, with the response “Grant us thy peace,” had become universal. (HONORI AUGUSTODUN, *Gemma*, lib. i. c. 3; INNOCENT III. *De Missa*, lib. iii. c. 4; MABILLON, *Mus. Ital.* t. ii. p. 285; CALVOER. *Rit. Eccl.* p. i. pp. 710, 711.)

It was the ancient practice of the church not only to sing an imitative psalm before the communion, and others during the distribution of the elements, but to conclude the whole ceremony with some solemn form of praise and thanksgiving, in which the whole body of communicants joined. These were selected, for

the most part, from the Book of Psalms; but they varied in different times and places.

3. *Sign of the cross.*—The practice of marking the body with the sign of the cross at the celebration of the Lord's supper is unquestionably one of most remote antiquity in the Christian church. It has been generally supposed to be of apostolic origin. Basil the Great (*De Spir. S. ad Amphil. c. 27*) mentions the practice of Christians signing themselves with the sign of the cross as the first instance of a ceremony concerning which no written instruction had been given (i. e. in Scripture), but which was unhesitatingly regarded as founded on apostolic tradition. Chrysostom (*Demonstr. quod Christus sit Deus, c. 9*) and Augustin (*Tract. 118 in Joan.*) also allude to the practice as well known, and generally prevalent.

The first trace of the especial use of this sign at the administration of the Lord's supper is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, book viii. chap. 12. All ancient liturgies, of both the East and the West, lay great stress upon this observance; but they vary greatly in their rules respecting the number of crossings to be performed.

At the Reformation, the reformed churches on the continent abolished this practice, on account of the superstitious abuse to which it had become liable; and the same course was followed by our own church (of England), although she retained the sign of the cross in baptism. But the Lutheran church adhered to primitive usage in this particular.

4. *Use of incense.*—That the use of incense (*θυμίαμα*) was unknown in the first ages of the Christian church appears plainly from the silence of the apostolic fathers, and early writers, (including Justin Martyr, the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and Cyril of Jerusalem, who describe at large the ceremonies observed at the celebration of the eucharist,) as well as from the express declarations of early apologists on the negative side, (e. g. TERTULL. *Apologet. c. 30; De Corona Mil. c. 10; ATHENAGORAS, Legat. pro Christ. c. 13; ARNOB. adv. Gent. lib. vii. c. 26.*)

Bellarmin (*De Missa*, lib. ii. c. 19) and Bona (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. i. c. 25) endeavour to found the practice of their church in this respect upon apostolical tradition; but no certain trace of the use of incense in Christian worship can be found during the first four centuries. It appears to have been introduced about the time of Gregory the Great, when the eucharist began to be regarded as a sacrifice, and the sacrificial customs of the Jewish dispensation were supposed to be in harmony with the spirit of that sacred ordinance. After that period, it is perfectly true that (to use the words of Bona) “*Nulla est ecclesiastica cæremonia, eujus crebrior mentio fiat in antiquis et recentioribus omnium gentium liturgiis quam thuris et thymiamitis, quod sæpe inter sacrificandum adoletur,*” i. e. “*there is no ceremony of the church, of which more frequent mention is made in the liturgies, both ancient and modern, of all nations, than the frequent burning of incense during the celebration of the holy sacrifice.*” But such assertion does not apply to the practice of the church during any period anterior to that of Gregory the Great.

5. *Agapæ, or feasts of charity.*—The history of the common meals or feasts in the early church, called *agapæ* (*ἀγάπαι*, more frequently than in the singular *ἡ ἀγάπη*), is in many respects obscure. (See book vii. chap. 4.) It appears that they were not independent rites, but always connected with some act or office of public worship. When they were celebrated in connexion with the Lord’s supper, they seem to have taken place before the administration of that sacrament, in conformity with the circumstances of the original institution, which took place “*after supper,*” (1 Cor. xi. 25.) This arrangement is supposed to have led to the disorders which St. Paul so sharply reprovèd in the Corinthian church; and the inconvenience of it becoming generally manifest, it was soon made the practice of the church to celebrate the Lord’s supper first, and even to dispense with attendance at the feast which followed, although all Christians were required to contribute provisions for it, according to their ability. (See JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol.* i. c. 67; HIERONYM. *Comment. in 1 Cor.* xi.; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 27 *in 1 Cor.*)

But, even under these altered circumstances, the love-feasts were frequently attended with intemperance, and other serious disorders, which form subjects of grave complaints in the writings of the Fathers. (CLEM. ALEX. *Pad.* lib. ii. c. 1; AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 64; *contr. Faust.* lib. xx. c. 21; *Confess.* lib. vi. c. 2; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 27 *in* 1 *Cor.* xi.; GREG. NAZ. *Præcept. ad Virgin.*) This may perhaps be reckoned among the causes of the change in the time of celebrating the Lord's supper, already mentioned, from the evening to the early part of the morning. And hence it was that afterwards the holding of Agapæ within the churches was forbidden. (AUG. *Ep.* 64 *ad Aurel.*; *Conc. Laod.*, cir. A. D. 364, c. 28; *Conc. Carthag.* A. D. 397; *Conc. Aurel.* ii. c. 12; *Conc. Trullan.* c. 74.) And by this regulation the Agapæ became entirely distinct from the eucharist, which continued to be publicly celebrated in the church.

It cannot be exactly determined at what period the Agapæ were entirely abolished.

6. *Kiss of charity or peace.*—In the New Testament, we find frequent mention of “a holy kiss,” (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26,) and “a kiss of charity,” (1 Pet. v. 14,) as a token of brotherly love among the first converts to Christianity. This appears to have taken place at their assemblies for religious worship, agreeably with an observation made by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. c. 65), “after prayers we salute one another with a kiss;” and although, at a subsequent period, the practice was observed on other occasions (as at baptism, absolution, ordination), yet its most solemn and most general use was during the celebration of the Lord's supper. It was omitted on Good Friday, in remembrance of the traitorous kiss of Judas Iscariot.

This kiss was given in some churches before, and in others after, the consecration of the eucharistic elements. The following passage from the nineteenth canon of the Council of Laodicea is worthy of remark on other accounts, as well as for its prescription concerning this token of Christian charity and concord. “After the bishops' sermons (*μετὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων*), let a

prayer for the catechumens be first pronounced. When the catechumens have left the church, let the prayer for the penitents (τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ) be said. After these have received imposition of hands (προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα), and have retired, let the three prayers of the faithful (τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς τρεῖς) be offered; the first in silence (διὰ σιωπῆς), but the second and third aloud (διὰ προσφωνήσεως). Then let the kiss be given, (τὴν εἰρήνην, i. e. the kiss of peace.) When the presbyters have given this kiss to the bishop, let the laity exchange it among themselves. Hereupon let the holy sacrifice be accomplished. But it is permitted to the clergy (τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς) alone, to approach the altar, and communicate there." All this proceeds upon the system of secret instruction.

Great care was taken in the early church to prevent abuses likely to arise from this practice; but, notwithstanding the reproaches of the heathen, it was not discontinued. (ORIGEN. *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* lib. x. c. 33; TERTULL. *ad Uxor.* lib. ii. c. 4; CLEM. ALEX. *Pedag.* lib. iii. c. 11; ATHENAGORAS. *Legat.* c. 32.)

In later times, express regulations were made for the preventing of disorders in connexion with this practice. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (book viii. c. 11), it is laid down as a rule, that "the clergy should salute the bishop, and that, among the laity, the men should salute the men, and the women should salute the women;" and the observance of this distinction of the sexes was enjoined by subsequent councils.

During the eighth and ninth centuries, this practice continued to prevail in its full extent. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, it was still in existence; but before the close of that period, it appears to have ceased.

#### § 9.—LITURGY, OR FORMULARIES USED AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

HAVING thus taken a survey of the various ceremonies connected with the administration of the Lord's supper in the ancient church, or what was *done*, it is time to consider the various for-

mularies which were used throughout the service, or what was *said*, on that solemn occasion.

The model of all the liturgies, or forms of prayer, used by the ancient church at the celebration of the Lord's supper, (see book iv. chap. I, § 6.) is that contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions*; which, although it may have never been in actual use in any church, yet, as being the oldest document of the kind extant, and as being substantially the same as those which came into general use, possesses a peculiar value, and deserves attentive perusal and examination. It is found in *Apost. Const.* lib. viii. c. 12—15, under the title of “The order of James, the brother of John the son of Zebedee,” and is as follows:—

“I, James, the brother of John the son of Zebedee, ordain that immediately [at the beginning of the communion] the deacon make proclamation, saying, ‘Let none of the catechumens, none of the hearers, none of the unbelievers, none of the heterodox (*μη τις των ετεροδόξων*), be present! Ye that have made the first prayer [*την πρώτην εὐχὴν*, i. e. the general prayer, during which catechumens and strangers were allowed to be present] go forth! Ye mothers, take your children with you! Let no one have ought against another! [i. e. let no one bear hatred or malice towards another.] Let no one come in hypocrisy! Let us all stand up before the Lord with fear and trembling to offer our sacrifice!’

“This having been said, let the deacons bring the gifts (*τὰ δῶρα*) to the bishop at the altar. Let the presbyters stand on his right and left hand, as pupils by the side of their teacher. Let two deacons stand on both sides of the altar, holding a small fan (*ρίπίδιον*) made of parchment, peacock's feathers, or fine linen, and with a gentle motion drive away the flies, that none of them fall into the cups (*τὰ κύπελλα*). Let the *chief priest* [*ἀρχιερεὺς*, the same that is entitled in other parts of this liturgy *ὁ ἱεράρχης*, i. e. the consecrating minister], after that himself and the presbyters have offered a private prayer, and having put on his vestment, stand before the altar, and there made the sign of the cross (*τρόπαιον τοῦ σταυροῦ*) with his hand upon his forehead (and for all, *εἰς πάντας*). *Then let him say,*

“The grace of Almighty God, the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all.”

*And the people shall answer with one voice,*

And with thy spirit.

*The chief priest,*

Lift up your hearts!

*The whole congregation,*

We lift them up unto the Lord.

*The chief priest,*

Let us give thanks unto the Lord.

*The whole congregation,*

It is meet and right so to do.

*Then shall the chief priest say,*

It is very meet and right that we above all things should praise thee, the only true God, who wast before all creatures, from whom the whole family in heaven and earth does proceed; thee who alone art unbegotten, who art without beginning, without Lord or master, who hast need of nothing; thee, the giver of all good, who art above all cause and generation, who art always the same, from whom, as from their centre or original [*ἀφετήριη* or *ἀφετήριον*, the dock, or cradle, from which a ship is launched], all things are launched into existence. Yea, thou art knowledge, without beginning, eternal sight, unbegotten hearing, untaught wisdom, the first in nature, the law of existence, exceeding all number. Thou hast created all things out of nothing by thine only-begotten Son; whom thou didst from eternity beget by thy will, by thy power, by thy goodness, and without any intervention (*ἀμεσιπέτως*); him who is the only-begotten Son, the word that is God, the living wisdom, the first-born of every creature, the angel of thy great decree, thine high priest, the king and Lord of all things visible and invisible, who was before all things, and by whom all things consist. For thou, O eternal God, hast made all things by him; and by him thou dost vouchsafe to govern them in the order of thy providence. By him thou hast given them being, and by him dost thou give them their well-being (*τὸ εὖ εἶναι*). O God and Father of thine only-begotten Son, thou who didst



create first the cherubim and seraphim, the æons (ages) and hosts [of heaven], power and dominions, principalities and thrones, archangels, and angels, and after all these beings, by him [the Son] didst create this visible world, and all that is therein. For thou art he that hast established the heavens as an arch [*ὡς καμάραν*], and spread them out like a curtain; that hast founded the earth by nothing but thy will; that hast made the firmament, and day and night; that hast brought forth the light out of thy hidden treasures, and hast added darkness for a covering (*τούτου στολῆ*), and to give rest to the living and moving creatures in the world; that hast ordained the sun in the heaven to rule the day, and the moon to rule the night, and hast ordered the course of the stars in heaven, to the praise of thy greatness and might; that hast made water for drink and for purification, the atmosphere for breathing, for the sound of the voice, and for hearing; that hast made fire for comfort against the darkness, for the supply of our necessities, giving out light and heat; that hast divided the great sea from the earth, the one in which ships may go, and the other to be trodden by the foot; that hast filled the one with small and great animals, and hast filled the other with tame and wild beasts, hast adorned it with all kinds of herbs and plants, crowned it with flowers, and enriched it with seeds; that hast set the deep within its bounds, and surrounded it with barriers of fine sand; that sometimes liftest it up by winds to the height of mountains, and then again makest it plain; now making it to rage with a tempest, and then quieting it into a gentle calm, so that the ships pass over it with a smooth and easy voyage; thou that hast encircled the world which thou hast created by thine Anointed with rivers and streams, and moistened it with fountains of living water, and bound up the earth with mountains to make it firm. Yea, thou hast filled and adorned thy world with sweet smelling and wholesome herbs, with many and various animals, the stronger and the weaker, some for meat and some for labour, tame and wild, with hissing serpents, and singing birds of various notes; with the course of the year, with the number of months and days, and with the order of the seasons; with the flight of clouds bringing rain, for the production of fruits, and the support of animals;

with winds that blow at thy command, and with the multitude of herbs and plants.

Nor hast thou only made the world and established it, but thou hast also created man the citizen of that world, and appointed him to be its ornament and glory. For thou saidst to thine own Wisdom, "Let us make man in our image and likeness, and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air." And therefore thou didst create him with an immortal soul, and with a perishable body, the one made from nothing, the other composed of the four elements. His soul thou didst endue with the knowledge of reason, and with a power to distinguish between piety and impiety, between right and wrong. And to his body thou didst give the privilege of five senses (*τὴν πένταθλον αἴσθησιν*), and the power of locomotion.

And thou, O Almighty God, didst by Christ plant paradise in Eden towards the East, didst adorn it with various decorations, and didst introduce man into it as into a well-furnished habitation. When thou createdst him, thou gavest to him an implanted law, that he might have within himself the seeds of divine knowledge. When thou placedst him in that glorious paradise, thou gavest him permission to eat of all things, only forbidding him to taste of one kind in expectation of something better, in order that, keeping that command, he might receive immortality as the reward of his obedience. When he had transgressed that command, and through the temptation of the serpent and the advice of his wife, he had tasted of the forbidden fruit, then didst thou justly drive him out of paradise. But, of thy great goodness, thou didst not consign him to complete destruction, because he was the creature of thy hand; but, having put the creatures in subjection to him, thou didst permit him to gain subsistence, although with toil and in the sweat of his brow, whilst thou didst cause all things to grow and increase upon the earth. Only thou didst suffer him for a short time to sleep [the sleep of death], and callest him by an oath (*ὄρκω*, assurance confirmed by oath, Heb. vi. 17), to a regeneration. Thou didst loosen the bands of death, and didst promise life by a resurrection.

And not only didst thou do all this, but thou dost glorify those of his innumerable posterity who cleave to thee, and punishest those who depart from thee. Thou didst graciously accept the offering of holy Abel; but thou didst turn away with indignation from the guilty offering of Cain the fratricide. Thou didst graciously accept Seth and Enos; and didst translate Enoch from the earth. For thou art the creator of men, the author of life, the supplier of all wants, the giver of the law, the rewarder of the obedient, and the punisher of transgressors.

Thou didst bring a great flood upon the world because of the multitude of the ungodly, but didst deliver from the flood righteous Noah with eight souls in an ark, in order that they might be the end of the former generation, and the beginning of that which was to come. Thou didst kindle a tremendous fire upon the five cities of Sodom, and didst turn a fruitful land into a plain of salt because of the wickedness of its inhabitants; but didst deliver righteous Lot from the burning. Thou art he who didst deliver Abraham from the idolatry of his forefathers, didst make him the heir of the world, and didst reveal to him thine anointed [Christ]. Thou didst consecrate Melchizedek as the high-priest of thy worship. Thou didst declare thy patient servant Job as the conqueror of the serpent, the author of evil. Thou didst choose Isaac to be the son of promise. Thou didst bring Jacob, the father of twelve sons, whose descendants were to become a great multitude, with seventy-five souls down to Egypt. Thou, O Lord, didst not forget Joseph, but, for a reward of his virtue, didst make him ruler over Egypt. Thou, O Lord, didst not forget the Hebrews sorely oppressed in Egypt, remembering thy promises to their fathers, but thou didst deliver them, and punishedst the Egyptians.

But, when men had corrupted the law written in their minds, and either declared nature self-existent and independent (*αὐτόματον*), or at least gave more honour to the creature than was meet, and made it equal unto the most high God, then didst thou not abandon them wholly to their error, but, by the hands of thy holy servant Moses, to whom thou didst reveal thyself as God, thou didst give the written law, as a support to the law of

nature, didst declare the creatures to be the work of thy hands, and didst root up the errors of idolatry. Thou didst adorn Aaron and his posterity with the office of the priesthood. Thou didst punish the Hebrews when they sinned, and didst receive them again into thy favour, upon their repentance. Thou didst visit the Egyptians with ten plagues; didst divide the sea, and cause the Israelites to go through the midst of it, but drownedst the Egyptians pursuing them. Thou didst sweeten the bitter waters by a piece of wood, didst cause waters to flow forth from the hard rock, didst rain down manna from heaven, didst give quails from the air for food, and didst provide by night a pillar of fire for light, and by day a pillar of cloud for shade. By Joshua, thine appointed captain, thou didst destroy seven nations of Canaan, dividedst Jordan, driedst up the rivers of Ethan, and didst throw down the walls of Jericho without engines of war, or the hands of men.

For all these things, O Lord Almighty, we give glory and praise unto thy name. The innumerable hosts of angels adore thee, with archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, dignities, powers, hosts, and æons (ages). The cherubim adore thee, and seraphim with six wings, with twain whereof they cover their feet, and with twain their head, and with twain they fly. These, and with them a thousand thousands of archangels, and ten thousand times ten thousand angels, cry out without rest or intermission, and with all the people join their voices, saying, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts! Heaven and earth are full of his glory! Glory be to him for ever! Amen.

*After this let the chief priest say,*

For thou truly art holy and most holy, high and the most high for ever! Holy also is thine only-begotten Son, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ. He, in all things serving thee his God and Father, who did create the world, and uphold it, was not unmindful of the ruined race of man. For when, after the law of nature, after the admonitions of the (written) law, after the reproof of prophets, after the ministry and presidency (*ἐπιστασίας*) of angels, they had transgressed not only the natural but the positive law, and had forgotten the flood, the fire (of Sodom), the plagues of Egypt, and the overthrow of the Canaanites, and

were now ready to perish, then did it come to pass according to thy will, that the creator of mankind himself became man. The giver of the law was made under the law; the high priest became the sacrifice; the shepherd was made a sheep. He appeased thee, his God and Father, reconciled the world, and delivered all men from impending wrath. He was born of a virgin and came in the flesh, He, the word of God, the beloved Son, the first born of all creatures. According to the prophecies which he had given of himself, he came of the posterity of David and of Abraham, and he was born of the house of Judah, and from the virgin's womb, he who is the former of all things that are made. He who is without body, became incarnate. He who was begotten from all eternity (*ἀχρόνως*) was born in time. He lived a holy life, and taught according to the law. He removed all kinds of sickness and infirmity from men. He wrought signs and wonders among the people. He partook of meat, drink, and sleep, He, who gives nourishment to all that need it, and fills all things living with plenteousness<sup>34</sup>. He made known Thy name to those who knew it not; he put ignorance to flight, and revived the fear of God; He fulfilled Thy will; He finished the work which Thou gavest him to do. And after he had accomplished all this, he fell into the hands of wicked men, the counterfeit and false priests and high-priests of a sinful people, by the treachery of an ungodly man. Of them he suffered, by thy permission, pain and scorn. He was delivered to Pilate the governor; the Judge himself was judged; the Saviour was condemned; he who is impassible was nailed to the cross; he who is by nature immortal, died; the author of life was laid in the grave, that he might deliver from sufferings and death those for whose sake he had come into the world, that he might break the bonds of the devil, and deliver men from his delusions. On the third day he rose again from the dead; he remained forty days with his disciples; he was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on thy right hand, his God and Father.

We, therefore, in commemoration of the things which he suffered for our sakes, present our thanksgivings unto thee, O Almighty God, not as we ought, but as well as we are able,

<sup>34</sup> Here appears to be a slight allusion to the doctrines of the Docetæ.

according to his institution. For, in the same night in which he was betrayed, he with his pure and undefiled hands took bread, and looking up to thee, his God and Father, he brake it and gave it to his disciples, saying, This is the mystery (*μυστήριον*, sacred act) of the New Testament; take of it, and eat; this is my body which is broken (*θρυπτόμενον*) for many for the remission of sins. Likewise, he mingled wine and water in the cup (*τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*), and sanctified it, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; this is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth my death till I come.

We therefore, in remembrance of his sufferings and death, of his resurrection from the dead, of his return to heaven (*εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου*), and of his second appearing hereafter, when he will come with glory and power, to judge the living and the dead, and to reward every man according to his works, do now, according to his institution, present unto thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup, and do give thanks unto thee for that thou hast thought us worthy to stand before thee and minister as priests, beseeching thee that thou, the self-sufficient God, wouldst look down favourably upon these gifts (*δῶρα*) which lie before thee, and that, for the honour of thine Anointed, thou wouldst graciously accept them, and that thou wouldst send down upon this sacrifice (*θυσίαν*) thy Holy Spirit, who is the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may manifest (*ἀποφάνη*; Latin version, *ut exhibeat*) this bread as the body of thine Anointed, and this cup as the blood of thine Anointed, and that all who partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his impostures, may be filled with the Holy Spirit, may be made worthy of thine Anointed, and may be partakers of eternal life, Thou, O almighty Lord, being reconciled to them.

And we also beseech thee, O Lord, for thy holy church from one end of the earth unto the other, which thou hast purchased to thyself by the precious blood of thine Anointed, that thou wouldst preserve it unmoved and unshaken even unto the end of

the world. We pray thee also for the whole order of bishops (*πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς*), who rightly propagate the word of truth. We pray for me thine unworthy servant who am now offering to thee (*ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς τοῦ προσφέροντος σοι οὐδενίας*), for all the presbytery, for the deacons and all the clergy, that thou wouldst endue them with wisdom, and fill them with the Holy Spirit. We pray also, O Lord, for the emperor and all that are in authority, and for the whole army, that our affairs may remain in peace, and so we may pass our whole life in quietness and concord, and praise thee through Jesus Christ, who is our hope.

And we bring unto Thee our offering for all saints, who have been acceptable to thee from the beginning of the world, for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all those whose names thou knowest. And we present unto Thee our offering for this people, that Thou wouldst make them, to the glory of thine anointed, a royal priesthood, a holy nation; for those who live in virginity and chastity, for the widows (servants) of the church; for those who live in lawful wedlock, and have children; and for the children of thy people; that none amongst us may be a cast away.

And we call upon Thee for this city and its inhabitants, for those that are in sickness, or in hard bondage; for all who are banished or proscribed; for all that travel by land or water; beseeching Thee, the helper and succour of all, to be their defender and keeper (*ἐπίκουρος*).

And we pray Thee for all those who hate us and persecute us for thy name's sake; for those who are without and are in error, that Thou wouldst convert them to good, and mitigate their fury.

And we pray Thee for the catechumens of the church, and for those who are possessed by the enemy [*i. e.* the Devil], and for the penitents among our brethren, that thou wouldst perfect them in faith, deliver and purify them from the power of the evil one, and accept their repentance, granting forgiveness unto them as well as unto ourself.

And we also present unto Thee our offering for the good temperature of the air, and the increase of the fruits of the earth,

that we, continually enjoying thy good gifts, may without ceasing praise Thee, who givest food to all flesh.

And lastly, we pray Thee on behalf of all those who, from any good cause, are now absent, that thou wouldst preserve us in all godliness, and wouldst bring us all, without change, without blame, and without defect, unto the kingdom of thine Anointed, the God of all things visible and invisible, our King.

For to Thee belongs all glory and honour, thanksgiving, praise and adoration, to Thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, throughout all ages, world without end.

*And all the people shall answer, Amen.*

*Then let the bishop say,*

The peace of God be with you all !

*And let all the people answer,*

And with thy spirit !

*Then let the deacon say with a loud voice as follows :—*

C. 13. A BIDDING PRAYER (*προσφώνησις*) FOR THE FAITHFUL AFTER THE DIVINE OBLATION.

Let us pray yet again and again to God and his Anointed for this gift which is offered to the Lord our God, that the good God would vouchsafe, by the mediation of his Anointed, to accept it upon his heavenly altar as a sweet-smelling savour.

Pray we for this church and for the people, for all bishops and presbyters, for all deacons and ministers of Christ, and for all that belongs to the fulness of the church, that the Lord may keep and preserve them all.

Pray we for the emperor and for all that are in authority, that our affairs may remain in peace, and that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life in all godliness and honesty.

Remember we also the holy martyrs, that we may be thought worthy to be partakers of their conflict.

Pray we also for those that rest in faith, pray we for the good temperature of the air, and for the increase of the fruits of the earth.

Pray we for the newly baptized (*νεοφωτιστων*, lit. newly illuminated), that they may be confirmed in faith, and may exhort one another to the same.



Quicken us, O God, by thy grace ! And so let us commend ourselves to God by the mediation of his Anointed.

*And the bishop shall pray, saying,—*

O great God, great is thy name, great in counsel, and mighty in operation, O God and Father of thy holy Son Jesus our Saviour, look upon us and this thy flock which thou hast chosen through him, to the glory of thy name. Sanctify us in body and in soul ; and grant that we may all continue pure, and free from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, that we may obtain those good things which are prepared for us, and that not one amongst us may be judged unworthy. Be thou our help, O thou helper and protector, through thine Anointed. With whom be unto Thee all honour, praise, glory, and thanksgiving, to Thee and to the Holy Ghost, for ever. Amen.

*After all the people have said Amen, let the deacon say,—*

Let us give attention !

*Then the bishop, speaking to the people, shall say,—*

Holy things for those that are holy.

*(Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.)*

*And the people shall answer,—*

There is one Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father ! Blessed be he for ever. Amen ! Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace, good-will towards men. Hosannah to the Son of David ! Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the God and Lord that has manifested himself unto us ! Hosannah in the highest !

*Hereupon let the bishop receive (μεταλαμβάνετω) the eucharist ; and after him the presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, ascetics, [i. e., such lay persons as had taken upon them the vow of a strictly religious life ;] of the women, the deaconesses, virgins and widows ; afterwards the children ; and then all the people, in order, with modesty and reverence, and without noise. Let the bishop administer the consecrated bread (τὴν προσφορὰν, the offering) with these words, “The body of Christ.” And let the receiver say, “Amen.” Let the deacon hold the cup, and say, while he administers it, “The blood of Christ ; the cup of life.” And let the person who drinks answer, Amen.*

*While all are receiving the eucharist, let the thirty-third Psalm*

[i. e., our thirty-fourth] *be recited*, (λεγέσθω.) *When all and every one have received, let the deacons carry the remnants into the pastophoria. The psalm being ended, let the (officiating) deacon say as follows:—*

Now that we have received the precious body and the precious blood of Christ, let us give thanks unto him who has judged us worthy to be partakers of these holy mysteries; and let us pray that this may be not for our condemnation, but for our salvation; for the good of our souls and bodies; for establishment in godliness, for the forgiveness of sins, and for eternal life. Let us stand up, and commend ourselves to the grace of God and his Anointed.

*And the bishop shall conclude the thanksgiving with the following words:—*

#### C. 14. PRAYER AFTER RECEIVING.

O Lord, Almighty God, the Father of Christ, thy glorious Son, who dost hear all them that call upon thee aright, and understandest even the prayers of the silent, we thank thee that thou hast permitted us to be partakers of thine holy mysteries, by which thou hast wrought in us the perfection of our right knowledge, for our confirmation in godliness and the forgiveness of our sins. For we have called upon the name of thine Anointed, and have been made the members of thine own family (σοι προσφκειώμεθα). And as thou hast separated us from the fellowship of the ungodly, so do thou unite us with those who are holy unto thee. Confirm us in the truth by the coming (ἐπιφοιτήσει) of the Holy Ghost; teach us that which we know not, fill up that which is lacking, confirm us in that which we have learnt. Protect the priests that they may be unblameable in thy service; keep all kings in peace, all governors in righteousness; let the air be healthy, and the fruits of the earth flourish; and keep the whole world by thine overruling providence. Pacify the contentious; bring back the wandering; sanctify thy people; keep virgins in their virginity, the married in faith (or in fidelity), and support the chaste; grant that the children may grow and thrive; confirm the newly baptized; instruct the catechumens, and make them worthy of admission to the church, (μνήσεως;) and gather us all into thine heavenly

kingdom, in Christ Jesus our Lord, with whom be all honour, praise, and glory unto thee and the Holy Ghost for ever. Amen.

*Then shall the deacon say,*

Fall upon your knees before God and his Anointed, and receive the blessing.

*And the bishop shall pronounce the following benediction :—*

O almighty, faithful, and incomparable God, thou who art everywhere, and art present with all, yet contained by none (*ἐν οὐδενὶ ὡς ἐνόντι ὑπάρχων*), thou who art bounded by no space, defined by no word (*λόγοις μὴ παραγόμενος*; Lat. *verbis non seduceris*), unbegotten, all-sufficient, far removed from all that is transitory, incapable of change, unchangeable by nature; thou who dost dwell in light which no man can approach unto, and according to thy nature art invisible, and yet art known by all rational beings who willingly seek thee, and mayest be found by them; O God of Israel, of the people truly enlightened, that believe in Christ, graciously vouchsafe to hear me for thy name's sake. Bless those who here bow their heads before thee; fulfil the wishes of their hearts so far as may be expedient for them, and let none of them be shut out of thy heavenly kingdom. Sanctify, keep, protect, preserve them; deliver them from the adversary and from every enemy; defend their houses, and preserve them in their going in and their coming out. To thee do we ascribe, as most due, all honour, praise, glory, worship, and adoration; to thee, and thine Anointed and Son, Jesus, our Lord, God, and King; and to the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, world without end. Amen.

*Then let the deacon say,*

Depart in peace.

This service is the model upon which all the ancient sacramental services were formed. The more immediate pattern of the services in the Western church is the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, itself founded upon this. See APPENDIX C.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## OF PENANCE, CONFESSION, AND ABSOLUTION.

## § 1.—PUBLIC PENANCE.

By public penance we are to understand, according to the phraseology of early ecclesiastical writers<sup>1</sup>, a mode of discipline by which the church restored or re-admitted, under certain conditions, those of her members who had been rejected as unworthy of her communion, and who were desirous of being reconciled and again united to the body. As, at the first institution of Christianity, it was required of all Jews and heathens, who would become Christians, to renounce their former errors, prejudices, and vices (which preparatory change is called in the New Testament *μετάνοια*); so it was afterwards demanded, that Christians who had acted in any manner inconsistent with their baptismal profession and covenant, and were desirous of being restored to their former condition or position in the church, should submit to the imposition of certain penalties, or to a certain course of discipline, called altogether *Pœnitentia*. In establishing this discipline, the church had respect to the benefit of the parties who were subject to it, desiring by this means not to wound, but to heal, not simply to punish, but to correct. The institution of penance may therefore be regarded as one of the most important portions of ecclesiastical discipline.

It may be proper to introduce a consideration of this subject with the following general remarks.

I. Penance related only to actual members of the church, *i. e.*, to such as had received baptism and the Lord's supper. No Jew or heathen could do penance; nor were even catechumens admitted to penance, because they were not regarded, in strictness, as members of the church.

<sup>1</sup> Quod autem dicitur Petrum egisse pœnitentiam, cavendum est, ne ita putetur egisse, quomodo agunt in ecclesia, qui proprie pœnitentes vocantur. AUGUST. *Ep.* 108.—Quosdam a societate removemus altaris, ut pœnitendo

placare possint, quem peccando contempserunt, seque ipsos puniendo. Nam nihil aliud agit, quem veraciter pœnitet, nisi ut id, quod mali fecerit, impunitum esse non sinat. *Id. Ep.* 153 (*al.* 54).

2. Penance was not a temporal, but purely spiritual, penalty. It had to do only with the ecclesiastical relations, and not at all with the civil capacity, of the persons on whom it was imposed.

3. No one was compelled to do penance; indeed, so far from being commanded or arbitrarily imposed, penance was something to be sought as a favour. And this, perhaps, may be considered as constituting the leading difference between this kind of punishment and every other.

4. Usually, in the ancient church, no one was permitted to do penance more than once. Repetitions of penance did sometimes occur, but they were exceptions to the general rule.

5. The mode and duration of penance were regulated according to the nature and degree of the crime of which the offender had been guilty. In this respect, many exceptions to general rules were made according to circumstances.

6. In many cases, the performance of penance was extended to the whole term of the penitent's life. But this sentence was subject to many mitigations.

7. The penitents were divided into several classes; which, though differing according to time and place, were carefully distinguished by the early church.

8. The performance of penance restored an offender to the communion of the church. But this restoration was not complete and full, at least in respect of the clergy; that is to say, the received penitent was not regarded as equal, in all circumstances, to members who had never offended.

9. The severity of this institution sometimes became excessive, and injurious, in many respects, to the true interests of the church; but, on the whole, it was productive of vast and overwhelming advantages. The exercise of penance, during times of persecution and apostacy, was especially laudable and useful.

In order to examine this subject closely, we must give a separate consideration to the following points.

I. The origin and antiquity of penance.

II. Its objects; or, the offences for which it was imposed.

III. The different classes of penitents.

IV. The duties of penitents, and penalties imposed on them; or, the different kinds and degrees of penance.

V. The restoration or re-admission of penitents into the church.

I. *The Origin and Antiquity of Penance.*—Penance, in the Christian church, may be regarded as an imitation, or rather a continuation, of an institution belonging to the Jewish synagogue. It was, in fact, an appendage of the practice of excommunication, or the system of excluding offenders from religious privileges, which descended from the synagogue to the Christian church. The chief difference between Jewish and Christian excommunication consisted in the circumstance that the former extended in its consequences to the affairs of civil life, whereas the latter was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations. Neither the spirit of early ecclesiastical regulations, nor the situation and constitution of the church during the first three centuries, admitted of any intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties.

Excommunication, in the Christian church, consisted at first simply in the exclusion of the offender from the Lord's supper and the agapæ or love-feasts; and hence the word excommunication, *i. e.*, separation from *communion*. This practice was founded upon the words of the apostle, 1 Cor. v. 11, τῶ τοιοῦτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, *with such an one no not to eat*; a passage which does not refer to common meals and the ordinary intercourse of life, but to the religious agapæ or other solemnities, as appears from the context, and from a comparison with 1 Cor. x. 16—18; xi. 20—34.

In the Old Testament, we read not only of penitence or repentance as a certain disposition of mind and heart (namely, a sorrow for past sin, with purpose of amendment), but also of practices, which may be regarded, in a certain sense, as acts of penance, or which were at least designed as outward expressions of inward compunction, such as fasting, mourning, and the like (*c. g.*, Nehem. ix.; Jonah iii). But we do not read of penance in the ecclesiastical acceptance of the term.

The New Testament, however, besides making several allusions to the practice, furnishes one clear example of excommunication and penance, in the case of an offending member of the church of Corinth, who was excluded from the church, and afterwards re-admitted, upon the authority of St. Paul. (1 Cor. v. 1—8; 2 Cor. ii. 5—11.) This offender was formally expelled by the assembled church, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; and by this sentence he was removed from the church of Christ, into which he had been admitted by baptism, and reduced to his former condition as a heathen, or a subject of the kingdom of Satan and evil spirits; which is, perhaps, the full meaning of the expression, *παράδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*, (v. 5,) “to deliver to Satan.” The same act of excommunication is described briefly in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, “If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maran-atha;” where “anathema” corresponds to the Hebrew *אֲנָתָהּ*, which, in the Old Testament, denotes something devoted or given up to God; and maran-atha (*מָרְנָהּ אָתָּה*, a Syro-Chaldaic phrase,) means “The Lord cometh;” so that the whole sentence denotes that the church gives up the offender, and leaves him entirely to the judgment of the Lord, without, however, pronouncing any special curse or imprecation upon him. All that the apostle demands of the Corinthians respecting the offender is, that they should exclude him from their society,—that he should cease to be regarded as a member of the church (v. 2, 13); he does not pretend to pronounce any further judgment upon him, but expressly refers to the judgment of God. “For what have I to do,” says he, (v. 12,) “to judge them also that are without? (*i. e.*, those who are not Christians, to which class the ejected member of the Corinthian church would belong;) do not ye judge them that are within? (*i. e.*, the full members of the church.) But them that are without, God judgeth;” (*κρίνει*; or rather, God *will judge*, *κρινεῖ*, another reading, which Griesbach describes as “undoubtedly genuine.”) It appears from 2 Cor. ii. 1—11, that the Corinthians, although they had not restored the offender to his church-privileges when the apostle wrote, were yet willing to extend this favour to him; and the apostle very gladly gave his sanction to the measure.

Concerning these important passages, we may make the

following general remarks. First, The apostle entrusts the Corinthian church with the act of excluding the offender. Secondly, He calls this exclusion “a punishment” (ἐπιτιμία); but he distinguishes it equally from a civil penalty, and from a punishment inflicted by the judgment of God; regarding the whole transaction as an ecclesiastical act, immediately intended for the security of the church. Thirdly, No mention is made of any act or course of penance performed by the excommunicated person previously to his re-admission into the church; but the silence of the apostle on this subject is no proof that no outward penance was performed; and it is to be particularly noticed, that St. Paul did not consent to his restoration until he had given indication of his sorrow for the sin committed (λύπη), to which he probably refers in a subsequent part of the epistle, (vii. 10,) when he says, “Godly sorrow (ἡ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη) worketh repentance (μετάνοιαν) to salvation, not to be repented of.”

Early ecclesiastical writers furnish us with ample accounts of the rules and customs of the church with regard to excommunication and penance; and perhaps there is more information to be obtained with respect to this branch of the history of the primitive church than concerning any other. The apostolic fathers treat frequently of this subject; and speak of penitence, not merely as a disposition of the mind and a religious duty, but as a part of ecclesiastical discipline. Tertullian says expressly, that it ought not to exist only in the conscience, but to be accompanied by an external act<sup>2</sup>. The *Shepherd of Hermas* treats expressly of penitence in many places; and although there is every reason to ascribe this work, not to Hermas who is mentioned by St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 14), nor to any author of the apostolic age, but to some writer of the second century, yet, on account of the great reputation which it acquired, and the degree of authority which was attached to it in early times<sup>3</sup>, it is entitled to some measure of attention and respect. In this book, mention is made of an angel of penitence; that is, an

<sup>2</sup> Pœnitentia secunda . . . ut non sola conscientia proferatur, sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. TERTULL. *de Pœnitent.* c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> It was publicly read in the Christian assemblies, and Tertullian calls it “fere scriptura.”



angel appointed to lead fallen Christians to repentance, and to strengthen and support them in the exercise. This angel is represented as teaching Hermas that although baptism is the proper and true penitence, yet room for repentance is still allowed to those who, after baptism, may have fallen into sin through the force of Satan's temptations; but this only *once*. It is also declared that bold and presumptuous sinners will not be restored by the grace of penitence (*non est per pœnitentiam regressus ad vitam*); and that God grants this grace only to those whose conversion he has foreseen<sup>4</sup>.

From the writings of Tertullian (including an entire treatise *De Pœnitentia*), we may infer the existence of a complete system of excommunication and penance. In some of this author's writings, composed probably before his adoption of Montanist opinions<sup>5</sup>, he speaks of the grace of penitence (*pœnitentia secunda*, the first having taken place at baptism), as accorded to offenders after baptism, of all kinds, but only once<sup>6</sup>; whereas in

<sup>4</sup> Quorum viderat Dominus puras mentes futuras, et servituros ei ex totis præcordiis, illis tribuit pœnitentiam: at quorum aspexit dolum et nequitas, et animadvertit ad se fallaciter reversuros, negavit iis ad pœnitentiam regressum, ne rursus legem ejus nefandis maledicerent verbis. *HERM. Past. p. 3, simil. 6.*

<sup>5</sup> Or if, as some suppose, these works were written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist, we must consider this as one of those points on which he was known to differ from the majority of that sect.

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes, et censura divina. Nam et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu, summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis et conventus, et omnis sancti commercii, relegetur. *TERTULL. Apologet. c. 39.*—Hæc igitur venena ejus providentia Deus, clausa licet ignoscen-  
tiæ janua, et intinctionisstru obstructa, aliquid adhuc permisit patere. Collo-

cavit in vestibulo *pœnitentiam secundam*, quæ pulsantibus patefaciat: sed jam *semel*, quia jam secundo. Sed amplius nunquam, quia proxime frustra. Non enim et hoc semel satis est? *De Pœnit. c. 7.*—Hujus igitur Pœnitentiæ secundæ et unius, quanto in arto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio, ut non sola conscientia proferatur, sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. Is aetus, qui magis vocabulo Græco exprimitur et frequentatur, *exomologesis* (*ἐξομολόγησις*) est, qua delictum Domino nostrum confitemur: non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione pœnitentia nascitur, pœnitentia Deus mitigatur. Itaque *exomologesis* proster-  
nandi et humiliandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiæ illicem; de ipso quoque habitu atque vietu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obsecurare, animum mœroribus dejicere, illa, quæ peccavit, tristi tractatione mutare. Ceterum pastum et potum pura nosse, non ventris scilicet, sed

his treatise, *De Pudicitia*, (especially c. 2—6,) he excludes “mœchos et fornicatores” from this benefit absolutely and altogether.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, defended the more moderate opinions of Tertullian against the Novatians, who contended that the lapsed ought not to partake of the benefit of “pœnitentia secunda,” and to be readmitted into the church. He discusses this subject in his treatise *De Lapsis*, and *De bono patientie*; and in several of his epistles, especially *Ep.* 10, 13, 25, 46, 48, 54<sup>7</sup>.

The discipline of penance existed at an early period in the Eastern churches, as well as in those of the West and Africa. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromat.* lib. ii. c. 13) says, with reference to the *Shepherd of Hermas*, that penitence, properly so called, can take place only once after baptism, and that any subsequent manifestations of repentance (συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπάλληλοι ἐπι τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι μετάνοιαι) do not deserve that name<sup>8</sup>. And Origen appears to have taught the same doctrine<sup>9</sup>.

animæ causa. Plerumque vero juvenis preces alere, ingemiscere, lacrymari et mugire dies noctesque ad Dominum Deum tuum, presbyteris ad-  
volvi, et aris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere. Hæc omnia exomologesis, ut pœnitentiam commendat, ut de periculi timore Dominum honoret, ut in peccatorem ipsa pronuntians pro Dei indignatione fungatur, et temporali afflictione æterna supplicia, non dicam, frustetur, sed expungat. *Ibid.* c. 9.

<sup>7</sup> Ne igitur ore nostro, quo pacem negamus, quo duritiam magis humane credulitatis, quam divinæ et paternæ pietatis opponimus, oves nobis commissæ a Domino reposeantur: placuit nobis, Sancto Spiritu suggerente, et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admonente, quia hostis imminere prænuntiatur et ostenditur, colligere intra castra milites Christi, examinatis singulorum causis, pacem lapsis dare, imo pugnaturis arma suggerere; quod

credimus vobis quoque paternæ misericordiæ contemplatione placitum. Quod si de collegis aliquis exstiterit, qui urgente certamine pacem fratribus et sororibus non putat dandum, reddet ille rationem in die judicii Domino, vel importunæ censurae, vel inhumane duritiæ suæ. CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 54 ad Cornelium, de pace Lapsis danda.

<sup>8</sup> He adds, Δόκησις τοίνυν μετάνοίας, οὐ μετάνοια, τὸ πολλάκις αἰτεῖσθαι συγγνώμην, ἐφ' οἷς πλημμελοῦμεν πολλάκις.

<sup>9</sup> Dupin (*Nov. Biblioth.* t. i. p. 216) describes the views of Origen on this subject in the following terms,—Ex ecclesia pellebantur ii, qui post baptismum crimina publica perpetrabant, et in suis contra Celsum libris observat, homines esse prepositos, qui fidelium moribus prospicerent. Semel tantum, idque raro, pœnitentia concedebatur. Excommunicatio maxima erat pena ecclesiastica; non tamen dubitabant, quin injuste excommunicati servari possent.

Among the most certain indications of the early existence of a regular penitential discipline in the church, we may reckon the prayer for the penitents contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 8, 9). These testimonies, together with the decrees of several councils held at the beginning of the fourth century, clearly prove the universal prevalence of such a system as early as the second and third centuries.

II. *Of the objects of Penance, or the offences with which it was concerned.*—As public penance was prescribed only to persons who had been excommunicated, and as its immediate end was, not the forgiveness of the offender by Almighty God, but his reconciliation with the church, and restoration to spiritual privileges in its communion, it is evident that the system could be applied to no other than open and scandalous offences. It was an old maxim, *De occultis non judicat ecclesia*, *The church does not take cognizance of things done in secret*; and ancient writers say expressly that the church pardons only wrongs committed against herself, as such,—but refers the forgiveness of all sins to God<sup>10</sup>. It was reserved for later times to overlook this important distinction, and to claim for the church, in any sense, the power of forgiving sins.

In accordance with this representation of penance, as it existed in the early church, are the synonymous expressions, *disciplina, orandi disciplina, patientiæ disciplina, deifica disci-*

<sup>10</sup> Quapropter Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere jussimus. Ceteros cum ingenti populi suffragio recepimus. Omnia autem remisimus Deo omnipotenti, in cujus potestate sunt omnia reservata. CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 46.—Nos, in quantum nobis et videre et judicare conceditur, faciem singulorum videmus, cor scrutari et mentem perspicere non possumus. De his judicat occultorum scrutator et cognitor cito venturus, et de arcanis cordis atque abditis judicaturus. Obesse autem mali bonis non debent, sed magis mali a bonis adjuvari. *Id. Ep.* 55.—Qua ex

causa necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores et præpositi in unum conveniamus ad disponenda ea, que curæ nostræ commissa sunt, ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur, lapsis quoque fratribus, et post lavaerum salutare a Diabolo vulneratis per penitentiam medela quaeratur: non quasi a nobis remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Domino plenius satisfacere cogantur. FIRMIAN. *Ep. ad Cyprian., Ep. Cyp.* 75.

plina, and the like, which frequently occur in the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian. The term *satisfactio* and *satisfacere* also were used in the same sense, being applied to the demand made by the church, or the conditions it imposed, in order to a restoration to the body. Hence also the favourite expression, "*pœnitentia canonica*," *i. e.*, the exercises demanded by the rules of councils and bishops, called *canones pœnitentiales*.

The re-admission of the lapsed, (*lapsi*, *i. e.*, persons who, after having professed Christianity, had abjured their faith,) was a memorable subject of controversy in the early church.

About the middle of the third century, the case of the lapsed excited great attention, especially in the churches of Carthage and Rome. A knowledge of the transactions which occurred in connexion with this affair is highly important in order to an acquaintance with ecclesiastical antiquity; and I therefore insert here a brief narrative of those transactions, from the pen of the late Dr. Burton. "At the end of 249, or early in 250, Decius issued an edict by which the Christians were to be compelled to sacrifice to the gods. . . . The see of Carthage was now filled by Cyprian, who had succeeded Donatus in 248 or 249. His election had been opposed by Novatus and four other presbyters, whose factious conduct was productive of much evil, not only to the bishop, but to the church at large. As soon as the imperial edict arrived at Carthage, Cyprian was obliged to fly for his life, and was separated from his flock for about sixteen months. . . . He might have returned sooner to Carthage, if Novatus and his followers had not continued to set themselves against him. The persecution had caused several Christians to pay an outward obedience to the edict of Decius, by assisting at a sacrifice. Others, who had not actually sacrificed, had allowed their names to be added to the list of those who had done so, and received a certificate from the magistrate, which saved them from further molestation. The number of persons who had lapsed, as it was termed, or who had received this certificate, was far greater than on any former occasion; and considerable difficulty was felt as to re-admitting them into the church. It had been the custom for such persons to go through a prescribed form of penitence; after which the bishop and

clergy laid their hands upon them, and they were restored to communion. It was also the privilege of confessors, that is, of persons who had suffered torture, or received sentence of death, to give to any of the lapsed a written paper, termed a letter of peace, and the bearer was entitled to a remission of some part of the ecclesiastical discipline.

“The absence of the bishop caused a difficulty in the admission of these penitents, and many of them were in great distress lest they should die under the sentence of excommunication. Novatus and his party were for acting without the bishop. They admitted several of the lapsed to communion; and even some confessors so far seconded them as to make a very indiscriminate use of their letters of peace. News of all this irregularity was conveyed to Cyprian, which added much to his troubles and anxiety; but the letters which he wrote to his clergy conveyed the charitable direction, that if any person had received a paper from a confessor, and was in danger of dying, he might be admitted to communion without delay. . . .

“The unanimity of different churches upon this point was very remarkable, as well as the pains which they took to communicate with each other at this trying time. The Christians of Rome and Carthage kept up a frequent intercourse, and acted in perfect concert. Though the Romans were still without a bishop, the decision of Cyprian met with the approbation of the Roman clergy, who held a meeting among themselves, and agreed to admit the lapsed to communion, if they were on the point of death.

“The majority of Cyprian’s clergy acted according to his instructions. . . . But Novatus still continued his irregular proceedings with the lapsed; and a little before Easter an open schism was formed against the bishop’s authority. . . . As soon as Easter was passed, Cyprian was able to return; and his first act was to publish a treatise concerning the case of the lapsed, and then to convene a council of several bishops and clergy. They decided that those who had actually sacrificed, should submit for a time to a prescribed course of discipline; but that those who had only accepted the certificate, if they were

truly penitent, should at once be restored to communion. The authors of the late schism were excommunicated.

“ While this council was sitting at Carthage, news was brought of Cornelius being elected to the bishopric of Rome. The absence of Decius, who had marched to check an invasion of the Goths, enabled the clergy to take this step; but the spirit of insubordination unfortunately spread from Carthage to Rome. Novatus had gone to the latter city; and found there a man who was in every way ready to copy his schismatical proceedings. This was a presbyter, named Novatian, who was charged with having denied his faith, and had been put out of communion by the clergy while the see was vacant. . . . He began by opposing the election of Cornelius, and setting himself up as a rival bishop; having persuaded three other bishops, who were simple, uneducated men, to come from a remote part of Italy, and assist in his consecration. . . . It was very desirable that the schism should not spread; and Cornelius, as well as his clergy, were anxious that his election should be made known at Carthage. Cyprian also took pains to inquire into the case, and soon convinced himself that Cornelius was the lawful bishop. The next step of the bishop of Rome was to assemble a council, which was attended by sixty bishops, and a great number of presbyters. The proceedings of Novatian were condemned, and the decision of the council of Carthage concerning the lapsed was adopted, with the additional provision that bishops or clergymen, if they had lapsed, should only be re-admitted to communion as laymen, and should no longer exercise their spiritual functions. Copies of this decision were sent to distant churches; and Cyprian showed the same wish to produce uniformity by announcing the election of Cornelius to all the African churches, and by publishing a treatise on the unity of the church.

“ It was necessary that the heads of the church should act in concert with respect to the lapsed, since a spirit was displaying itself in several places of treating these unfortunate persons with the utmost severity. The Montanists had held the most unforgiving doctrines with respect to the heavier offences; and there

were many who maintained that the church had no power to forgive its members who had lapsed. Novatian embraced this principle in all its rigour; in which he seems to have been actuated merely by the love of opposing Cornelius; for Novatus, whose example he had followed in beginning his schism, went into the opposite extreme of over-indulgence, merely because Cyprian recommended caution in re-admitting the lapsed. From this time, Novatianism became the name of a distinct and numerous party in the church. All the more flagrant sins, as well as that of lapsing in the time of persecution, were held by this party to admit of no forgiveness: no repentance on the part of the offender, nor any course of discipline imposed by the church, could entitle him to be re-admitted to communion." (BURTON, *History of the Christian Church to the Conversion of Constantine*, chap. 15.)

The lapsed were divided into several classes, and it was generally allowed that they should be treated with different degrees of severity, according to the nature of their offences. They were divided into *libellatici*, i. e., those who had received from a heathen magistrate a written certificate, as a warrant for their security (*libellum securitatis* or *pacis*), either testifying that they were not Christians, or containing a dispensation from the necessity of sacrificing to the gods in confirmation of their adherence to heathenism<sup>11</sup>: *sacrificati*, i. e., Christians who had offered sacrifice to the heathen gods, in testimony of their renunciation of the faith: and *traditores* (so called first during the persecution under Diocletian), i. e., those who had delivered up into the hands of the heathen either their copies of the sacred writings, the baptismal registers, or any other property of the church<sup>12</sup>. These persons were regarded as offenders in different

<sup>11</sup> Cum ergo inter ipsos, qui sacrificaverunt, multa sit diversitas, quæ inclementia est, et quam acerba duritia, libellaticos cum iis qui sacrificaverunt jungere? Quando is, cui libellus acceptus est, dicat, ego prius legeram et episcopo tractante cognoveram non sacrificandum idolis, nec simulacra servum Dei adorare debere; et ideo, ne hoc facerem, quod non licebat, cum

occasio libelli fuisset oblata, quem nec ipsum acciperem, nisi ostensa fuisset occasio, ad magistratum vel veni, vel alio eunte mandavi, Christianum me esse, sacrificare mihi non licere, ad aras diaboli me venire non posse, dare me ob hoc præmium, ne quod non licet faciam, &c. CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 52.

<sup>12</sup> Post Cypriani mortem XL et quod excurrit annis peractis traditio codi-

degrees; and the circumstance of their having acted by compulsion or voluntarily, was likewise taken into account. Sometimes those who had been guilty of adultery or murder were reckoned among the lapsed.

III. *Different classes of Penitents.*—The writings of Tertulian and Cyprian present no trace of a division of penitents into several classes; and hence it may perhaps be not too much to infer, that no such classification existed in their time, it being hardly probable that writers who treat so copiously of penitence, would have omitted to notice such an arrangement, if it had really existed in the church.

The earliest writer who makes any mention of classes of penitents is Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocæsarea from A.D. 244 to A.D. 270. The *Epistola Canonica*, ascribed to this author, has however been supposed to be spurious, or at least interpolated; and, although the propriety of this criticism has been disputed, we can hardly venture to appeal to the doubtful document as a sufficient authority. But, while it is possible that the mention of four degrees of penitents in the last canon of Gregory may have proceeded from a later hand, it is certain that such a classification was not only recognised, but alluded to as something established and well known, as early as the fourth century. (*Concil. Ancyran.* A.D. 314, can. 4—6, 9; *Conc. Nicæn.* A.D. 325, can. 11—14; *Conc. Laodic.* c. 2, 19, 34, 35.) And in the Epistle of Basil the Great “ad Amphilochem,” which contains other references to the work of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the four degrees of penitents are named in exact accordance with the passage ascribed to Gregory. On the whole, we may suppose this classification to have been introduced, at the latest, during the latter part of the third century, or at the beginning of the fourth.

These four classes or degrees (stationes) of penitents were the following:—

<p>cum facta est, unde cœperunt appellari traditores. AUGUSTIN. <i>De Bapt. contr. Donatistas</i>, lib. vii. c. 2.—De his, qui scripturas sanctas tradidisse dicuntur, vel vasa Domini, vel nomina fratrum</p>	<p>suorum, placuit nobis, ut quicumque eorum in actis publicis fuerit detectus, non verbis nudis, ab ordine cleri amoveatur. <i>Conc. Arelat.</i> i. A. D. 314, can. 13.</p>
--	--



1. *Προσκλαίοντες*, flentes, i. e., *the mourners or weepers*, who were rather candidates for penance, than penitents strictly speaking. Their station was in the church porch, where they lay prostrate, begging the prayers of the faithful as they went in; and desiring to be admitted to do public penance in the church. This is what Tertullian means when he says (*De Pœnit.* c. 9), they were used to fall down at the presbyters' feet, and kneel to the friends of God, and intreat all the brethren to recommend their petitions and intercede with heaven for their sin<sup>13</sup>.

2. *Ἀκροωμένοι*, audientes, i. e., *the hearers*.—When their petition was accepted, they were said to be admitted to penance that is, to have liberty to pass through the several stages of discipline which the church appointed for the probation and trial of such as pretended real sorrow for any notorious offence, and the scandal given to the church by the commission of it. This is the true meaning of those common phrases, “*pœnitentiam dare*,” and “*pœnitentiam accipere*,” giving and receiving penance, that is, granting or accepting the conditions of public penance in the church. These (hearers) were allowed to stay and hear the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached; but were obliged to depart before any of the common prayers began, with the rest of those catechumens and others, who went by the name of hearers only. Their station was in the narthex, or lowest part of the church.

3. *ὑποπίπτοντες*, *Γονυκλίνοντες*, *substrati* or *genuflectentes*, i. e., *the prostrators or kneelers*.—These were allowed to stay in the church after the hearers were dismissed, and to hear the prayers that were offered up, particularly for them, by all the people, and to receive imposition of hands from the bishop, who also made a particular prayer for them. (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 19; *Chrysost. Hom.* 18 *in 2 Cor.*; *Hom.* 76 *in Matth.*; *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 8, 9.) The station of this sort of penitents was within the

<sup>13</sup> These were, probably, called also *χειμάζοντες* or *χειμάζμοινοι*, *hiemantes*, because they remained in the open air, not being admitted within the church. Some have supposed that the *χειμάζοντες* were persons possessed by evil spirits; but the former interpretation is the more probable.

nave or body of the church, near the ambo or reading desk, where they received the bishop's imposition of hands and benediction. Some canons style this order, the penitents, by way of emphasis, without any other distinction; because they were the most noted, and the greatest number of penitential acts belonged to them whilst they were in this station.

4. *Συνιστάμενοι*, consistentes, or *the by-standers*.—These had liberty, after the other penitents, energumens and others were dismissed, to stand with the faithful at the altar, to join in the common prayers, and see the oblation offered; but yet they might neither make their own oblations, nor partake of the eucharist with them. This the Council of Nicæa (can. 11) calls communicating with the people in prayers only without the oblation. (See also *Conc. Ancyr.* c. 4, 5, 8, 16, 25.) This communicating in prayers only was but an imperfect sort of communion; in opposition to which, when they were admitted again to the eucharist, they were said *ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον*, “to attain to perfection.” (From BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, book 18, chap. 1.)

Cave (*Primitive Christianity*, book i. c. 8), following Belarmin (*De Pœnitent.* lib. i. c. 22), speaks of a fifth order or class of penitents, which Bingham has pointed out as a mistake; but it appears not improbable that penitents may have been at first admitted to stay until the end of the prayers preceding the consecration and distribution of the sacred elements; and afterwards, as a still further favour, allowed to be present during the whole of the ceremony (but without communicating). A fifth class may be thus accounted for; but the matter is obscure, and not of much importance.

We must not suppose that these gradations were always strictly observed after their first introduction. Much, perhaps, depended upon the will of the bishop, from the earliest times; and afterwards this officer was expressly permitted to determine not only the duration of the term of penance, but the manner in which it should be performed<sup>14</sup>. And here we may discover the

<sup>14</sup> Τοὺς δὲ ἐπισκόπους ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς δοκιμάσαντας φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι, ἢ πλείονα προστιθέναι χρόνον· πρὸ πάντων δὲ καὶ ὁ πρῶτων βίος, καὶ ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐξε-

ταξέσθω· καὶ οὕτως ἡ φιλανθρωπίᾳ ἐπιμετρέσθω. *Conc. Ancyr.* c. 5. This rule was established also by Constitut. Carolin. l. vii. c. 294.

foundation of a practice which subsequently led to enormous abuses,—that of granting *indulgences*. The so-called *Indulgentia Paschalis* has an especial reference to the penitents and their stations in the early church.

IV. *Of the duties and burdens imposed upon Penitent ; or, of the different kinds and degrees of Penance.*—It must be carefully remembered, that penance was throughout a *voluntary act* on the part of those who submitted to it, and by no means compulsory. And so anxious was the primitive church to preserve this voluntary character of penance, that it was held unlawful even to exhort or invite any one to submit to this kind of discipline. It was required that the offender should seek it as a favour, and should supplicate for admission among the penitents. But although an offending member was at liberty either to return into the church by doing penance or not, yet he was not at liberty to choose the course or method of penance to be undergone, if he once determined to seek restoration. No one could even take his station among the penitents, without having received permission upon application made to the bishop or presbyter. The acts of the first class of penitents may, perhaps, be regarded as a formal and continual supplication of this kind.

The duties or burdens imposed upon penitents consisted of the following particulars:—

1. Penitents of the first three classes were forbidden to exercise the privilege of standing during public prayers. They were obliged to kneel.

2. All were required to express their penitential sorrow by an open and public confession of their sin. It was not sufficient for them to make this confession once before the bishop and clergy, but it was to be made before the whole church, with sighs, tears, and other expressions of grief; and these lamentations, together with entreaties for the prayers and intercessions of the faithful, were to be frequently renewed by the penitents as long as they remained in the first or lowest class. Some opinion of the nature of these deprecatory effusions may be formed from

a copy of one preserved [by Cyprian, *Ep.* 46. Almost all the canons relating to penance make mention of tears, sighs, and lamentations.

3. During the whole term of penance all ornaments of dress were to be laid aside; and all expressions of joy or pleasure to be abandoned. We find, not only from the canons of councils (e. g., *Conc. Tolet.* i. c. 2; iii. c. 12; *Agath.* c. 15), but also from early ecclesiastical writers, that penitents were required literally to wear sackcloth, and to cover their heads with ashes<sup>15</sup>. This practice was by no means restricted in point of time to the Dies Cinerum (Ash Wednesday); although doubtless all penitential exercises were performed with especial diligence during Lent, the end of which season was distinguished by grants of absolution.

4. Male penitents were required to cut off their hair and shave their beards in token of sorrow; and females were enjoined to appear with their hair dishevelled, and wearing a peculiar kind of veil<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> Ὅστε ἔωθεν ἀναστῆναι, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενον σάκκον, καὶ σποδὸν καταπασάμενον μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς, καὶ δακρύων προσπεσεῖν. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 28.—Quis hoc crederet, ut saccum indueret, ut errorem publice fateretur, et tota urbe spectante Romana, ante diem paschæ in Basilica Laterani staret in ordine pœnitentium? ΠΙΕΡΟΣ. *Ep.* 30, *Epit. Fab.*—De ipso quoque habitu atque vietu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare. TERTULL. *De Penit.* c. 9.—Totum corpus incuria maceretur, cinere adpersum, et opertum cilicia. AMBROS. *ad Virgin. Lapsam* c. 8.—Agite pœnitentiam plenam, dolentis ac lamentantis animi probate mœstiam. . . . Orare importet impensius, et rogare, diem huctu transigere, vigiliis roctes ac fletibus ducere, tempus omne lacrimosis lamentationibus occupare, stratos solo adhærere, in cinere et cilicio et sordibus volutari, post indumentum Christi perditum nullum jam velle vestitum, post diaboli cibum malle je-

junium, justis operibus incumbere, quibus peccata purgantur, eleemosynis frequenter insistere, quibus a morte animæ liberantur. CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis*.

<sup>16</sup> Quicumque ab episcopo pœnitentiam postulat, prius eum tondeat, aut in cinere et cilicio habitum mutare faciat, et sic pœnitentiam ei tradat. *Conc. Toletan.* iii. c. 12.—Pœnitentes si comas non deposuerint, aut vestimenta non mutarint, abjiciantur. *Conc. Agath.* c. 15.—Amputentur crines, qui per vanam gloriam occasionem luxuriæ præstiterunt. AMBROS. *ad Virg. Laps.* c. 8.—It is well known that for a long time the tonsure of the clergy was opposed, as being contrary to the old ecclesiastical rules which expressly prescribed their wearing long hair and beards (*Constit. Apost.* lib. i. c. 3; EPIPHAN. *Heres.* lxxx.), and as being a token of servitude and penitence. It was gradually introduced, however, by the monks.

5. During the whole time of penance, the candidates were required to abstain from bathing, feasting, and many corporeal pleasures lawful at other times. In the spirit of this regulation, they were forbidden to marry during this period of humiliation and probation. (*Conc. Arelat.* ii. c. 21.)

6. Besides the observance of these prohibitions, or regulations of a negative and privative kind, the penitents were expected to comply with certain positive demands.

i. They were obliged to be present, and to perform their parts, as far as was permitted, at every religious assembly or act of worship,—a rule which neither the faithful nor the catechumens were bound to observe. (*Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 82.)

ii. A claim was made upon them for especial attention to works of love and charity, particularly that of almsgiving.

iii. And they were expected to perform the office of the parabolani, in visiting and relieving the sick, and burying the dead. But perhaps the latter regulation was peculiar to the African church. (*Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 81.)

All these duties and performances were sometimes included under the general term *ἐξομολόγησις*, confession, the word being understood to signify, not only words, but works, by which the penitent may give expression to his sorrow for sin and resolution of amendment.

V. *Re-admission of Penitents into the Church.*—In early times, although penance and absolution were not reckoned among the sacraments, yet the restoration of penitents was a solemn and public act of the church, and was conducted with a view to the edification of the whole body, as well as to the benefit of the individual penitents. It was enacted, that the absolution should be granted only by the bishop who had pronounced the sentence of excommunication, or his successor, and this rule was strictly enforced by several councils (*Conc. Illiberit.* c. 53; *Arelat.* i. c. 16, 17; *Nic.* c. 5; *Sardic.* c. 13); any bishop who should absolve a penitent belonging to another diocese being liable to severe censure, or even to deposition, for this irregular proceeding. (*Conc. Cæsaraug.* c. 5; *Carthag.* ii. c. 7.) And on this account

the names of excommunicated persons were published in lists circulated among neighbouring dioceses. (*Conc. Tolet.* i. c. 11; THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 9; AUGUSTIN. *contra Petil.* lib. iii. c. 38.)

Absolution was usually granted during Passion Week (hence called *hebdomas indulgentiæ*), but also at other times appointed by the bishop, in the church. This act was performed during divine service; and, for the most part, immediately before the celebration of the Lord's Supper. On these occasions, the penitents, having taken their station either before the altar or in front of the reading-desk (*ambo*), knelt down before the bishop, who absolved them with imposition of hands and prayer. We do not find any form of words appointed for the use of the bishop in this act of absolution, although it is likely from analogy that such a form was provided; but as the act was commonly designated by the phrase *dare pacem*, it is likely that the prayer or benediction contained the expression "Depart in peace!" In the case of heretics, the ceremony of unction was added; the bishop anointing with the chrism the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears of the penitent, and saying, "This is the sign of the gifts of the Holy Ghost." (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 7; *Constantin.* i. c. 7.) The fifty-first psalm appears to have formed part of the penitential service. (BASIL. M. *Ep.* 63; ATHANAS. *Ep. ad Marcel. de Interpr. Psalm.*)

Immediately after the act of absolution the penitents were admitted to partake of the Lord's supper; and from that moment they were restored to all the privileges of the faithful. A clergyman, however, after absolution, was reckoned among the laity; and a layman, under these circumstances, was incapable of entering into holy orders<sup>17</sup>.

A passage from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, quoted by Bingham, deserves particular attention, in connexion with the subject of absolution. Cyril, in expounding Our Saviour's

<sup>17</sup> Ex pœnitentibus, quamvis sit tempore non prodidit fuisse pœnitentem. *Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 68. Conf. ignorantiam episcopi factum fuerit, *Conc. Aurelian.* iii. c. 6; *Agath.* c. 43 deponatur a clero, quia se ordinationis *Toletan.* i. c. 2.

words, John xx. 23, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them," makes the following observations:—"Spiritual men remit or retain sins two ways: for either they call those to baptism who are worthy of it upon account of a good life and approved faith; or else they forbid and repel those from the divine gift who are unworthy of it. This is one way of remitting or retaining sins, as Paul delivered the Corinthians over to the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved; and afterwards received him, that he might not be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow. The other way is, when they correct and punish the children of the church offending, and pardon them again upon their repentance. Now, because the ministers of Christ are in a great measure the proper judges of men's qualifications both for baptism and the eucharist, therefore a great power and authority was allowed them in both these cases to examine into men's behaviour and faith, and to judge who were fit and who were not fit for the reception of them; and accordingly to minister, or not to minister, to them these mysteries, which were the means of conveying remission of sins to the worthy receiver; and so they were invested with a sort of absolute judicial authority in the external administration of these things with respect to the outward communion of the church, though not with an absolute authority over the conscience in respect to God, who alone can properly remit sin and absolve the sinner. So they acted in a double capacity in these matters; as judges in respect of men's visible qualifications for the sacraments, and the proper time and season of admitting them to the participation of them; having power to shorten or prolong the time, as they judged of the negligence or proficiency of the petitioning parties: but they acted only as intercessors to God for them, as to anything pertaining directly and properly to the purification of the conscience from sin, which is not in man's power, but only in a ministerial way, to do those things which, as means of grace, may contribute towards obtaining a proper absolution and remission of sins from God, in whose power only is the absolute power of forgiving sins." (CYRIL. ALEX. lib. xii. in *Joan* xx. 23.)

"All the power of ecclesiastical discipline was primarily

lodged in the hands of the bishop, and he was the ordinary minister of absolution. But because the necessities of the church required in many cases that part of this burden should devolve upon others, and the bishop was not able personally to discharge the whole of it to all that needed; therefore presbyters, as his proper assistants, were taken in to be sharers and fellow-labourers with him. They had a general commission to grant the great indulgence or absolution of baptism, and that of the eucharist, and the word and doctrine, to all that needed: and though they were more restrained in the exercise of public discipline, and the final reconciliation of public penitents by imposition of hands and prayer; yet the intermediate imposition of hands upon the penitents in their daily exercise was often committed to them: and by the bishop's leave they might give the final reconciliation to public penitents, either openly in the church, or privately on a sick bed, when necessity and the fear of immediate death required a speedier absolution. (*Conc. Carth.* ii. c. 3, 4; iii. c. 32; *Conc. Arausican.* i. c. 2; *Conc. Epaonen.* c. 16; *DIONYS. ap Euseb.* lib. vi. c. 44.) And the same commission or licence was granted even to deacons. (*Conc. Illiber.* c. 32; *CYPRIAN. Ep.* 13, *al.* 18; 14, *al.* 19.) It is plain, also, that the clergy had some share with the bishop in the more public and solemn absolutions; because Cyprian often complains of some forward men who were desirous of having the eucharist granted them before they had received the solemn imposition of hands from *the bishop and clergy* to reconcile them to the altar. (*CYPRIAN. Ep.* 10, *al.* 15; 11, *al.* 16; 12, *al.* 17.)"—(FROM BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xix. c. 3.)

## § 2.—PRIVATE PENANCE.

PROPERLY speaking, public penance is such as relates to notorious offences, and is performed only before the church; private penance relates to sins confessed only to a priest, for which satisfaction is privately performed<sup>18</sup>. It is private penance, thus

<sup>18</sup> Publica et privata pœnitentia in eodem potissimum distinguuntur, quod publica ea dicitur, in qua peccatum commissum publicatur, et pro eo publice coram ecclesia peragitur satisfactio: privata vero illa, in qua peccatum soli detegitur sacerdoti, et satisfactio occulte ac privatim injungitur peragenda. Ex quo sequitur, ut publica peccata ad penitentiam publicam, oc-



closely connected with the practice of auricular confession, which has been exalted to the rank of a sacrament in the church of Rome.

No precedent or other authority in favour of this practice can be found in the New Testament. James v. 16 relates to a *mutual* confession of sins; and demands no more confession of the people to a priest, than of a priest to the people. Roman Catholic writers, abandoning this passage, contend, however, that auricular confession is founded upon Scripture, inasmuch as it is a natural and necessary accompaniment of the power of forgiving sins, which they suppose to have been vested in the apostles. (Matt. xviii. 18; xvi. 19; John xx. 23.) Such is the position maintained by the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. c. 3—6); the unsoundness of which has been, however, abundantly proved.

The more acute and judicious controversialists on the Romish side betake themselves to the authority of the fathers in this matter; claiming Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and others, as bearing witness to the existence of private confession in their days. But it is found, upon examination, that the *ἐξομολόγησις*, or confessio, to which they allude, is quite another thing,—such, in fact, as has been already described; a point which is fully conceded by a celebrated Roman Catholic antiquarian, Gabriel Albaspinæus. (*Observat. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 26.) The truth is, that the ancient writers speak of *ἐξομολόγησις* only in the sense of confession of sin to Almighty God, or as denoting public penance; the whole exercise, in the latter case, being denominated from its introductory part. Concerning the former kind of confession, the fathers teach expressly that it is to be made only to God, and not by any means to man, whether the whole church or individual ministers. (BASIL. M. in Ps. xxxvii. 8; CHRYSOSTOM. *Hom.* 31 in *Ep. ad Hebr.*) It is wholly unconnected with anything in the shape of satisfaction or penalty; its only necessary accompaniment being repentance or contrition, with purpose of amendment. The other kind of confession related, as has been already explained, to those open or notorious

cultæ ad privatam, pertineant, neque enim licet peccatum occultum publicare, aut etiam pro occulto penitentiam ita publicam imponere, ut ex ea peccatum ipsum detegatur. BELLARMIN. *De Penit.* lib. i. c. 21.

offences, on account of which a member of the church had been excluded from her communion; and it was required as a preparatory step in order to a restoration to ecclesiastical privileges. And together with this, we may rank the public confession of previous sins which was required as one of the preliminaries of baptism; allusion to which is made by some of the earliest ecclesiastical writers<sup>19</sup>.

During the Decian persecution, the number of penitents being very large, the bishop deemed it expedient to appoint certain presbyters to the especial office of receiving their confessions preparatory to public penance; it having been already recommended, as a wholesome practice, that persons suffering under any perplexities of mind or troubles of conscience, should have recourse to some wise and skilful pastor for their guidance and satisfaction<sup>20</sup>. The establishment of this office of penitentiary presbyters is related by SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 19, and SOZOMEN, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 16; from whom we learn also that it was never admitted by the Novatians; that it was abolished at Constantinople, by Nectarius the bishop, in the reign of Theodosius; and that this example was followed by almost all the bishops of the east, in whose churches the office was accordingly discontinued; but that it continued in use in

<sup>19</sup> Ἐπὶ τῷ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἑμῶν συννεχομένων. JUSTIN, *M. Apol.* ii.—Τοῦτο ἐκείνο πάλαι τὸ σωτήριο λουτρὸν ἦν, ὃ εἶπετο τοῖς μεταγνώσκουσιν. *Id. Dial. cum Tryph.*—Ingressuros baptismum orationibus crebris, jejuniis et genucationibus, et pervigiliis, orare convenit, et cum confessione omnium retro delictorum, ut exponat etiam baptismum Joannis. TERTULL. *de Baptism.* c. 23.

<sup>20</sup> “Thus Clemens Romanus, or the author under his name, bids every one, into whose heart either envy or infidelity, or any such crime, has slyly crept, not to be ashamed, if he has any care of his soul, to confess his sins to the bishop or minister presiding over him, that by the word of God and his saving counsel he may be healed.

(CLEM. *Ep. 1 ad Jacob.*) And so Maldonat owns (*De Confess.* cap. 2, p. 40, t. 3) this has no relation to sacramental confession. The same advice is [given by Origen, Gregory Nyssen, and St. Basil, upon the like occasion, to confess their sins to the priest, who by his compassion and skilfulness was able to help their infirmities, and at once to take care both of their credit and cure. Origen gives another reason for confessing private sins to the priest, because he was best able to judge, whether it were proper for such sins to admit men to do public penance in the church, which in those days was no unusual practice. (GREG. NYSS. *De Penit.*; BASIL. *Regul. Brev. Resp.* 229; ORIG. *Hom. 2 in Ps. 37.*)] BINGHAM *Antiq.* b. xviii. c. 3, § 7, 8

the western churches, and chiefly at Rome, to prepare men for the public penance of the church. The appointment of these penitentiary priests may be regarded as having led the way to the institution of confessors, in the modern acceptation of the term. But these officers were by no means identical, and ought not to be confounded with each other. The office of the penitentiary priests, "was not to receive private confessions in prejudice to the public discipline; much less to grant absolution privately upon bare confession before any penance was performed; which was a practice altogether unknown to the ancient church;—but it was to facilitate and promote the exercise of public discipline, by acquainting men what sins the laws of the church required to be expiated by public penance, and how they were to behave themselves in the performance of it; and only to appoint private penance for such private crimes as were not proper to be brought upon the public stage, either for fear of doing harm to the penitent himself, or giving scandal to the church." (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xviii. c. 3, § 11.) The confession of sins was indeed private; but it was destined to be made public in order to the performance of penance. The private or auricular confession of later centuries is quite different from the confession made to those penitentiary presbyters. Confession was not made to them, with a view of obtaining forgiveness from God; but in order to procure restoration to the former privileges of the offended church. It was considered indeed useful and necessary to seek for both kinds of forgiveness at the same time; but no Christian minister claimed the power of pronouncing pardon in the name of God. (See SCHROECK, *Kirchensgeschichte* iv. 318—321.

The regular establishment of the system of private confession and absolution is usually ascribed to Leo the Great<sup>21</sup>, who repre-

<sup>21</sup> Illam contra apostolicam regulam presumptionem, quam nuper agnovi a quibusdam illicita usurpatione committi, modis omnibus constituo submoveri. De pœnitentia scilicet, quæ a fidelibus postulatur, ne de singulorum peccatorum genere libello scripta professio publice recitetur: cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat, solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta. Quamvis enim plenitudo fidei videatur esse laudabilis quæ propter timorem Dei apud homines erubescere non veretur; tamen, quia non omnium hu-

sented not merely any particular penitentiary priests, but every priest, as possessing the power and authority to receive confession, to act as an intercessor with God on behalf of the penitent, and to declare forgiveness of sins in the name of God. But even the system introduced by this pontiff differed from that which has prevailed since the thirteenth century in the Roman church, inasmuch as the confession of sins was left to every one's own conscience, and penance was still regarded as an entirely voluntary act, which no one could be compelled to perform; nor was the priest supposed to possess in himself any (delegated) power of forgiving sins. And subsequently to the age of Leo, it was considered as a matter quite at the option of an offender either to confess his sins to a priest, or to God alone<sup>22</sup>.

jusmodi sunt peccata, ut ea, qui pœnitentiam poscunt, non timeant publicare, removeatur tam improbabilis consuetudo, ne multi a pœnitentiæ remediis arceantur, dum aut erubescunt, aut metuunt inimicis suis sua facta reserari, quibus possint legum constitutione percelli. Sufficit enim illa confessio, quæ primum Deo offeritur, tum etiam sacerdoti, qui pro delictis pœnitentium precator accedit. Tunc enim demum plures ad pœnitentiam poterunt provocari, si populi auribus non publicetur conscientia confitentis. LEONIS M. *Epist.* 168, c. 2, *ed. Bal. (Ep. 136 ed. Quesn.)*

<sup>22</sup> Quidam Deo solummodo confiteri debere dicunt peccata; quidam vero sacerdotibus confitenda esse percensent: quod utrumque non sine magno fructu intra sanctam fit ecclesiam. Ita dumtaxat et Deo, qui remissor est peccatorum, confiteamur peccata nostra, et cum David dicamus Delictum meum cognitum tibi feci (Ps. xxxii. 5). Et secundum institutionem apostoli confiteamur alterutrum peccata nostra, et oramus pro invicem, ut salvemur (Jacob. v. 16). Confessio itaque, quæ

Deo fit, purgat peccata; ea vero, quæ sacerdoti fit, docet, qualiter ipsa purgentur peccata. Deus namque salutis et sanitatis auctor et largitor, plerumque hanc præbet suæ potentiæ invisibili administratione, plerumque medicorum operatione. *Conc. Cabilon.* A.D. 813, c. 33.—The celebrated scholastic writers, Abelard (*Ethica*, c. 25), Gratian (*Tract. de Pœnitent.* p. 2, c. 33), and Peter Lombard (*Sent.* iv. distinct. 17), handle this point very freely. The latter proposes three questions with reference to it;—"Primo queritur, utrum absque satisfactione et oris confessione per solam cordis contritionem peccatum alicui dimittatur? Secundum, an aliquando sufficiat confiteri Deo sine sacerdote? Tertio, an Laico fidei facta valeat confessio? In his enim etiam docti diversa sentire inveniuntur, quia super his varia ac pene adversa tradidisse videntur doctores."—Lombard himself decides the question thus, "Oportere Deo primum, et deinde sacerdoti offerri confessionem, nec aliter posse perveniri ad ingressum Paradisi, nisi adsit facultas."

## § 3.—ABSOLUTION.

It has been already remarked that the original signification of *ἄφεσις*, *Absolution*, in the early church, was nothing more or less than reconciliation with the church and restoration to its communion; without any reference to the forgiveness of sins on the part of Almighty God. The early writers insist much upon the truth that God alone can forgive sins (TERTULL. *adv. Marc.* lib. iv. c. 10; CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis; Ep.* 3, 33, 55, 75; IREN. *adv. Hæres.* lib. v. c. 17; ATHANAS. *Orat.* 3, *contr. Ariana.*; BASIL. M. *contr. Eunom.* lib. v.; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 29, *in Matth.*; AMBROS. *De Spirit. S.* lib. iii. c. 19); and, what is more to the point, it may safely be asserted that no writer belonging to the first three centuries of the Christian church makes mention of power or authority, on the part of a priest, to forgive sins in the place of God. After the fourth century, as the practice of private penance prevailed, the doctrine of the conveyance of the divine forgiveness through the church, or by the ministration of men, began to gain ground<sup>23</sup>. After the twelfth century, absolution was exalted to the rank of a sacrament, which was supposed to be administered by the priests with a power delegated immediately from God; and hence the council of Trent represented the power of the keys as belonging to bishops and priests<sup>24</sup>, but

<sup>23</sup> Nec eos audiamus, qui negant, ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere. Itaque miserum in Petro Petram non intelligunt, et nolunt credere, datas ecclesie claves regni celorum, ipsi eas de manibus amiserunt. AUGUSTIN. *de Agone Chr.* c. 11.— Multiplex misericordia Dei ita lapsibus subvenit humanis, ut non solum per baptismi gratiam, sed etiam penitentiae medicinam, spes vite reparatur aeternae, ut qui regenerationis dona violassent proprio se iudicio condemnantes ad remissionem criminum pervenirent: sic divinae bonitatis praesidiis ordinatis, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri. Mediator enim Dei et hominum homo

Jesus Christus hanc Propositis Ecclesiae tradidit potestatem, ut et confidentibus actionem penitentiae darent, et eosdem salubri satisfactione purgatos ad communionem sacramentorum per jannam reconciliationis admitterent. LEO. M. *Ep.* 59 (*ed. Baller.*; *Ep.* 46 *ed. Quesn.*)

<sup>24</sup> Circa ministrum hujus sacramenti declarat sancta synodus, falsas esse et a veritate evangelii penitus alienas doctrinas omnes, quae ad alios quosvis homines, praeter episcopos et sacerdotes, clavium ministerium perniciose extendunt. . . . Quamvis autem absolutio sacerdotis alieni beneficii sit dispensatio, tamen non est solum nudum ministerium, vel annuntiandi

to them alone; but with certain reservations in favour of the episcopal authority<sup>25</sup>.

The earliest forms of absolution on record are in the strain of supplication or deprecation. "In the *Apostolical Constitutions* there is an order for the reconciling of penitents, that the bishop shall receive them into communion with imposition of hands, and the prayers of the whole church for them. The form of this prayer is in the end of the liturgy ascribed to St. James, under the title of *Εὐχὴ τοῦ Ἰλασμοῦ*, *The prayer of propitiation*, which is directed to Christ in these words, 'O Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, thou Shepherd and Lamb, that takest away the sins of the world, that forgavest the debt to the two debtors, and grantedst remission of sins to the sinful woman, and gavest to the sick of the palsy both a cure and pardon of sins; remit, blot out, and pardon our sins, both voluntary and involuntary, whatever we have done willingly or unwillingly by transgression, and disobedience, which thy Spirit knoweth better than ourselves. And whereinsoever thy servants have erred from thy commandments in word or deed, as men carrying flesh about them, and

evangelii, vel declarandi remissa esse peccata; sed instar actus judicialis, quo ab ipso, velut a iudice, sententia pronuntiatur. *Conc. Trident.* Sess. xiv. c. 6. . . Si quis dixerit, absolutionem sacerdotis non esse actum iudiciale, sed nudum ministerium pronuntiandi et declarandi remissa esse peccata confitenti: modo tantum credat se esse absolutum; aut sacerdos non serio, sed joco absolvat; aut dixerit non requiri confessionem confitentis, ut sacerdos eum absolvere possit, anathema sit. *Ibid.* can. 9.

<sup>25</sup> Quoniam igitur natura et ratio iudicii illud exposcit, ut sententia in subditos duntaxat feratur, persuasum semper in Ecclesia Dei fuit, et verissimum esse Synodus hæc confirmat, nullius momenti absolutionem eam esse debere, quam sacerdos in eum profert, in quem ordinariam aut subdelegatam non habet jurisdictionem. Magno opere vero ad Christiani populi

disciplinam pertinere S. S. Patribus nostris visum est, ut atrociora quaedam et graviora crimina non a quibusvis, sed a summis duntaxat sacerdotibus absolventur. Unde merito *Pontifices Maximi*, pro suprema potestate sibi in Ecclesia universa tradita, causas aliquas criminum graviore suo potuerunt peculiari iudicio reservare. Neque dubitandum est, quando omnia, que a Deo sunt, ordinata sunt, quia hoc idem *Episcopis omnibus* in sua cuque Diocesi, in reedificationem tamen, non in destructionem, liceat, pro illis in subdito tradita supra reliquos inferiores sacerdotes, auctoritate, præsertim quoad illa, quibus excommunicationis censura annexa est. *Conc. Trident.* Sess. 14, c. 7.—It is afterwards ordained "ut nulla sit reservatio in articulo mortis: utque ideo omnes sacerdotes quoslibet penitentes a quibusvis peccatis et censuris absolvere possunt."

living in the world, or seduced by the instigation of Satan; or whatever curse and peculiar anathema they are fallen under, I pray, and beseech thy ineffable goodness to absolve them with thy word, and remit their curse and anathema according to thy mercy. O Lord and Master, hear my prayer for thy servants; thou that forgettest injuries, overlook all their failings, pardon their offences both voluntary and involuntary, and deliver them from eternal punishment. For thou art he that hast commanded us saying, ‘Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;’ because thou art our God, the God that canst have mercy, and save and forgive sins; and to thee, with the eternal Father and the quickening Spirit, belongs glory now and for ever, world without end. Amen. The same form was used for many ages in the Latin church also. In an old Latin missal, published by Illyricus and Cardinal Bona, the absolution, under the title of *Indulgentia*, runs in this form:—‘He that forgave the sinful woman all her sins for which she shed tears, and opened the gate of paradise to the thief upon a single confession, make you partakers of his redemption, and absolve you from all the bond of your sins, and heal those infirm members by the medicine of his mercy, and restore them to the body of his holy church by his grace, and keep them whole and sound for ever.’” (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xix. ch. 2, § 4.) The indicative or imperative form, *i. e.*, I absolve thee, did not come into use until the twelfth century, after which period it was generally adopted. Thomas Aquinas was the first writer who attributed to priests the power of actually conferring remission of sins, or conveying officially a notification of such remission, which power he inferred from the nature of absolution. The use of the indicative form was established by the Council of Trent. It usually runs thus:—“Ego te absolvo ab omnibus peccatis tuis, in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.” *i. e.*, *I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.* It deserves to be remembered, that some members of the Council of Trent proposed to appoint a merely declarative form of absolution in preference to the indicative or imperative; but the majority of votes decided in favour of the latter.

The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries strictly enjoined all spiritual persons to observe profound secrecy with respect to sins or crimes which were penitentially confessed to them<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> Adulterio pollutas mulieres et confitentes ob pietatem, vel quomodocunque convictas, publicare patres nostri prohibuerunt, ne convictis mortis causam præberent. *BASIL. M. Ep. Canon. c. 34.*—Causas criminum, quas illi confitebantur, nulli nisi Domino, apud quem intercedebat, loquebatur, bonum relinquens exemplum posteris sacerdotibus, ut intercessores apud Deum sint magis quam accusatores apud homines. *PAULIN. in vit. Ambrosii.*—Caveat autem omnino sacerdos

ne verbo aut signo, aut alio quovis modo aliquatenus prodeat peccatorem; sed si prudentiori consilio indignerit, illud absque ulla expressione personæ caute requirat: quoniam qui peccatum in penitentiali iudicio sibi detectum præsumserit revelare, non solum a sacerdotalis officio deponendum decernimus, verum etiam ad agendam perpetuam penitentiam in aretum monasterium detrudendum. *DECRET. INNOCENT. III.*



BOOK V.  
OF SACRED SEASONS.

---

CHAPTER I.  
OF FESTIVALS.

§ 1.—ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS.

OUR Lord and his apostles observed the Jewish festivals. The former, who fulfilled the whole law of Moses, appears from the Gospels to have regularly attended the feasts which were observed by the Jews in his time. On the Sabbath, he repaired to the synagogues, testifying by his presence his approbation of those places of worship, and taking the opportunity which they afforded of speaking to the assembled people. When charged with a violation of the Sabbath (*e. g.*, Luke xiii. 11 seq.; xiv. 1 seq.), he defended his conduct by reference to the precepts or examples of the Old Testament. He went regularly every year to the feast of the passover at Jerusalem; and in the last year of his ministry, at least, he attended the feast of tabernacles, and that of the dedication. But our Saviour left no precept appointing any seasons or days of religious observance by his disciples in after times. (See APPENDIX D.)

After the ascension of Christ, and especially after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the apostles and other disciples formed a society or fraternity at Jerusalem; but yet so that they adhered to the civil and ecclesiastical institutions of their countrymen. As long as they were permitted to do so by the sanhedrim, they went at certain times to the temple, especially on the greater festivals; and thus the Jewish divisions of time were introduced into the Christian church at its very foundation. But it was the office of the apostle Paul to admonish the infant church that an adherence to Jewish times and seasons was not an essential part of the Christian religion; and he resisted all attempts to impose the yoke of Mosaic ceremonies and obser-

vances upon the Gentile converts. (Col. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 9; Rom. xiv. 5.) By the efforts of the same apostle, the practice of the Jews with regard to the strict observance of particular days was distinguished from the genius of Christianity; but not entirely suppressed. Acting under his high commission, and by the guidance of the Spirit of truth and liberty, St. Paul removed from the church the oppressive and useless burden of the celebration of Jewish festivals,—turned to the account of practical religion the sacred days which were retained (see 1 Cor. v. 6 seq.),—sanctioned the consecration of the first day of the week in the room of the seventh (Acts xxii.; 1 Cor. xvi. 2),—and approved, if he did not establish, the celebration of a sacred feast, and the use of unleavened bread, at the season of the Jewish passover. (See 1 Cor. v. 6 seq.) We do not find that the apostle gave any direction to Christians respecting the observance of festivals beyond those which have now been mentioned.

It appears, then, that the greater number of festivals in the primitive church were established according to the analogy of Jewish observances previously existing. This is the case as regards, for instance, the weekly Sabbath, and the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide. Others, of later introduction, are to be traced to peculiar events and circumstances,—such as the respect paid to martyrs, portions of heathen worship, and practices of various sects or parties, as will appear from the history of particular festivals. The leading idea on which the celebration of festivals was founded in the Christian church is the following: that the object of such festivals is to commemorate the personal history of our Lord, and the chief blessings of the Gospel,—to excite men to gratitude to the giver of all good gifts, and to encourage the practice of Christian virtue. It is a favourite position of early ecclesiastical writers, that in the course of the festivals observed by the church, all the benefits of Christianity are set forth, and the whole of the sacred history is exhibited in regular connexion. According to Eusebius, the three high festivals embody the three leading principles of the Christian religion, and were arranged with a view to the recognition and worship of the sacred Trinity in Unity. (See GREGOR. NYSS.

*Orat.* 19; EPHREM. SYR. *Serm. de diebus festis*; SYNESIUS *Serm. in Ps.* 45; CHRYSOST. *Hom. passim*; EPIPH. *Orat. de Assump.*)

## § 2.—CELEBRATION OF FESTIVALS IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

THE following may be regarded as the chief peculiarities of Christian festivals during the first four centuries:—1. All such festivals were holidays, that is, days on which all public and judicial business was suspended, and all games or amusements which interfered with devotion were prohibited. Works of necessity and charity, however, were not only excepted, and permitted, but enjoined. 2. Attendance on public worship was a duty prescribed to all Christians. 3. Places of worship, and the private houses of Christians, were adorned in an especial manner. 4. The Christians were expected to appear in their best dress, or at least with peculiar cleanliness and neatness of apparel. 5. All fasting was forbidden. 6. Agapæ (love-feasts) were celebrated early in the morning; and afterwards the richer members of the church used to entertain the poor, and to distribute alms. 7. Public prayers were said in a standing, instead of kneeling, posture. It is evident that these regulations tended to piety and cheerfulness; but not, like the heathen observances, to revelry and vice.

In the first centuries of Christianity, the church was free from any superstitious opinions respecting the value or necessity of its festivals. A remarkable passage from the historian Soerates has been pointed out, as expressive of truly just and enlightened sentiments on this subject. “Never,” says he, “did the apostle (St. Paul) or the evangelists lay a yoke of bondage upon the disciples, but left the celebration of the passover and other festivals to the discretion of those who thought that they could derive any benefit from the observance. For our Saviour and his apostles neither commanded this by any law, nor enjoined the performance by the sanctions of a threatened penalty or curse. It was the design of the apostles not to make laws concerning festivals, but to promote piety and a good life.” (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 22. See also NICEPH. *Hist. Eccl.* xii. 32.) And many of the fathers expressly mention, as one excellence of the Christian

religion, and one point of its superiority over the Jewish and heathen systems, that it does not regard one day as more holy than another, but teaches us to regard every day as a Sabbath, a day of rest or repose, and the Lord's day, to be employed to the honour of God. They say that especial festivals and solemnities were appointed chiefly as aids and encouragements to weak believers. (CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* v. 7; ORIG. *Contr. Cels.* viii. 21, 23; Hieron. *Comm. in Gal.*; AUG. *Ep.* 118, *ad Januarium.*)

### § 3.—MULTIPLICATION OF FESTIVALS.

IN the earliest records of the Christian church, down to the fourth century, we find mention of only the following festivals:—the Lord's day, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsuntide, the commemorations of certain martyrs (not exactly defined), and last of all, Christmas. But after that period festivals were so greatly multiplied in the church, that later times bear no resemblance, in this respect, to the first four centuries. Many causes contributed to this multiplication of festivals; among which may be reckoned as the chief,—

1. The commemorations of martyrs and confessors already introduced; which led to the establishment of numerous festivals in honour of saints, and to the superstitious use of relics, invocations, pilgrimages, and the like.

2. The errors of some sects respecting existing festivals; to correct which the catholic church introduced new observances.

3. Several laws of Constantine, relating to the celebration of Easter, the religious observance of Friday in every week, and the feasts of martyrs.

4. The celebration of Christmas, which was introduced in the fourth century, led the way to the establishment of other festivals in connexion with itself, such as those in honour of the Virgin Mary.

5. The propensity of many Christians to partake in the celebration of heathen festivals, and in Jewish observances, had become a serious evil in the church during the third and fourth centuries. In Homilies and decrees of councils, of that date, we

find earnest protests against the amalgamation of Christian worship with Jewish and heathen rites, and a description of the dangers which threatened Christianity from this practice, which had begun to gain ground. (See CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 1, 6, 52, and elsewhere; *Conc. Laod.* c. 29, 37, 39; *Conc. Illiber.* c. 49, 50.) This perverse attachment to forms and ceremonies altogether foreign to the Christian religion appears to have been a leading cause of the multiplication of festivals within the church. The original simplicity of Christian worship had become unsatisfactory to the multitude; and it was deemed necessary to give splendour and external attractions to the religion of the gospel, by the establishment of new festivals, or by converting Jewish and heathen ceremonies into Christian solemnities. It was thought that this might be done with safety, inasmuch as there was no longer occasion to fear that the people would return to Judaism or heathenism. And accordingly, in the time of Gregory the Great, many observances were adopted into the course of Christian worship from the Jewish and heathen ritual, without fear of those evil consequences which were formerly apprehended from such a combination. (See GREGOR. M. *Reg.* ix. *Ep.* 71; THEODORET. *De Mart.* l. viii.)

If, in addition to these causes, we take into consideration the increasing claims of the papacy, and the superstitious and bad taste of the middle ages, we shall be at no loss to account for the progressive, and at length enormous, multiplication of Christian festivals down to the time of the Reformation.

#### § 4.—OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY, AND THE SABBATH.

*The Lord's day*<sup>1</sup>.—We learn from the books of the New Testament, that in the earliest period of the church Christians constantly met together on the first day of the week, by divine authority, to perform their religious services, and especially to commemorate the resurrection of Christ from the dead. The early writers of the church, after the days of the apostles, make

<sup>1</sup> This account of the observance of the Lord's day and Saturday, is taken chiefly from CAVE'S *Primitive Christianity*, book i. chap. 7.

frequent mention of this practice; and furnish a good account of the manner in which the Lord's day was observed during the first centuries.

Justin Martyr informs us, that "on Sunday all the Christians living either in the city or country met together;" and that on these occasions, after the Scriptures had been read, the president addressed an exhortation to the congregation,—that they then broke bread, the president offering up prayers, *i. e.*, they celebrated the Lord's supper, and that part of the consecrated elements were sent by the hands of the deacons to the absent members of the church<sup>2</sup>. Tertullian, speaking of the leading portions of Christian worship, entitles them, "Dominica solemnities," *i. e.*, *the solemnities of the Lord's day.* (*De Anima. c. 3.*) And in like manner Pliny, in his report to Trajan of the proceedings of the Christians, describes them as meeting together for religious purposes *on a set day.*

The Lord's day was always observed as a festival, or day of spiritual rejoicing<sup>3</sup>; fasting, and every appearance of sorrow or humiliation being studiously avoided, even by the more rigid Montanists. But this sacred day was not devoted to any carnal mirth, or unhallowed festivities. On the contrary, it was kept holy, and honoured by the public performance of divine worship. "A true Christian," says Clement of Alexandria, "according to the commands of the Gospel, observes the Lord's day by casting out all bad thoughts, and cherishing all goodness, honouring the resurrection of the Lord, which took place on that day<sup>4</sup>." Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in a letter to the church of Rome, preserved by Eusebius, mentions the observance of the Lord's

<sup>2</sup> Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μερόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται . . ὁ προσεστώσ δια λόγου τὴν νοθεσίαν . . ποιῆται, ἐπεῖτα, ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ ὁ προσεστώσ εὐχὰς ἀναπέμπει . . καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. JUSTIN. M. *Apol. II.*

<sup>3</sup> Κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶνιν ζῶντες. IGNAT. *Ep. ad Magnes.*—*Diem Solis letitia indulgemus.* TERTULLI. *Apol. c. 16.*—*Die Dominico jejuniū nefas ducimus,*

*vel de geniculis adorare.* TERTULLI. *De Cor. Mil.*—*Quantula est enim apud nos interdictio ciborum duas in anno Hebdomadas Xerophagiarum nec totas, exceptis scilicet Sabbatis et Dominicis offerimus Deo.* TERTULLI. *De Jejun.*

<sup>4</sup> Οὗτος ἐντολὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος, κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, ὅτ' ἂν ἀποβάλλῃ φαῖλον ρόημα καὶ γνωστικὸν προσδύζη, τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ταῦ κυρίου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζων. CLEM. ALEX. *Strom. lib. 7.*

day, and speaks of it as distinguished by the reading of the Scriptures in the congregation<sup>5</sup>.

The resurrection of our Lord from the dead, and the work of creation, were the great subjects of commemoration, and of holy joy, on this sacred day. Justin Martyr says expressly, "On Sunday we all meet together, because it is the first day on which God made the world out of chaos, and Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead; for on the day before Saturday they crucified him, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them the things which we require you to observe<sup>6</sup>."

This sacred festival was usually denominated, ἡ κυριακὴ, dies Dominicus, *the Lord's day* (Rev. i. 10; IGNAT. *Ep. ad Magnes.*; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 53, § 3; *Ep.* 33; TERTULL. *De Idololat.*); but sometimes also, as we have seen, *Sunday*, dies Solis, in compliance with the common phraseology, and when it was necessary to distinguish the day, in addressing the heathen. During the early ages of the church, it was never entitled "the Sabbath;" this word being confined to the seventh day of the week, which continued to be observed by the Jews, and in part also, for a considerable period, by the converts to Christianity, as we shall observe presently.

After the empire had become Christian, the observance of the Lord's day became a frequent subject of legislation. "No sooner was Constantine come over to the church," says Cave, "but his principal care was about the Lord's day; he commanded it to be solemnly observed, and that by all persons whatsoever. (EUSEB. *De vit. Constant.* lib. iv. c. 18—20.) . . . And for those in his army who yet remained in their paganism

<sup>5</sup> Τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἀγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάζομεν, ἐν ἣ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ἦν ἔξομεν αἰε ποτε ἀναγνώσκοντες νουθετίσθαι, ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν. DIONYS. ap. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνελθεύσαν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρῶτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ἣ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε,

καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη, τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς ἐστάυρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν Κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα φανείς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν. JUSTIN. *M. Apol.* II.—Κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες ἐν ἣ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ. IGNAT. *Ep. ad Magnes.*

and infidelity, he commanded them upon Lord's days to go out into the fields, and there pour out their souls in hearty prayer to God. . . He moreover ordained, that there should be no courts of judicature open upon this day; no suits or trials in law; but, at the same time, any works of mercy, such as emancipating slaves, were declared lawful. (*Cod. JUST.* lib. iii. tit. 12, *De Feriis*, l. 3.) That there should be no suits nor demanding debts upon this day, was confirmed by several laws of succeeding emperors. (*Cod. THEOD.* lib. ii. tit. 8, *De Feriis*, l. 1; lib. viii. tit. 8, l. 3.) Theodosius the Great, A.D. 386, by a second law ratified one which he had passed long before, wherein he expressly prohibited all public shows upon the Lord's day, that the worship of God might not be confounded with those profane solemnities. (*Cod. THEOD.* lib. xv. tit. 5, *De Spectaculis*, l. 2.) This law the younger Theodosius some few years after confirmed and enlarged; enacting, that on the Lord's day (and some other festivals then mentioned) not only Christians, but even Jews and heathens, should be restrained from the pleasure of all sights and spectacles, and the theatres be shut up in every place. And whenever it might so happen that the birth-day or inauguration of the emperor might fall upon that day, . . . he commanded that . . . then the imperial solemnity should be put off and deferred till another day. (*Ib.* leg. 5.) Subsequently, these matters were arranged by the decrees of councils; (e.g., *Conc. Aurelian.* 3, A.D. 538, c. 27; *Antissidor.* A.D. 478, c. 16; *Matic.* 2, A.D. 585, c. 1; *Moguntin.*, A.D. 815, c. 37.)"

*The Sabbath or Saturday.*—Next to the Lord's day, the Sabbath or Saturday (for so the word *Sabbatum* is constantly used in the writings of the fathers, when speaking of it as it relates to Christians), was held by them in great veneration, and especially in the eastern parts honoured with all the public solemnities of religion. For the Gospel in those parts prevailing chiefly among the Jews, who were generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a great reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath, as that which had been appointed by God himself, as the memorial of his rest from the work of creation, settled by their great master Moses, and celebrated by their ancestors for so many ages, as the solemn



day of their public worship, and were, therefore, very unwilling that it should be wholly antiquated and laid aside.

For this reason it seemed good to the prudence of those times to indulge the humour of the Jews in this respect, as well as with regard to some other rites, and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices. Hence they usually had most parts of divine service performed upon that day;—they met together for public prayer, for reading the Scriptures, celebration of the sacraments, and other such duties. This is plain, not only from some passages in Ignatius and the *Constitutions*, but from writers of more unquestionable credit and authority. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (*Homil. de Sem. in init.*), tells us that they assembled on Saturdays, not that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath. And Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 8), speaking of the usual times of their public meeting, calls the Sabbath and the Lord's day the weekly festivals, on which the congregation was wont to meet in the church, for the performance of divine services. Therefore the Council of Laodicea (can. 16, 49, 51), among other things, decreed, that upon Saturday the Gospels and other Scriptures should be read; that in Lent, the eucharist should not be celebrated but upon Saturday and the Lord's day, and that upon those days only, in the time of Lent, it should be lawful to commemorate and rehearse the names of martyrs.

Upon this day, also, as well as upon Sunday, all fasts were severely prohibited (an infallible argument that they counted it a festival day), one Saturday in the year only excepted, namely, that before Easter-day, which was always observed as a solemn fast. But though the church thought fit thus far to correspond with the Jewish converts as solemnly to observe the Sabbath; yet, to take away all offence, and to vindicate themselves from compliance with Judaism, they openly declared that they did it only in a Christian way, and kept it not as a Jewish Sabbath, as is expressly affirmed by Athanasius (*Homil. de Sem.*), Nazianzen, and others. And the forementioned Laodicean synod has a canon (c. 29) to this purpose: “that Christians should not Judaize, and rest from all labour on the Sabbath, but follow their ordinary work (*i.e.*, so far as consisted with their attendance upon

the public assemblies), and should not entertain such thoughts of it, but that still they should prefer the Lord's day before it; and on that day rest as Christians; but if any were found to Judaize, they should be accursed."

Thus stood the case in the eastern churches; in those of the west we find it somewhat different. Amongst them, the Sabbath was not observed as a religious festival, but kept as a constant fast. The reason whereof (as given by Pope Innocent, in an epistle to the bishop of Eugubium, where he treats of this very case) seems most probable; if (says he) we commemorate Christ's resurrection not only at Easter, but every Lord's day, and fast upon Friday, because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy; the apostles themselves spending those two days (namely, Friday and the Sabbath) in great sorrow and heaviness; and he thinks no doubt ought to be made but that the apostles fasted upon those two days, whence the church had a tradition that the sacraments were not to be administered on those days, and therefore concludes that every Saturday, or Sabbath, ought to be kept a fast (*INNOCENT. Ep. ad Decium Eugubin. c. 4*). To the same purpose, the Council of Illiberis (can. 36) ordained, that a Saturday festival was an error that ought to be reformed, and that men ought to fast on every Sabbath. But, though this seems to have been the general practice, yet it did not obtain in all places of the west alike. In Italy itself, it was otherwise at Milan, where Saturday was a festival. (*PAULIN. in vit. Ambros.; AUGUSTIN. Ep. 118 ad Januar.*)

#### § 5.—OF ANNUAL FESTIVALS.

OF all the annual festivals of the Christian church, that of Easter is undoubtedly the most ancient; and this was originally used as a commemoration of both the death and the resurrection of our Saviour. The next, in point of antiquity, is Whitsunday. But perhaps this ought to be regarded rather as the close of the great Easter festival; for it appears that the whole space of seven weeks, or fifty days, from Easter to Whitsunday, was regarded as one continued festival, and celebrated without fasting and kneel-

ing. Perhaps Whitsuntide was not viewed as a distinct festival until after the introduction of that of the Ascension. It is well known that, for a considerable period, the church was miserably distracted by great and painful disputes respecting the particular day on which Easter ought to be kept<sup>7</sup>.

Traces of the commemorations of martyrs, in the third and fourth centuries, are extant. This is the case with respect to the

<sup>7</sup> "The state of the case was briefly this. The churches of Asia Minor kept their Easter upon the same day whereon the Jews celebrated their passover, namely, upon the fourteenth day of the first month (which always began with the appearance of the moon), mostly answering to our March; and this they did, upon what day of the week soever it fell, and hence were called *Quartodecimans*, because they kept Easter, *quarta decima Lune*, upon the fourteenth day after the *phôris* or appearance of the moon. The other churches, and especially those of the west, did not follow this custom, but kept Easter upon the Lord's day following the day of the Jewish passover, partly the more to honour the day, and partly to distinguish between Jews and Christians. The Asiatics pleaded for themselves the practice of the apostles; Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had lived and conversed with them, having kept it upon that day, together with St. John and the rest of the apostles, as Irenæus (who himself knew Polycarp, and doubtless had it from his own mouth) speaks, in a letter about this very thing, though himself was of the other side (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 24). And Polyrates, in a letter to the same purpose, instances not only in St. John, but in St. Philip the apostle, who himself and his whole family used to keep it, from whom it had been conveyed down in a constant and uninterrupted observance through all the bishops of those places, some whereof he there enumerates, and tells us that seven bishops of that place, in a con-

stant succession, had been his kinsmen, and himself the eighth, and that it had never been kept by them upon any other day. Tho other churches also (says EUSEBIUS, *ib.* c. 23), had for their patronage an apostolical tradition, or at least pretended to it, and were the much more numerous party. This difference was the cause of great disturbance in the church; for the bishops of Rome tried hard to impose their custom upon the eastern churches, whereupon Polycarp went to Rome to confer with Anicetus, who was then bishop, about it (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 14); and though they could not settle the matter, yet they parted fairly. After this, Pope Victor renewed the quarrel, and was so fierce and peremptory in the case, that he either actually did, or (as Valesius supposes, Annot. in EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 24) severely threatened to, excommunicate those eastern churches for standing out against it. . . . But the Arian bishops little regarded what was either said or done at Rome, and still went on in their old course . . . till the time of Constantine, who, finding this controversy, among others, much to disquiet the peace of the church, did, for this and some other reasons, summon the great Council of Nice, by which . . . Easter was ordained to be kept upon one and the same day throughout the world, not according to the custom of the Jews, but upon the Lord's day; and this decree was ratified and published by the imperial letters to all the churches." CAVE, *Primitive Christianity*, book i. ch. 7.

feast of the Innocents, which existed before that of Christmas. We have Homilies of Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nazianzum, which were preached at the feast of the Maccabees. The observance of St. Stephen's day is to be referred to the sixth or seventh century. The Greek church celebrated a feast of all the martyrs immediately after Whitsuntide.

The feast of the Nativity, or Christmas, was introduced during the fourth century. After the establishment of this festival, a kind of system was introduced, by which the different festivals of the church began to be regarded with reference to their object and meaning, rather than (as formerly) to their date and origin. At the close of the fourth century, we find a threefold cycle of sacred seasons, by which the personal history of our Saviour was represented in a kind of chronological order. Each of the three principal feasts represented some leading idea, and stood in connexion with other festivals before and after it, by way of a preparation or companion.

1. *Cycle of the Feast of the Nativity or Christmas.*—This cycle begins with the first Sunday in Advent, and ends with the Epiphany (January 6). In the interval between the beginning of the fifth and the end of the eighth century, many inferior festivals were established in connexion with this period. Such were—

St. Stephen's Day.

St. John the Evangelist's Day.

The Innocents' Day.

The Circumcision of Christ.

The Epiphany.

The Purification of the Virgin Mary.

2. *The Cycle of Easter.*—All the festivals in this cycle are closely connected with the personal history of our Lord. The commencement is made by Palm Sunday. The whole of the following week (*Hebdomas magna*), especially the last three days, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter Eve (*Sabbatum magnum*), was sacred (CHRYSOST. *Hom. in Ps. 115, sic de Hebdomade Magna*). The octave of Easter was *Dominica in albis*, i. e., *Sunday of white vestments*, because, on that day, which was observed with great solemnity, the neophytes, or persons newly

baptized, used to lay aside their white garments, and commit them to the repository of the church.

Easter was preceded by a fast, originally not of long duration, but subsequently extended to forty days. It appears to have been at first a voluntary fast, for the space of forty hours; but liberty in this respect was gradually abridged. Abstinence was enjoined as a sacred duty, not only upon the penitents and catechumens, but upon the faithful. In the fifth and sixth centuries, the term of this fast was fixed at thirty-six days; a space of time regarded as a tenth of the whole year, and hence called *Decimatio anni*. It is uncertain when the number of days was extended to forty (*Quadragesima*). Some refer the change to Gregory the Great (in the sixth century), and others to Gregory II. (in the eighth). Ash Wednesday (*dies cinerum*) is the first day of this fast, and Easter Eve the last.

3. *Cycle of Whitsuntide*.—The two former cycles include the whole history of our Saviour upon earth, from the day of his birth to the moment in which he showed himself alive to his disciples and friends after his resurrection. This third cycle represents the Saviour ascended into heaven, and seated on the right hand of God, fulfilling his promise of sending the Holy Ghost, and governing the church as its invisible, but almighty, head. It begins with the feast of the Ascension, and ends with the octave of Whitsunday.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### OF FASTS.

#### § 1.—PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

The doctrine and practice of our Lord and his apostles respecting fasting may be thus described. Our Saviour neglected the observance of those stated Jewish fasts which had been superadded to the Mosaic law, and introduced especially after the captivity, to which the Pharisees paid scrupulous attention (Matt. xi. 18, 19); and he represented such observances as inconsistent with the genius of his religion, (Matt. ix. 14—18; and parallel passages,

Mark ii. 15—22; Luke v. 33—39.) The practice of voluntary and occasional fasting he neither prohibited nor enjoined; he spoke of it, however, as being not unsuitable on certain occasions, nor without its use in certain cases (Matt. ix. 15; xvii. 21); he fasted himself on a great and solemn occasion (Matt. iv. 2); and he warned his disciples against all ostentatious and hypocritical observances of this kind (Matt. vi. 16—18). The doctrine of the apostles on this subject was to the same purport, neither commanding the practice of fasting, nor denouncing it as unlawful, unless either the observance or omission should involve a breach of some moral and Christian duty (Rom. xiv. 14—22; Col. ii. 16—23; 1 Tim. iv. 3—5). In practice, the apostles joined fasting with prayer, on solemn occasions (Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23).

It does not appear that much value was attached to the practice of fasting in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. In the *Shepherd of Hermas* it is spoken of in disparaging terms. “Nothing is done, nothing is gained, for virtue by bodily abstinence; rather so fast, that you do no wrong, and harbour no evil passion in your heart.” It appears rather singular that we find so little notice taken of fasting by the writers of the first centuries, if we take into account the spirit of the times, and especially the doctrines of Montanus, the tenets of the new Platonic school, and the progress of Gnosticism, which taught that matter was essentially evil. But it seems that the observance of fasts was introduced into the church, slowly and by degrees. We learn from Justin Martyr that fasting was joined with prayer at Ephesus in the administration of baptism; which is worthy of being remarked as an early addition to the original institution. In the second century, in the time of Victor and Irenæus, it had become usual to fast before Easter; and Clement of Alexandria speaks of weekly fasts. Tertullian (a Montanist) in his treatise *De Jejunio*, complains heavily of the little attention paid by the Catholic church to the practice of fasting; and hereby gives us to understand that, in his days, a large portion of orthodox Christians exercised in this matter that liberty of judgment which had been sanctioned by the apostles. Origen, in his voluminous writings, adverts to the subject only once; namely, in his tenth

homily on Leviticus. And here he speaks in accordance with the apostolical doctrine. It appears, however, from his observations, that at Alexandria Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as fast-days; on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday, and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the church at the end of the fourth century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: "In the whole Christian church the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour [*i.e.*, three o'clock in the afternoon]; except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, in which it is usual neither to kneel nor to fast at all. Besides this, there is no fasting on the Epiphany or Nativity, if those days should fall on a Wednesday or Friday. But those persons who especially devote themselves to religious exercises (the monks) fast also at other times when they please, except on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. It is also the practice of the church to observe the forty days' fast before the sacred week. But on Sundays there is no fasting, even during the last-mentioned period (comp. *Doctr. de fide*)." But even at this late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the church, and its observance was altogether voluntary. This fasting consisted, at first, in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon. A custom was afterwards introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water.

#### § 2.—PRACTICE OF LATER TIMES.

BUT fasting, after a time, ceased to be a voluntary exercise. By the second canon of the Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one who should neglect to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the church. The eighth Council of Toledo, in the seventh century (can. 9), condemns any who should eat flesh during the fast before Easter, and says that such offenders deserve

to be forbidden the use of it throughout the year. In the eighth century, fasting began to be regarded as a meritorious work; and the breach of the observance, at the stated seasons, subjected the offender to excommunication. In later times, some persons who ate flesh during the appointed seasons of abstinence were punished with the loss of their teeth (BARONIUS, *Annal. ad. an.* 1018).

Afterwards, however, these severities were, to a certain extent, relaxed. Instead of the former limitation of diet on fast-days to bread, salt and water, permission was given for the use of all kinds of food, except flesh, eggs, cheese, and wine. Then eggs, cheese, and wine, were allowed, flesh only being prohibited; an indulgence which was censured by the Greek church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Western. In the thirteenth century, a cold collation in the evening of fast-days was permitted.

The following are the fasts which generally obtained in the church: —

1. *The annual fast* of forty days before Easter or *the season of Lent*. The duration of this fast at first was only forty hours (TERTULL. *de Jejun.* c. 2, 13; IRENEUS *ap.* EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 24). In the time of Gregory the Great, this fast extended to thirty-six days; and by that pontiff, or by Gregory II., in the eighth century, it was extended to forty days, the duration of the recorded fasts of Moses, Elias, and our blessed Saviour (Exod. xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8; Matt. iv. 2). Hence the term *Quadragesima* (forty), which had been already used to denote this period, became strictly applicable. Concerning the gradual extension of this fast, see SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 19. Basil the Great, Ambrose, and Leo the Great speak of this quadragesimal fast as a divine institution; but this can mean no more than that the fast was observed in imitation of the example of the divine Redeemer.

2. *Quarterly fasts*; no traces of which occur before the fifth century; although Bellarmin (*De bonis operibus* lib. ii. c. 19) pretends that the three first of these fasts were instituted in the time of the apostles, and the last by Pope Calixtus, A. D. 224.



3. *A fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension*, introduced by Mamereus, bishop of Vienne, in the middle of the fifth century. In some places it was not celebrated until after Whitsuntide. It was called *Jejunium Rogationum*, or *Jejunium Litaniarum*, the Fast of Rogations or Litanies, on account of certain litanies sung on these days.

“About the middle of the fifth century, there was a new fast begun in France by Mamereus, bishop of Vienne, under the name of the *Litany or Rogation days*, which were the three days immediately before Ascension day, in the middle of Pentecost. The affixing of a fast to those days was altogether new; because heretofore the whole fifty days of Pentecost were one entire festival, and all fasting and kneeling were prohibited at this time. Supplications or litanies were in use before upon extraordinary occasions, but Mamereus was the first that fixed them to these days, as Sidonius Apollinaris informs us (lib. v. ep. 14; lib. vii. ep. 1).

“The words *λιτανεῖται* and *λίται*, *Litanies*, in Latin *Supplications* and *Rogationes*, in their original signification, are but another name for prayers in general, of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church, or by any private person. See EUSEB. *Vit. Const.* lib. i. c. 14; lib. iv. c. 61; CHRYSOST. *Hom. antequam iret in Exilium; Hom. 3 in Coloss.; Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. v., *de hæreticis* l. 30.” (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xxi. c. 2, § 8; and xiii. l. 10.) Such a litany as that established by Mamereus was called *Litania Major*, to distinguish it, as Bingham supposes, from the shorter form *Kyrie eleison*, or the *Litania Minor*. Gregory the Great instituted a greater litany at Rome, to be celebrated yearly on the twenty-fifth of April, which was called *Litania Septiformis*, from the circumstance that the church was ordered, on that occasion, to go in procession in seven distinct classes. These classes were arranged in the following order: first, the clergy, then the laymen, monks, virgins, married women, widows, the poor, and the children.

4. *Monthly fasts.* A fast-day in every month, except July and August. (*Concil. Illiberit.* can. 23; *Turon.* ii. can. 18, 19.)

5. *Fasts before festivals*; in the place of the ancient vigils, which were abolished in the fifth century.

6. *Weekly fasts*, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled *Stationes*<sup>1</sup>, from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called *statio* by the Romans. These fasts were not so strictly observed as some others, and were altogether omitted between Easter and Whitsuntide. The observance was enjoined especially upon the clergy and monks (*Constit. Apost.* v. 15; *Can. Apost.* 69). By the Council of Elvira, c. 26, at the beginning of the fourth century, Saturday was added to the weekly fasts; and this led to the gradual neglect of the Wednesday fast in the Western church.

The stations, or fasts on stationary days, terminated at three o'clock in the afternoon<sup>2</sup>; whence Tertullian calls them *half-fasts* (*semijejunia stationum*, *De Jejun.* c. 13). When a fast was continued the whole day, it was entitled *Jejunium*, or *jejunium perfectum*; and when it lasted until the morning of the following day, or for several days together, it was distinguished by the title *superpositio* (*ὑπέρθεις*). The latter kind of fast was commonly observed during the great week, or week before Easter; but it was not strictly peculiar to that season. It exceeded the others not only in point of time, but by the observance of additional austerities, such as the *ξηροφαγία*, or *living on dry food*, namely, bread, salt, and water, taken only in the evening.

7. There were also *occasional fasts*, appointed by ecclesiastical authority, in times of great danger, emergency, or distress. (CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 8, § 1; 57, § 3; TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 40; *de Jejun.* c. 13.)

<sup>1</sup> Stationum dies. TERTULL. *de Orat.*—Stationibus quartam et sextam Sabbati dicamus. *Id. de Jejunio.*—Τῆς νηστείας . . . τῆς τετραΐδος καὶ τῆς παρασκευῆς. CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* Lib. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Non ultra nonam detinendum. TERTULL. *de Jejunio.*—Quando et orationes fere nona hora concludat de Petri exemplo quod [Act x. refertur. *Ib.* c. 2.

## CHAPTER III.

## A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE DATE, NAMES, AND HISTORY OF ANCIENT FESTIVALS AND HOLY DAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

IN entering upon a more close examination of the date, names, and history of the several annual festivals of the early church, and of those which, having generally obtained during the middle ages, have been retained in our calendar, it will be convenient to arrange the whole, as usual, in two classes, namely, *Moveable* and *Immoveable*.

## I. MOVEABLE FEASTS AND HOLY DAYS, SUNDAYS, AND OTHER DAYS AND SEASONS IN CONNEXION WITH THEM.

Advent.

Septuagesima.

Sexagesima.

Quinquagesima.

Ash Wednesday.

Quadragesima, and the four following Sundays.

Palm Sunday.

Maunday Thursday.

Good Friday.

Easter Eve (*Sabbatum Magnum*).

Easter Day.

Sundays after Easter.

Ascension Day.

Whitsunday.

Trinity Sunday.

## II. IMMOVEABLE FEASTS AND HOLY DAYS.

*January.*

1. The Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ.
6. The Epiphany.
25. The Conversion of St. Paul.

*February.*

2. The Presentation of Christ in the Temple; or, the Purification of St. Mary the Virgin.
24. Saint Matthias's Day.

*March.*

25. The Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary.

*April.*

25. Saint Mark's Day.

*May.*

1. Saint Philip and Saint James's Day.

*June.*

11. Saint Barnabas the Apostle.
24. Saint John Baptist's Day.
29. Saint Peter and Saint Paul's Day.

*July.*

25. Saint James the Apostle.

*August.*

24. Saint Bartholomew the Apostle.

*September.*

21. Saint Matthew the Apostle.
29. Saint Michael and all Angels.

*October.*

18. Saint Luke the Evangelist.
28. Saint Simon and Saint Jude, Apostles.

*November.*

1. All Saints' Day.
30. Saint Andrew's Day.

*December.*

21. Saint Thomas the Apostle.
25. Nativity of our Lord, or Christmas-Day.
26. Saint Stephen's Day.
27. Saint John the Evangelist's Day.
28. The Innocents' Day.

*Advent<sup>1</sup>.*

Some writers claim a very high antiquity for the distinction of this season, and even trace its institution to the apostolic age; referring to the authority of Tertullian (*adv. Judæos*), and Cyprian (*Tractat. 4 de Idolor. vanitate; lib. 2, adv. Judæos*). But those passages refer to the doctrine of the church, and not to any season of solemn preparation for the celebration of our Saviour's nativity. Maximus Taurinensis, a writer of the fifth century, is the first who bears witness to the observance of Advent; and even this can be affirmed only on the supposition that the two homilies *De Adventu Domini* are really his production, and not, as has been supposed, the work of a later hand. We have, however, a more certain testimony at the beginning of the sixth century; *Conc. Ilrdens. A.D. 524; conf. Decretal. xxxiii. 9, 4.*—The computation according to which Advent always begins between the 26th of November and the 4th of December, adopted by the whole western church, has been retained by Protestants.—Formerly the Sundays of Advent were reckoned in an order the reverse of that which obtains at present; so that our Advent Sunday was called the fourth Sunday in Advent; and our fourth Sunday was called Advent Sunday. (*AMALAB. lib. iii. De Officio Eccles. cap. 40.*)

*Septuagesima Sunday.*

The third Sunday before Lent, or the Sunday following the last of those after Epiphany, is called Septuagesima (the Latin numeral denoting *seventieth*). According to Durandus, this name was given to it by the Roman bishop Telesphorus, in the second century. But Bede and Menin account for the appellation more satisfactorily by supposing it to have been adopted with reference to the previously existing title Quadragesima (*fortieth*), designating the first Sunday in Lent; and although there are not

<sup>1</sup> Habet nomen ab adventu Christi in carnem. Etsi enim hoc die Christus homo factus non sit, institutum tamen hoc festum, ut toto hoc tempore, quod est ab hoc die ad Natalem Domini usque, præparentur Christianorum animi ad sobriam vitam pianque meditationem Nativitatis Christi. HOSPINIUS, *De Origine Fest.*

ten days between each Sunday, yet the round numbers were adopted for the sake of convenience, and as being more striking than others. Some writers have regarded this addition of three introductory weeks to the season of Lent as a financial speculation of the bishop of Rome; his design being (as they imagine), to increase his revenue by extending the term of receiving application for his dispensations. The whole week preceding the Sunday was called *Septuagesima*; and was called also *Carnis prævium*.

*Sexagesima Sunday.*

The origin of this title may be understood from what has been said under the foregoing head. *Sexagesima* is the Latin numeral denoting *sixtieth*.

*Quinquagesima Sunday.*

Since it was not the custom of the church to fast on the Sundays during Lent (Sunday being always regarded as a feast), and hence the six weeks of Lent did not constitute a fast of forty days, it was thought right to include the preceding week in the period of the fast, in order to complete the stated period of time; and, inasmuch as the first Sunday of Lent was called *Quadragesima*, because from that day to Good Friday inclusive there was a space of forty days, hence the foregoing Sunday received the name of the next round number, *Quinquagesima* (*fiftieth*), although it was not quite fifty days distant from the end of the fast. This Sunday was sometimes termed *Quinquagesima Pœnitentiæ*, in order to distinguish it from the other *Quinquagesima*, or interval between Easter and Whitsuntide, *Quinquagesima Paschalis* or *latitiæ*.

This Sunday received also the appellation *Esto mihi* from the first words of the Introit, *Esto mihi in Deum protectorem*, &c., Ps. lxxi. 13, vers. Ital.

*Ash Wednesday.*

The first day of Lent, or the forty days' fast preceding Easter, is now commonly called *Ash Wednesday* (*dies cinerum, caput jejunii*). Some explanation of the name of this day, and infor-

mation respecting the date of its observance, would be clearly ascertained if the remark of Bellarmin (*De Penitentia*, lib. i. c. 22) were correct, that, as early as the beginning of the fifth century, the council of Agde made a canon to the effect that penitents should appear publicly before the congregation on the first day of the Quadragesimal fast, in the habit of mourners, *i. e.*, with ashes on their heads. It is certain, indeed, that the custom of wearing sackcloth and ashes in mourning, and as a token of penitence, passed from the Jews to the early Christians (TERTULL. *Lib. de Penitent.* c. 9; CYPRIAN. *de Lapsis ad fin.*; AMBROSIIUS *in Tractatu ad Virginem lapsam*). But there is no proof of so early a distinction of Ash Wednesday in the service of the church, as that for which Bellarmin contends. Gratian, upon whose authority the assertion of that writer rests, must have taken his account from later sources; for there is no trace of such a canon in the acts of the council of Agde, and the ceremonies described are in accordance with the practice of subsequent centuries. It appears also that the observances prescribed to penitents were not limited to the season of Lent. A homily ascribed to Maximus Taurinensis, who lived in the early part of the fifth century, is entitled, *In diem cinerum*; but there is little doubt that, even if the homily itself proceeded from that writer, the title was added by a later hand.

There is another custom of the Romish church from which the designation of Ash Wednesday may be derived with greater probability. On that day it is usual for a priest to consecrate a certain quantity of ashes, and to sprinkle them over the heads of the officiating clergy and the whole congregation, pronouncing at the same time the following admonition, “*Memento quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris,*” *i. e.*, “Remember that dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.” And it is from this office that many antiquarian writers, Romish as well as Protestant, derive the appellation of Ash Wednesday. These writers agree in regarding Gregory the Great (towards the end of the sixth century) as the founder of the day, and of the custom of consecrating the ashes (*incineratio*). (See HOSPINIUS. *de Origine et progressu festorum*; HILDEBRAND. *Libellus de diebus festis*; CALVOERIUS. *in Ritual. Eccles.* part ii. sect. 2; MITTWOCH. *in Dissert.*

*de Capite Jejunii.*) The instituted observance was, however, but partially adopted at first; and it was not until towards the end of the twelfth century (A.D. 1191), that it was universally established, by Pope Cœlestin III.

*Quadragesima and the four following Sundays.*

The first Sunday in Lent is sometimes called Quadragesima (the Latin numeral denoting *fortieth*), because, as has been already observed, it is the fortieth day before Good Friday, reckoning each inclusively.

This day is also sometimes called *Invocavit*, from the first word of the Introit, *Invocavit me et exaudium cum, &c.*, Ps. xci. 15

The second Sunday in Lent is sometimes entitled *Reminiscere*, from the first word of the Introit, Ps. xxv. 6.

The third is called *Oculi*, from the first word of the Introit, Ps. xxv. 15.

The fourth and fifth Sundays are in like manner respectively denominated *Lætare*, and *Judica*, from the first words of their Introits, Isa. liv. 1, and Ps. xliii. 1.

*Palm Sunday.*

The last Sunday in Lent, or Sunday before Easter, is called Palm Sunday, in commemoration of our Saviour's public entrance into Jerusalem and the circumstances attending it.

Palm Sunday appears to have been distinguished in the Greek church as early as the fourth century; and to have been celebrated as a festival (*έορτή*), as we learn from Epiphanius. The writings of the Greek fathers contain various incidental allusions to the celebration of this day. The date assigned in *ASSEMANI Biblioth. Orient.* tom. i. p. 23, *seq.*, for the introduction of this festival,—namely, the year 498,—appears to be too late.

The Western church does not present any trace of the observance of Palm Sunday until some centuries after it had been introduced in the East. Hildebrand (*De diebus festis*) affirms indeed that mention of the day occurs in the writings of Maximus, bishop of Turin, about the middle of the fifth century. He refers, however, merely to a title of one of the Homilies of



that writer; and it is evident that the title was appended by some more modern hand to a homily which contains no reference to the day in question, and is no other than a discourse on the twenty-second Psalm. We do not find any homily for the day, or any allusion to it, in the writings of Leo, Augustin, Chrysologus, or Cæsar of Arles. In short there are no signs of it in any records of the Latin church during the first six centuries. Some allusions to this festival occur in the epistles of Ambrose (especially in *Ep. 33 ad Uxorem*); but Bede is the first writer who expressly records its observance. In the age of Charlemagne, Palm Sunday was universally celebrated.—The title, in modern ecclesiastical language, is not *Festum palmarum*, but rather *Dominica Palmarum*, or in *Palms*,—in *ramis palmarum et olivarum*.—In the Romish church this day has received various other appellations, arising from particular customs and observances.—During the middle ages, it was usual for a priest to be led in procession mounted on the figure of an ass, in imitation of our Saviour's entering into Jerusalem. This custom has been abolished; but the day continues to be distinguished in Roman Catholic countries by the use of branches of palms, or other trees, carried in procession, with prescribed ceremonies.

#### *Munday Thursday.*

The origin of this day has been referred by many antiquarian writers to the seventh century. But it appears to have been of much earlier institution. It is evident from *Conc. Carthay. iii. A.D. 397, c. 27*, and *AUGUST. Ep. 118 ad Januarium*, that the day was observed, as early as the fifth century, by the solemn celebration of the Lord's supper connected with the ceremony of the washing of feet (*pedilavium*). Augustin speaks of the celebration of the Lord's supper as being the more ancient and general custom, and of the *pedilavium* as of later introduction and more partial observance.

In early times this day was distinguished by the following circumstances:—

1. A general and solemn celebration of the Lord's supper.
2. The candidates for baptism (*competentes*) publicly recited

the creed in the presence of the bishop or presbyters, and underwent an examination. This act was designated by the phrase *redditio symboli*. (AMBROSIUS *Ep.* 33; *Conc. Carthag.* iv. (A. D. 399) c. 24; *Conc. Bracar.* ii. A. D. 563, can. 1; *Conc. Agathens.* (A. D. 506) c. 13; *Conc. Laod.* (A. D. 361) c. 46.)

3. In many places this day was distinguished by the celebration of the *communio servorum*; because other persons chose rather to communicate on the following Easter day, and slaves were not admitted to the Lord's table on the higher festivals. (MOSCHI *Pratum Spirituale*, c. 79.)

4. The ceremony of the washing of feet, in imitation of the act of our blessed Lord, recorded in the thirteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, was connected with the celebration of the eucharist on this occasion. This observance does not appear to have become at any time quite universal in the Western church; although it was made a question whether it did not even partake of the nature of a sacrament. More importance was attached to it in the Greek church.

5. Several canons of Gallican councils held in the sixth century, forbid Jews to appear in public during the interval from this day to Easter-Monday. (*Conc. Aurelian.* (A. D. 540) c. 23; *Conc. Matiscon.* (A. D. 582) c. 14.)

This day has been distinguished by several appellations, alluding, for the most part, to the history or ceremonies attached to it. Such are,—

1. Dies cœnæ Dominicæ;—feria quinta in cœna Dominica;—in cœna Domini.

2. Eucharistia, or Dies natalis eucharistiæ; with reference to Matt. xxvi. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xi. 24. Conf. JUSTIN. MART. *Apol.* 2; CYPRIAN. *Ep.* x. 11; TERTULL. *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3; *Conc. Nic.* c. 13, 15.

3. Natalis calicis.

4. Dies panis.

5. Dies lucis:—with allusion to the lights used at the institution of the Lord's supper, or to the light of religious knowledge.

6. Dies mandati; with reference to our Saviour's command

to his disciples concerning the perpetual commemoration of his death; or to his “new commandment” to love one another. Hence the term *Maunday*.

7. *Dies viridium*. This title appears to have been adopted during the middle ages; but antiquarians have been much perplexed in their attempts to account for it. Perhaps it may have been given with reference to the appearance of spring.

### *Good Friday.*

In the earliest ages of the church the day of our Lord’s crucifixion was religiously observed, not independently, but as a part of the sacred season of Easter, which was celebrated by Christians in the room of the Jewish passover, in commemoration at once of the death and the resurrection of Christ. Hence the terms *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον* and *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*, *passover of the crucifixion*, and *passover of the resurrection*. A separate observance of this day, distinguished by a peculiar character, was established in the course of the second and following centuries. (TERTULL. *ad Uxor.* lib. ii.; ORIGEN. *contr. Cels.* lib. viii.; AUGUST. *Ep. ad Januar.*)—Constantine the Great, expressly commanded the solemn celebration of the day of the crucifixion (EUSEB. *de Vita Constant. M.* lib. iv. c. 18; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 8). And when, in the seventh century, this religious observance was found to be altogether neglected in Spain, it was expressly established in that country by the fourth council of Toledo (can. 7, 8).

This sacred day has been distinguished by various titles, in different times and places. Such are the following:—

1. *Πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, i. e., *the passover of the crucifixion*. This was its earliest appellation.

2. *Σωτηρία*, *dies salutaris*, i. e., *the day of salvation*.

3. *Dies absolutionis*, *the day of absolution*; on account of the solemn declaration of the forgiveness of sins, and the custom of absolving penitents from ecclesiastical penalties. Thus Ambrose says (*Ep.* 33), *Erat dies, quo sese Dominus pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia penitentia relaxatur*.

4. *Cœna pura*. This expression, which occurs in Irenæus, refers not to the celebration of the Lord’s supper, but to the

completeness of the fast; in which sense it is used also by Tertullian.

5. *Παρασκευή*, *parascève*, *the preparation*. This term was adopted by the early church, with reference to the Jewish ritual.

6. *Good Friday*; with reference to the divine goodness and mercy displayed in the redemption of mankind by the death of Christ. In like manner, the Jews called the great day of atonement יום טוב *the good day*.

7. Among the Saxons, *long Friday*; probably with allusion to the length of the fast.

This day was distinguished by the following observances:—

i. A strict fast (*Ep. Dionys; Conc. Tolet.* iv. (A.D. 633) c. 7, 8).

ii. Absolution of penitents.

iii. In very early times, the history of our Lord's passion was read on this day out of the Gospel of St. John only, instead of the harmonies of the gospel, as usual at other times.

iv. In later times, this day was distinguished by the omission of Doxologies, Introits, and the like, in the course of divine service; by the silence of music and bells; by the omission of customary genuflexions, in order to avoid imitating the act of the Jews recorded in Matt. xxvii. 29; and by a similar omission of the sacred kiss and embrace (*φίλημα ἄγιον καὶ ἀσπασμός*) at the celebration of the Lord's supper, in order to avoid an imitation of the kiss of Judas (Matt. xxvi. 48, 49).

v. The Lord's supper was celebrated. The elements, however, were not consecrated on this day, but on the day before. (*Præsanctificatio, missa præsanctificationum, sicca.*)

vi. Communion-tables and reading-desks were stripped of their ornaments.

vii. In the middle ages, the solemn event of the day was imitated in processions and dramatic representations;—a custom in accordance neither with the practice of the ancient church, nor with good christian feeling.

#### *Easter Eve. (Sabbatum Magnum.)*

The seventh day of the week before Easter received at a very early period the title of *Sabbatum Magnum*, the great or high

Sabbath; partly perhaps in imitation of the Jewish institution, and partly in token of respect for the time in which our Saviour lay in the grave. This was the only Jewish Sabbath which was (eventually) retained by the church, and distinguished by peculiar solemnities. Tertullian seems to allude to it, in lib. ii. *ad Uxorem*. The day is spoken of under its appropriate title in *Const. Apost.* lib. v. c. 18; CHRYSOSTOM, *Ep.* 1 *ad Innocent.*; and by other writers of the fourth century.

This day was distinguished by the following observances:—

1. A strict fast. This was at first voluntarily undertaken, with reference to the words of our Saviour, Matt. ix. 15. It was afterwards regulated by laws and institutions of the church. (TERTULL., *de Jejun.* c. 2; AUGUST., *Epist.* 86 *ad Consul.*; AMBROS., *Orat.* 1 *de Jejun.*; *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 18; *Conc. Trull.* c. 88;—CONF. WERNSDORF., *de Veteris Ecclesie Jejunii Prædicatione Paschali Religione.*)

2. A nocturnal assembly for worship,—the Easter Vigil.—This service is mentioned by the earliest writers, and is to be reckoned among the first of all that were established among Christians. It appears, from the testimony of Lactantius and Jerome, that the early Christians expected the second coming of our Lord on this night, and prepared themselves by fasting, prayer, and other spiritual exercises, for that great event. In the time of Constantine and Theodosius the Great, this vigil was celebrated with great solemnity. Eusebius (*de Vita Constant. M.* lib. iv. c. 22, *conf.* c. 57) describes the splendour of the illumination which took place on this occasion. (CONF. GREG. NAZIANZ., *Orat.* 42; GREG. NYSSEN., *Orat.* 4; SOCRAT., *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 5.)

The observance of this ceremony soon gave rise to abuses of considerable magnitude (TERTULL., *ad Uxorem*, lib. ii. c. 4). As early as the fourth century women were forbidden to be present at all vigils whatsoever (*Conc. Illiberit.* (A.D. 305) c. 35). Vigilantius inveighed against nocturnal religious solemnities in general (but with an exception in favour of the Easter vigil), on the ground of their being injurious to the morals of youth and the female sex; but he was strenuously opposed in this matter by Jerome (*adv. Vigilantium*). Complaints, however, continued

to increase, until at length the custom was abolished (*Conc. Antissiodor.* (A.D. 578) c. 3).—In the Greek church, the celebration of the Easter vigil has continued, and is attended with great solemnity. (G. H. GÖTZE, *Vigilie Paschales Veterum Christian.*; —KRAUSE *Diatribē de Perivigilio Paschalis ἀναστασίμων*; —WERNSDORF. *de Constantini M. Religione Paschali ab Euseb. de Vita Const. M.*)

The Easter vigil was distinguished

i. By the lighting of a colossal taper (*cereus paschalis*), signifying the resurrection of the Lord and the consequent rejoicing of the church. Perhaps this ceremony was a remnant of the solemnities of the time of Constantine; but there is no clear trace of its existence earlier than the sixth century.

ii. By the baptism of catechumens; particularly in the Greek church. This custom was prevalent towards the end of the fourth century (CHRYSOSTOM. *Ep. 1 ad Innocent.*; PALLADIUS *Vita Jo. Chrysost.* c. 9). It was usual also, on this occasion, to consecrate the water which was to be afterwards used in baptism.

iii. By the reading of proper lessons (lectiones or prophetiæ), which took place immediately before the celebration of baptism, or the consecration of the baptismal water. The number of these lessons varied in different countries; being in some places four, in others twelve, fourteen, or even twenty-four.

#### *Easter Day.*

The great fact of our Lord's resurrection, which forms the key-stone of our religion, and the foundation of Christian hope, was celebrated by an annual festival, as well as by the weekly observance of the Lord's day, in the earliest ages of the church. This festival received, as has been already stated, the title of *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*, the pascha or passover of the resurrection, to distinguish it from the preceding Friday, or *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*. In a short time, however, the term pascha was limited to the day of the resurrection (although not with strict propriety of meaning); and then again, subsequently, it was employed to designate the whole period of the Easter festival.

The modern name Easter is derived, probably, from the old

Saxon *oster*, to rise, or German *urstand*, resurrection; or, as is more generally supposed, from the name of a Saxon goddess.

This day was distinguished in early times by—

1. A solemn celebration of the Lord's supper.
2. The baptism of catechumens.
3. Appropriate salutations, and demonstrations of joy.
4. The liberation of prisoners (CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* 30 *in Gen.*); with certain exceptions. (*Cod. Theod.* l. ix. tit. 35. leg. 3; *Cod. Justin.* l. i. tit. 4, leg. 3.)
5. The manumission of slaves. (*Cod. Justin.* l. iii. tit. 12, l. 8; *conf Cod. Theodos.* l. ii. tit. 8.)
6. A general holiday to slaves, throughout the week, in order to give them an opportunity of attending the services of the church. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 34 *De resurrectione Jesu Christi*; *Conc. Trull.* c. 66.)
7. The heathen were forbidden to celebrate public spectacles and the like, in order that the devotions of Christians might not be interrupted. (*Cod. Theodos.* l. xv. tit. 5.) And, in like manner, it was afterwards made a law that no Jew should approach a church, or even appear in public among Christians, from Maunday Thursday to Easter day inclusive. (*Conc. Aurel.* ii. (A.D. 533) c. 25.)

8. One great distinction conferred upon this high festival was the connexion established between this and many other sacred days, so that it was made to regulate the times of their celebration.

After considerable disputes, as we have already seen, the time of the celebration of Easter was fixed to the Lord's day next after the full moon happening upon or immediately after the vernal equinox; with a provision that if the full moon should happen upon a Sunday, Easter day should be the Sunday after; hereby avoiding the possibility of the Christian festival being coincident with the Jewish passover. This regulation of the Council of Nicæa is not, however, to be found among its canons; but it appears to have been communicated to the several dioceses by letters. (SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 9.) Wheatly indeed tells us that Constantine caused "a canon to be passed at this council, that everywhere the great feast of Easter should be observed on

one and the same day; and that not on the day of the Jewish passover, but, as had been generally observed, upon the Sunday afterwards. And that this dispute might never arise again, these paschal canons were then established, namely,—

“1. That the one-and-twentieth day of March shall be accounted the vernal equinox.

“2. That the full moon happening upon, or next after, the one-and-twentieth day of March, shall be taken for the full moon of Nisan.

“3. That the Lord’s day next following that full moon be Easter day.

“4. But if the full moon happen upon a Sunday, Easter day shall be the Sunday after.”

Upon this passage Dr. Waterland has made the following remarks, in a MS. note:—“There are no such canons among the Nicene, nor does it anywhere appear that the Nicene fathers were thus particular; if they had, there could scarce have been such variety as was afterwards seen in the several churches. All I think that the Nicene fathers did was to prohibit the rule of the Quartodecimans, and to determine in favour of those who kept Easter always on a Sunday; enjoining the whole church to observe one rule, and to keep the same day, leaving it to the Alexandrians every year to point out the day, and then to publish it. The canons, however, or rules here mentioned, are such as the Alexandrian calculations then and before went upon; and such as the western churches at length came into, after the time of Dionysius Exiguus.”

The whole space of fifteen days, consisting of Easter day and the week before and after, was known, as early as the fourth century, by the name of the great week (*ἑβδομάς μεγάλη*; *hebdomas magna*; *septimana major*). “The ancients,” says Bingham, “commonly included fifteen days in the whole solemnity of the pasch, that is, the week before Easter Sunday, and the week following it: the one of which was called pascha *σταυρώσιμον*, *the pasch of the cross*, and the other pascha *ἀναστάσιμον*, *the pasch of the resurrection*. Suicerus will furnish the learned reader with examples of both. The general name pascha, which is of Hebrew extract, from פסח, which signifies the passover,



will include both. For the Christian passover includes as well the passion as the resurrection of our Saviour, who is the true paschal Lamb, or passover, that was sacrificed for us. And, therefore, though our English word Easter be generally used only to signify the resurrection, yet the ancient word pascha was taken in a large sense, to denote, as well the pasch of the crucifixion, as the pasch of the resurrection. And for this reason, the ancients commonly speak of the pasch as containing fifteen days in its solemnity, including the passion week, together with that of the resurrection." *Antiq.* b. xx. c. 5, § 1.

The *great week* of the fourth century corresponded, therefore, to our *passion week* and *Easter week* combined.

### *Sundays after Easter.*

The Octave or first Sunday after Easter day, has received various appellations. Such are the following:—

1. *Dominica in Albis*; because on this day those persons who had been baptized at Easter laid aside the white robes which they then received. These robes were laid up in the church, as evidences of their baptismal profession.

2. *Dies Neophytorum*; because the newly-baptized were on this day introduced to the congregation as actual members of the church.

3. *Quinquagesima* (or *quinquagesima lætitiæ*); because fifty days were reckoned from this day to the octave of Whitsuntide.

4. Ἀντίπασχα, *Anti-pascha*, *i. e.*, the Sunday after Easter.

5. *Pascha clausum*; *i. e.*, the close of Easter. Hence, perhaps, by corruption, our term, *Low Sunday*.

6. *Octava Infantium*; with reference to the newly-baptized as born of God. "Vos, qui baptizati estis, et hodie completis Sacramentum Octavarum vestrum, infantes appellamini, quoniam regenerati et ad æternam vitam renati estis." (AUGUSTIN. *Serm. de Diversis* xi.)

7. *Quasimodogeniti*; the term usually adopted by foreign Protestants; although of comparatively late origin, and peculiar to the western church. It is derived from the Latin version of 1 Pet. ii. 2, Quasi modo geniti infantes, as new-born babes, &c.

The other Sundays from Easter to Whitsuntide, which we reckon as the second, third, &c., Sundays after Easter, are sometimes distinguished also by titles taken from the first words of their introits; namely, *Misericordias Domini* (Ps. xxxiii. 5),—*Jubilate* (Ps. lxxvi. 2),—*Cantate* (Ps. xcvi. 1),—*Rogate* (*Cantic.* ii. 14, or *Isa.* xlviii. 20), or *Ad rocem jucunditatis*,—and *Exaudi* (Ps. xxvii. 7).

*Ascension Day.*

No mention of the celebration of this day occurs in the writings of the earliest fathers, *e. g.*, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, or Cyprian. It is remarkable, also, that Origen does not include it in his list of Christian festivals (*contr. Cels.* lib. viii. c. 21, 23). And the earliest notice of its celebration is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 33), where it is ordered that slaves should rest from their labours on the day of the Ascension (*τὴν ἀνάληψιν*). It is not improbable, therefore, that this festival was established during the latter half of the third century. The fact of its observance in the course of the fourth century is evident. If the oration ascribed to Epiphanius, entitled *εἰς τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *On the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ*, be genuine, it furnishes a proof that this festival was celebrated in the island of Cyprus about the middle of that century. Chrysostom refers to this festival: in one of his Homilies he says expressly, “We have lately celebrated the crucifixion, the passion, the resurrection, and afterwards the ascension of Jesus Christ; we now commemorate the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.” (*Hom.* 37.) Ambrose also alludes to this festival; and Augustine considers it to have been of Apostolic institution, or to have been established by a general council; but it must be remembered that the fathers, in using the term apostolical, did not always intend to assert that the custom to which they alluded was actually established by apostles themselves, but simply that it was one of very high antiquity,—and without a precise date in history. Perhaps in the earliest times the festival of the Ascension was included in the great quinquagesimal feast; and it may have begun to be

more particularly distinguished in the early part of the fourth century<sup>2</sup>.

The title of this day, which we find in ancient writers, is Ἐπισωζομένη, ἡμέρα ἐπισωζομένης, or σωζομένης (as in Chrysostom). This appellation is usually supposed to intimate that on the day of our Lord's ascension the work of human redemption was completed (διὰ τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας, *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 35). Baumgarten indeed regards the title as denoting a day rescued, as it were, from the inferior days by which it is surrounded, and made prominent or distinguished; and Augusti supposes that it may have contained a reference to certain errors of early heretics; but the common explanation is the more probable, and is in perfect accordance with the language of ancient homilies for the day<sup>3</sup>.

#### *Whitsunday.*

The whole space of fifty days immediately after Easter was celebrated, in the earliest ages of the church, under the name of Πεντεκοστή, Pentecost (Lat. Quinquagesima Paschalis). This sacred season is mentioned even by Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen; and abundantly by later writers. Ambrose and Hilary derive the institution from our Lord or his apostles; but Tertullian, who lived much earlier, is content to trace it to an ecclesiastical origin<sup>4</sup>.

Of this period, the first and the fourth weeks were distinguished with peculiar honour; the former, as being the first week after Easter, and the latter, probably, as being a kind of connecting link between the two high festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide. The first week was called Διακαινισμός or νέα, septimana in albis, with reference to the state of the newly bap-

<sup>2</sup> In primitiva ecclesia festum ascensionis Christi nullibi seorsim memoratur. Sed veteres hunc diem festum sub sua Pentecoste sive sub quinquaginta illis diebus, quæ inter Pascha et nostram Pentecosten interjacent, et omnes olim festi fuerunt, complexi sunt. HILDEBRAND, *de Diebus festis*.

<sup>3</sup> CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 35, in *Ascens.* :

BERNARD. *Serm.* 2, *Ascens. Dom.*

<sup>4</sup> Harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum, si legem expositules Scripturarum, nullam invenies. Traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix. Rationem traditioni, consuetudini, fidei, patrocinaturam aut ipse perspicies, aut ab aliquo, qui perspexerit, discas. *De Coron. Mil.* c. 3.

tized, who wore their white robes of baptism during that time. The fourth week was termed simply *μεσοπεντεκοστή*, or the middle of Pentecost.

This whole time was regarded as a season of rejoicing; and hence all fasting, and all kneeling at prayer, were forbidden. (TERTULL. *de Corona*, c. 3; *Conc. Nicæn.* c. 20.) Divine service was celebrated, and perhaps the Lord's supper administered, daily throughout this time. (Omnes quinquaginta dies ut pascha celebrandi sunt, et sunt tanquam dominica. AMBROS. *Comment. in Luc.* 1.) The Acts of the Apostles were read, as containing a history peculiarly appropriate to the season. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 33, *in Gen.*; AUGUSTIN. *Tractat.* 6, *in Johan.*) Baptism was frequently administered<sup>5</sup>. Alms were liberally distributed (LACTANT. *de vero Dei cultu*, c. 12); and slaves were frequently liberated. (Conf. ITIG. *de Veteri indulgentia Paschali.*) The places of worship were decorated with green branches. Such was the respect paid, in early times, to the whole interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide.

By degrees, however, the attention of the church became limited to the fiftieth day,—the day on which she commemorated the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit after our Lord's ascension,—as Pentecost, or Quinquagesima, in a proper sense. Towards the end of the fourth century, this more narrow acceptation of the term appears to have been generally adopted<sup>6</sup>.

This day was distinguished:—

<sup>5</sup> Diem baptismo solenniorem pascha præstat, exinde Pentecoste ordinandis lavaeris latissimum spatium est, quo et Domini resurrectio inter discipulos frequentata est, et gratia Sp. S. dedicata. TERTULL. *de Baptismo*, c. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Pentecosten, *i. e.* a passione et resurrectione Domini quinquagesimam diem, celebramus, quo nobis Sanctum Spiritum Paracletum, quem promiserat, misit: quod futurum etiam per Judæorum pascha significatum est, quum quinquagesimo die post celebrationem ovis occisæ, Moses digito Dei scriptam legem in monte accepit. Legite evangelium et advertite ibi Spiritum Sanc-

tum appellatum digitum Dei. AUGUSTIN. *contr. Faust.* l. xxxii. c. 12. —Utraque (legis promulgatio) facta est quinquagesimo die a paschate, illa in Sina, hæc in Sion. Ibi terre motu contremuit mons, hic domus apostolorum: ibi inter flammæ ignium et micantia fulgura, turbo ventorum et fragor tonitruorum personnit, hic cum ignearum visione linguarum, sonitus pariter de cælo, tanquam spiritus vehementis advenit; ibi clangor buccinæ legis verba perstrepsit; hic tuba evangelica apostolorum ore intonuit. HIERONYM. *ad Fabiol.* § 7.

1. By a public administration of baptism on a large scale. (LEO M. *Ep.* 2, 20; GELAS. *Ep.* 9.)

2. By a solemn celebration of the Lord's supper. By the eighteenth canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506), every layman, who would claim the title of a Catholic Christian, was required to communicate at the three festivals of Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, at least.

3. By the custom of decorating houses and churches with flowers and green boughs<sup>7</sup>.

The origin of our modern name, *Whitsunday*, *Whitsuntide*, cannot be satisfactorily explained. Wheatly says, "It was styled Whit-Sunday, partly because of those vast diffusions of light and knowledge which were then shed upon the apostles in order to the enlightening of the world, but principally from the white garments which they that were baptized at this time put on". Though Mr. Hamon L'Estrange conjectures that it is derived from the French word *Huict*, which signifies eight, and then *Whit-Sunday* will be *Huict-Sunday*,—i. e., the eighth Sunday, namely, from Easter. And to make his opinion the more probable, he observes that the octave of any feast is in Latin called *Utas*, which he derives from the French word *Huictus*<sup>9</sup>. In a Latin letter I have by me of the famous Gerhard Langhain, I find another account of the original of this word, which he says

<sup>7</sup> Mos ille Christianorum, quod festo Pentecostes fenestras, domos, et templa gramine, floribus, et betulis viridantibus ornent, a Judæis descendit ad Christianos. Hi enim in laudem legis ejusque memoriam pavimenta ædium, plateas, et synagogam gramine perspargunt, fasciculos ramusculo rumviridium passim fenestris apponunt, eorolas virides capitibus impositas gentant, quia illo tempore, quo lex in monte Sinai tradita est, omnia fuerant florentia et viridantia, id quod colligunt ex Exod. xxxii. 3. BUXTONF. *Synagog.* *Jud.* c. 20.

<sup>8</sup> But the most ancient mode of spelling is *Witesoneday*; whereas the letter *h* follows the *W* in White, ac-

ording to the old orthography of that word.

<sup>9</sup> This is not probable, because the name *Witsonday*, as in Wickliff, obtained while the word *Utas* for Octaves was still preferred, and was not at all changed, unless into *Utares*. *Witesone* for *Whitson* is as old as Robert of Gloucester, who wrote about A.D. 1270. Besides that, if *Huict* was the name, we should find some remains of the old spelling in the age of Robert of Gloucester, who did not live long after the first rise of that name. We find no other name than that of *Pentecost* in the more ancient Saxon writings. As low as 1180, in homilies upon the day, there is no notice of this later name. *Dr. Waterland's MS. Note.*

he met with accidentally in a Bodleian manuscript. He observes from thence, ‘that it was a custom among our ancestors upon this day to give all the milk of their ewes and kine to the poor for the love of God, in order to qualify themselves to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; which milk being then, as it is still in some countries, called *white meat*, &c., therefore this day, from that custom, took the name of Whitsunday.’ Or perhaps, say some, it might have been so called, because all persons were required to pay their tithe of young before that day, or be liable to the wite or mulct.”

### *Trinity Sunday.*

The introduction of this day into the calendar is of comparatively late, but uncertain, date. It is probable that the zeal of many Christians against the use of images in the eighth and ninth centuries may have been the first cause of the appointment of a distinct day for meditating upon the nature of the Holy Trinity in Unity, or the one true God, as distinguished from all idols. And it appears that the universal celebration of the day, in the western church, was not established until the fourteenth century.

The following particulars have been noted in order to assist in discovering the probable antiquity of the institution:—

1. No mention of Trinity Sunday occurs in ALCUIN'S *Homiliarium*.

2. POTHO, in a treatise *De Statu domus Dei s. Ecclesie*, written about the year 1152, speaks of this festival as among the modern innovations—*novæ celebritates*—of his time.

3. BERNARD of Clairveaux has no homily upon this festival.

4. It appears from DURANDUS that such a festival was celebrated in his time, but that the practice was not universal.

5. The learned PROSPER LAMBERTINI, afterwards Pope Benedict XIV. (who died in the year 1758), affirms, in his treatise *De Festis Domini*, &c., lib. i. c. 12, s. 16, that the universal observance of Trinity Sunday cannot be traced to an earlier date than A.D. 1334, when it was established by order of Pope John XXIII.

“In the ancient liturgies,” says WHEATLY, “we find that this

day was looked upon only as an octave of Pentecost; the observation of it as the feast of the Trinity being of later date. For since the praises of the Trinity were every day celebrated in the doxology, hymns, and creeds, therefore the church thought there was no need to set apart one particular day for that which was done on each." Upon which Dr. Waterland has made the following note:—"Durandus sets this festival as high as Gregory IV., A.D. 834. Gervase of Canterbury (who lived about A.D. 1200) informs us that Thomas à Becket, soon after his consecration, A.D. 1162, instituted this festival in England. Quesnel informs us of an *Officium pro festo sanctissimæ Trinitatis*, extant in a manuscript breviary for the use of the monks of Mount Cassin,—the age about 1086. And this is the oldest certain authority I have met with, except Berno Angiensis, who mentions it (*De Rebus ad Missam Spectantibus*). He flourished about A.D. 1030. So that the festival is certainly near seven hundred years old."

*The Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ. January 1.*

This festival was quite unknown to the early church. After the introduction of the festival of the Nativity, which took place in the fourth century, the first of January received a certain distinction in accordance with the custom of continuing the celebration of the higher festivals during several days, or the adoption of the system of octaves from the Jewish ritual. From that period until the seventh century, this day was distinguished as *Octava Natalis Domini*, *the Octave of the Nativity*.

At first, however, this day was observed rather as a season of humiliation and fasting than as a festival; and this was done in order to mark and preserve the distinction between the manners of Christians and those of the heathen<sup>10</sup>, who celebrated the Calends of January as the chief day of their Saturnalia with great licentiousness and revelry. (MACROB. *Saturn.* i. 8; OVID. *Fast.* i. 237.) During the first eight centuries, the sermons of Christian preachers on this day were of a penitential and severe

<sup>10</sup> Nos isto die jejnamus, ut ethnici nostris condemnari. AMBROS. *Serm.* intelligant, ipsorum gaudia jejuniis | 2, *de Cal. Jan.*

character; and were more correctly described by their earlier titles, “*Increpatio de Calendis Januariis*,” or “*De Idololatria in Calendis Januariis*,” than by that subsequently attached to them, “*In festo Circumcisionis Domini*.” (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 23; AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 5; *Serm.* 125, *de Tempore*; CHRYSOLOG. *Serm.* 155.) The decrees of councils during this period were of the same purport. (*Conc. Turon.* ii. A.D. 566, c. 17, 23; *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, c. 10; *Conc. Trullan.* A.D. 692, c. 62; *Conc. Rom.* A.D. 744, c. 8.)

In the course of the seventh century, as is generally supposed, the first of January received the appellation of the feast of the Circumcision, or of the name of Jesus; a commemoration which would naturally take place in the church, in accordance with the course of the Gospel narrative, when once it had become usual to celebrate the Nativity on the twenty-fifth of December, independently of the influence of other circumstances. Different dates, however, have been assigned for the commencement of this observance; some writers placing it as early as the fifth century, others in the seventh, and others even as late as the end of the eleventh. In support of the earliest of these dates we are referred to a Homily of Maximus of Turin, entitled, “*De Circumcisione Domini, vel de Cal. Jan.*,” *On the Circumcision of our Lord, or on the Calends of January*. But as no mention of the festival of the Circumcision occurs throughout the Homily, it is probable that, as often happens, the title is of much later origin than the composition itself, and therefore furnishes no evidence whatever on the point. Those who place the origin of this festival in the seventh century appeal to a collect in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, containing the words “*per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ejus hodie Circumcisionem et Nativitatis Octavam celebramus*,” *i. e.*, “*through our Lord Jesus Christ, whose Circumcision, together with the Octave of his Nativity, we this day celebrate*.” But considerable doubts have been raised respecting the genuineness of this Sacramentary; and consequently this proof of the date of the festival in question is not very decisive. Casaubon (*Exercitt. ad Baronii Annales*, ii. § 9) supposes that this festival was established by Ivo, bishop of Chartres, at the end of the eleventh century,—that it is first



mentioned by Bernard in the twelfth century,—and it was universally and canonically established by the synod of Oxford, A.D. 1222. This latter supposition has been adopted by several critics; but it appears not to rest upon sufficient foundation, for we have a Homily of Venerable Bede, written during the first half of the eighth century, which is not only entitled *De Circumcisione Domini*, but directly treats of the corresponding subject.

In the course of centuries, the first of January became generally recognised in Europe as the first day of the civil year; and this circumstance may perhaps have added to the celebrity of the festival of the Circumcision.

*The Epiphany. January 6.*

This festival was not observed in the earliest ages of the church, as appears from the omission of it in Origen's list; but it seems to have been common as early as the beginning of the fourth century,—a fact which is sufficiently attested by the homilies of the two Gregories, and by a passage of Ammianns Marcellinus, who mentions the observance of this festival by the Emperor Julian as an act of dissimulation<sup>11</sup>.

At first, the nativity of our blessed Lord, as well as his manifestation by a star to the Gentiles, was commemorated on this day. But when a peculiar day was set apart for the celebration of the incarnation or nativity, which took place probably about the middle of the fourth century, the festival of Epiphany was appropriated to the commemoration of various manifestations of our Saviour's divinity; namely, the appearance of the star,—the circumstances attending his baptism,—and the performance of his first miracle at Cana of Galilee.

This festival received various names, derived from the several circumstances to which it referred. These names were:—

1. *Τὰ Ἐπιφάνια*, *Manifestation*; with allusion to the appearance of the star, and the conversion of the Gentiles (1 Tim. iii. 16): and *Θεοφάνια*, *Manifestation of God*, with refer-

<sup>11</sup> Et ut hæc interim celaretur (namely, his inclination towards heathenism), feriarum die quem celebrantes mense Januario Christiani Epiphania dicitant, progressus in eorum ecclesiam, solemniter numine orato discessit. AMMIAN. MARCELLIN. lib. xxi. c. 2.

ence more particularly to the events attending our Lord's baptism. The term ἐπιφάνια was used at first as equivalent to γενέθλια, *nativity*; but afterwards a distinction was made between Epiphania prima et secunda, *the first and second Epiphany*; the former denoting Christmas Day, the latter Epiphany, properly so called.

2. Ἡμέρα τῶν φώτων, Dies luminum, ἄγια φῶτα τῶν ἐπιφανίων (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 3), *Day of lights*.—This name was given to it, Wheatly says, “as being the day whereon they commemorated the baptism of Christ<sup>12</sup>, who from that time became a light to those that sat in darkness: upon which account this day was . . . solemn for baptizing the catechumens. . . . And for the greater solemnity of so high a festival, it was the custom to adorn the public churches with a great number of lights and tapers, when they came to perform the service of the day.” Baptism, as has been observed in a former book, was usually termed φῶς, and φωτισμός, and the baptized, φωτισθέντες.

3. Festum trium regum, *The festival of the three kings*.—The fathers differ in their opinion concerning the character of the magi, or wise men, who came to Bethlehem under the guidance of the star. Some of them retain the New Testament appellation Μάγοι, and hence this festival is entitled *Festum Magorum*. Others translate the word into *Principes* or *Dynastæ*; others into *Sapientes*, *Wise Men*. Others render it *Magicians*; representing these celebrated visitors as no other than impostors and instruments of Satan. In later times, the opinion prevailed that they were *kings*, and *three* in number.

4. *Bethphania*.—This name, which sometimes occurs, is derived from the history of the first miracle at Cana of Galilee, where our Saviour *manifested* forth his glory, being *in a house*, at a wedding. (DURANDI *Ration. Divin. Offic.* lib. vi. c. 16; AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 29 *de temp.*; CHRYSOLOG. *Serm.* 147; EUCHER. *Hom. in Vigil. S. Andr.*)

<sup>12</sup> Ἡ ἁγία τῶν φώτων ἡμέρα εἰς ἣν ἀφίγμεθα καὶ ἦν ἐορτάζειν ἀξιῶμεθα σήμερον, ἀρχὴν μὲν τοῦ τοῦ ἐμοῦ χριστοῦ βάπτισμα λαμβάνει, τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτός, τοῦ φωτίζοντος πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* xxxix. in *Sancta Lumina*. Similar passages are common in contemporary writers.

5. This festival was by some called *Phagiphania*, from their connecting our Saviour's miracle of feeding five thousand men with the first miracle at Cana, as a manifestation of divine power to be celebrated on this day. (AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 29 *de temp.*)

Epiphany, like other high festivals, was celebrated—

i. By a vigil,—by the preaching of homilies,—the celebration of the Lord's supper,—and the granting of a holiday to slaves.

ii. Gradually, from the time of Theodosius the Younger to that of Justinian, all judicial proceedings and public spectacles were prohibited (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ii. tit. 8. *de feriis*, in interpretat. legis 2; lib. iii. tit. 12, *de feriis*, leg. 8).

iii. In the Greek, Syrian, and African churches, the Epiphany was a solemn period of baptism (GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 39, 40; VICTOR UTICENS. *de Persecut. Vandalor.* lib. ii.; JO. MOSCHI *Pratum Spirituale*, c. 214). On the vigil of this feast it was usual to consecrate the water to be used at baptisms throughout the year (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 22 *de Baptismo Christi*). The Roman and Gallican churches, which at first would not allow of any solemn time for baptism besides Easter and Whitsuntide, gradually conferred the same distinction upon the Epiphany (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 33; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xv. tit. 5, l. 5; *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. 12, l. 7; *Leges Visigothor.* lib. ii. tit. 1, l. 11).

iv. At this festival the *Indictio festorum mobilium*, *announcement of moveable festivals*, took place; notice was given of the days on which Easter, the Quadragesimal fasts, and Whitsuntide would fall (*Conc. Aurel.* iv. c. 1; *Conc. Antissidor.* c. 2).

A kind of dramatic representation of the oblations of the wise men at Bethlehem was incorporated into the services of the church during the middle ages.

*The Conversion of St. Paul. January 25.*

No clear trace of this festival is found of earlier date than the twelfth century. Some critics suppose that it had its beginning in the year 1200, when it was established by order of Innocent III. Baronius, however, maintains that such a festival had been observed in earlier times; but had grown out of use after the ninth century. He refers to certain homilies of Augustin,

which however prove only that the history of St. Paul's conversion was sometimes read in the churches, and formed therefore the topic of a preacher's discourse; and to the language of Venerable Bede, from which it may perhaps appear that a festival of this kind was celebrated in some places when he wrote.

After the thirteenth century, this festival became generally observed (*Conc. Coprinia*. A.D. 1250). It was honourably distinguished by Clement VIII. in the latter end of the sixteenth century, as a *festum duplex majus*.

*The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, or, the Purification of  
St. Mary the Virgin. February 2.*

The second of February is the fortieth day after the day set apart for the commemoration of our Saviour's nativity (December 25); and therefore it has been celebrated as the day on which the purification of the Virgin Mary took place, according to the levitical institutions (Luke ii. 22—24). Perhaps this festival was made to take the place of one of the many celebrations by which this month was distinguished among the heathen (MACROBIUS *Saturnal.* lib. i. c. 13; TERENTIUS VARRO, *de Lingua Lat.* lib. v. c. 3; AUGUSTUS *De Civit. Dei*, lib. vii. c. 7).

The sixth century may be regarded as the earliest date of this festival. It was probably established during the reign of Justinian. It received the following appellations:—

1. *Festum Purificationis Mariæ, The Feast of the Purification of Mary.*

2. Ἐπισπαντή, *Festum Occursus, The Feast of the Meeting*; with reference to the history, recorded in Luke ii. 25, *seq.*, concerning the meeting of Simeon and our Saviour in the Temple.

3. *Festum Præsentationis, Simeonis et Annæ, Festum Simeonis*; i. e., *The Feast of the Presentation, of Simeon and Hannah*, or simply, *of Simeon*.

4. *Festum Candelarum, or Luminum, i. e., The Feast of Lights.* This appears to be a comparatively modern title, given with reference to the custom of carrying lighted tapers, &c., in processions. Wheatly alludes to the antiquity of this practice; but only in general terms, and without any reference to authority.

“On the Purification,” says he, “the ancient Christians used abundance of light both in their churches and processions, in remembrance (as it is supposed) of our blessed Saviour’s being declared this day by old Simeon to be ‘a light to lighten the Gentiles,’ &c.; which portion of Scripture is for that reason appointed for the gospel for the day. And in the church of Rome they still continue to consecrate all the tapers and candles which they use in their churches all the year afterwards. From which custom, I suppose, the day first took the name of *Candlemas Day*.” It is usually supposed that the processions observed on this day were first established by Gregory the Great, in the year 600.

*St. Matthias’s Day. February 24.*

The date of the introduction of this festival is involved in considerable obscurity. It appears to have been established in the Greek church in the course of the eleventh century. It was perhaps *partially* observed in the West before that time; but it is entirely omitted in many ancient calendars. Dr. Waterland observes, in a MS. note on Wheatly, “The oldest authority I have yet met with is the calendar in ATHELSTON’S *Psalter*, Cotton Libr. A.D. 703.”

The twenty-fourth of February is the day appointed by the church of Rome for the commemoration of St. Matthias; with a provision that, in leap year, it should be observed on the twenty-fifth. In the Greek church St. Matthias’s day is the ninth of August.

*The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. March 25.*

This festival is dedicated to the commemoration of the annunciation which was made by the angel to the Virgin Mary, concerning the incarnation of our Lord. There is some uncertainty respecting the date of its establishment. Hospinian supposes this festival to have originated in the age of Athanasius, or during the fourth century. Others refer it to the time of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the third century. But many critics, including Du Pin, Bellarmin, and others of even the Romish church, doubt the genuineness of homilies on this festival which

bear so high a date, and are disposed to ascribe them to some writer of the seventh century, who composed them probably soon after the monotheletic controversies. And this opinion appears to derive some confirmation from the circumstance that the council of Laodicea (A.D. 361) made a canon to the effect that the Quadragesimal Fast should not be interrupted by the commemoration of martyrs or saints. But this festival must have been established at least in the interval which elapsed between that year and the year 692, since it was specially mentioned by the Trullan council assembled in that year, can. 52. Augusti thinks, however, that this festival may have been observed in the time of the council of Laodicea; only that it was observed as one of those which related to our blessed Lord, and not as a saint's day. It is, indeed, expressly called one of our Lord's festivals, in the homily ascribed to Athanasius. It is probable that after the fifth century, when the respect paid to the Virgin Mary greatly increased in consequence of what passed during the Nestorian controversies, this festival was expressly referred to the honour of that saint, and its observance was fixed to the twenty-fifth of March. This arrangement was not adopted at first by the Spanish and Oriental churches; but afterwards it became universal. If these views be correct, the history of the establishment of this festival is simply as follows:—in early times it was celebrated as one of the Lord's festivals (*ἐορτὴ δεσποτικὴ*),—in the fifth century it gradually assumed the character of a saint's day,—and in the course of the sixth century it was universally observed under that character.

This day has been distinguished by various appellations.

1. *Ἡμέρα ἰσπασμοῦ*, *the day of salutation*, from the history recorded in Luke i. 29.

2. The Greeks applied to it the equivalent term *χαριτισμὸς*, with reference to Luke i. 18.

3. *Εὐαγγελισμὸς*,—*ἡμέρα ἀγία τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ*,—*the day of the Gospel*; with reference to the subject-matter of the annunciation.

4. *Annunciatio Angeli ad B. Mariam*; *the annunciation of the angel to Saint Mary*. (GREGORII. M. *Lib. Sacrament.*)

5. *Annunciatio Domini*, *the annunciation of the Lord* (ANAS-

TASHI *Lib. Pontif. S. Serg.*; where it is remarked that Pope Sergius III., A.D. 687, increased the solemnity of this festival).

6. *Annunciatio Mariæ, the annunciation of Mary.*

7. *Ἡμέρα ἐνσαρκώσεως, festum Incarnationis,—the festival of the incarnation.* Hence it was that in Rome, France, and England the ecclesiastical year began with this day.

8. *Festum Conceptionis Christi, the festival of the conception of Christ.*—This title is sometimes confounded with one of much later date, — *Festum Conceptionis Mariæ*; — which denotes another festival that bears no immediate reference to our Lord, but is appropriated to the commemoration of the conception of the Virgin Mary herself.

With regard to the mode of celebrating this festival in early times, the records of antiquity furnish very scanty information; notwithstanding that Bernard, after Chrysostom, entitles it *radix omnium festorum,—the root of all festivals.*

We find, however, many homilies which were composed expressly for this day;—and some hymns, in the works of John of Damascus, and of his contemporary Cosmus of Jerusalem.

*St. Mark's Day. April 25.*

The date of this festival cannot be exactly ascertained. It is certain that no such day was observed in the Latin church before the end of the seventh century (GAVANTI *Thesaur. Sacr. Rit.* tom. i. p. 490). Nor do the acts of councils contain any mention of a distinct festival of St. Mark until the middle of the thirteenth century, when it was ordered by the council of Cognac (A.D. 1250—60), that a day should be observed in commemoration of this evangelist.

Dr. Waterland has made the following observations concerning the date of this festival, in a MS. note to Wheatly's Introduction:—"St. Mark's feast is certainly as old as the ninth century. It appears not in the Calendar of Athelston's Psalter; but is found (Apr. 25) in the Calendar of C. C. C., Wanl. p. 107, and in Ado, and in Bede's genuine Martyrology, p. 360. It is therefore as old as 730."

The twenty-fifth of April was chosen for the festival of St. Mark, some say, as being the day on which the evangelist

suffered martyrdom at Alexandria; or, according to others, in commemoration of the time of year in which his bones were conveyed from Alexandria to Venice. Some writers suppose the translation of the relics to have taken place as early as the fifth century; while others date the event as late as the ninth.

*St. Philip and St. James's Day. May 1.*

No certain account of the reason for uniting the two apostles, Philip of Bethsaida, and James the Less, son of Alphaeus, has come down to us. In the absence of more authentic history, we are compelled to adopt a story concerning the mingling of their relics at Rome as the probable foundation of the observance. It is said that, when Christians began to collect and treasure up the relics of celebrated martyrs and saints (about the middle of the fourth century), the remains of Philip were conveyed from Hierapolis to Rome, and then placed in the same grave with those of St. James. Afterwards, in the sixth century, Pelagius, bishop of Rome, dedicated a church which he built to the two apostles; and the combination, thus established, has continued ever since.

It is impossible to say when the festival of these apostles was first instituted. If the foregoing history be true, such a festival may have been established in the sixth or seventh century. When the "feast of all the apostles" grew into disuse, it was ordered that the day on which it had been celebrated (November 30) should be observed in honour of the two apostles St. Philip and St. James. We have no means of ascertaining whether this festival was at first merely of a local or provincial character, or generally observed.

The Oriental church commemorates each of these apostles separately, having fixed upon the fourteenth of November for the festival of St. Philip, and the twenty-third of October for that of St. James.

*St. Barnabas the Apostle. June 11.*

Very little information concerning this festival can be obtained. It is rarely mentioned in old calendars; and many writers on heortology pass it over in silence. Hospinian dates



the institution of this festival in the twelfth century; but it has been thought that it ought to be placed as high as the eighth, or higher.

The eleventh of June has been appropriated to the commemoration of St. Barnabas in both the Latin and the Greek churches; but the reason of this appointment is not known. Perhaps the day may have been connected with some unknown tradition concerning the apostle, or with some history relating to his relics.

*St. John Baptist's Day. June 24.*

The nativity of St. John the Baptist was solemnly commemorated as early as the fourth century. This festival is attested by extant homilies of Maximus of Turin, Augustin, and Leo the Great; and by the fourteenth canon of the council of Agde (A. D. 506), where the *Natalis S. Joannis Baptistæ* holds a place among the principal saints' days. It is always found in the calendars of a later date, when it occurs as a festival of the first rank, with vigils and octaves.

Augustin (*Serm. 1, De Joanne Baptist.*) remarks, as something peculiar, that in the service of the church the nativity of the Baptist is commemorated, rather than his martyrdom. The martyrdom, however, was not entirely omitted; and Augustin conjectures, that the *festum decollationis*, the *festival of the beheading*, which occurs in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, was originally not distinct from that of the nativity. Wheatly merely observes, "There was formerly another day (namely, August 29) set apart in commemoration of his beheading, but now the church celebrates both his nativity and death on one and the same day; whereon, though his mysterious birth is principally solemnized, yet the chief passages of his life and death are severally recorded in the portions of Scripture appointed for the day."

*St. Peter and St. Paul's Day. June 29.*

The reported martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome gave occasion to the commemoration of these two apostles by the ancient church on the same day. It appears, from Homilies by

Maximus of Turin, Ambrose, Leo the Great, and Augustin, that this festival was generally observed at the latter end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth. During the reign of Anastasius, who died in the year 510, it was introduced at Constantinople, at the request, it is said, of an ambassador from Rome. A Homily attributed to Chrysostom (*Hom.* 167, *Opp.* t. 5, *ed Savil.*), if genuine, would prove the observance of this festival in the east at a still earlier period; but it has been doubted whether that composition really proceeded from the pen of the reputed author.

*Saint James the Apostle. July 25.*

This day is set apart for the commemoration of St. James the elder, son of Zebedee, and brother of St. John. It is not improbable that such a festival existed at an early period in Spain; but no ancient trace of it can be found in any other country. It appears that this day was not generally observed before the eleventh century. (THOMASSINI *Commentarius Dogmat. et Historic. de dierum festorum celebratione*; usually appended to the *Heortologia of Guyetus.*)

The twenty-fifth of July was chosen for the day of this commemoration, not with reference to the date of the apostle's death, which happened probably a little before Easter, but in connexion with the legend of the miraculous translation of the relics of the apostle from Palestine to Compostella in Spain.

*Saint Bartholomew the Apostle. August 24.*

This festival is of uncertain date. Some critics refer it to the eleventh century, or even a later period (GUYET. *Heortologia*, lib. ii. c. 23, § 9); but others affirm, upon the testimony of ancient calendars, that it was known as early as the eighth century.

The Greeks celebrate the martyrdom of St. Bartholomew, (together with that of St. Barnabas) on the eleventh of June; and the translation of his relics on the twenty-fourth of August. In the western church, the festival was observed on the twenty-fourth of August; except at Rome, where it was kept on the twenty-fifth.

*Saint Matthew the Apostle. September 21.*

We have no information respecting the origin of this festival. It probably acquired general observance at some period subsequent to the beginning of the eleventh century.

In the Greek church, St. Matthew's day is the sixteenth of November.

*Saint Michael and all Angels. September 29.*

This festival appears to have arisen out of several distinct commemorations of fabulous appearances of the Archangel Michael at various places, said to have occurred during the sixth and seventh centuries. The date of the collective festival is uncertain. It appears not to have been generally observed before the eighth century; but after the Council of Mentz, (A. D. 813,) by which it was recognised, (can. 36,) it certainly gained ground.

The only certain information which we possess concerning the origin of this festival in the Greek church is, that its observance was formally established by order of the emperor Manuel Comnenus, in the twelfth century.

There is a tradition that this feast was instituted by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the fourth century.

*Saint Luke the Evangelist. October 18.*

No historical account respecting the origin of this festival is extant. It was, probably, contemporary with the other festivals of apostles; which may, for the most part, be assigned to about the eleventh or twelfth centuries,—at least, so far as regards their general adoption. But Dr. Waterland, in a MS. note to Wheatly, observes that this festival is to be referred to the fifth century, "as appears from the Carthage calendar."

The eighteenth of October has been appointed for the commemoration of St. Luke by the Greek church, as well as by the Roman; but it is uncertain whether this day referred to the supposed martyrdom of the evangelist, or to the translation of his relics to Constantinople, which took place, according to Jerome (*De Script. Eccl.*), in the twentieth year of the reign of Constantine.

*Saint Simon and Saint Jude, Apostles. October 28.*

St. Simon and St. Jude were, probably, associated by the church on account of their relationship. (Mat. xiii. 55.)—When their commemoration-festival was instituted, or when it was first celebrated, history does not inform us. It is usually referred by archæological writers to the twelfth or thirteenth century.

*All Saints' Day. November 1.*

A festival in honour of all martyrs and saints obtained in the east as early as the fourth century; where it was celebrated on the octave of Pentecost, our Trinity Sunday. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 74, *De Martyrib. totius Orbis*; Conf. LEO. ALLAT. *De Hebdom. et Domin. Græc.* c. 31.)

This festival was of later institution in the western church. "About the year 610," says Wheatly, "the Pantheon or Temple dedicated to all the gods, at the desire of Boniface IV., bishop of Rome, was taken from the heathen by Phocas the emperor, and dedicated to the honour of *all martyrs*. Hence came the original of *all saints*, which was then celebrated upon the first of May; afterwards, by an order of Gregory IV., it was removed to the first of November, A.D. 834, where it has stood ever since. And our Reformers, having laid aside the celebration of a great many martyrs' days, which had grown too numerous and cumbersome to the church, thought fit to retain this day, whereon the church by a general commemoration returns her thanks to God for them all."

*Saint Andrew's Day. November 30.*

A day was set apart in commemoration of St. Andrew as early as the fourth century; from which period it has been observed without interruption.

The relics of St. Andrew were removed to Constantinople, by order of the Emperor Constantine, in the year 359. (EUSEB. *Chron.* 2; HIERONYM. *in Vita Evangel. Luc.*) The thirtieth of November was observed in honour of this apostle, as some suppose, with reference to that event; or, as others say, as being the day of his martyrdom.

*Saint Thomas the Apostle. December 21.*

According to the *Heortologia* of Guyetus, the institution of St. Thomas's day is to be referred to the eleventh century, or to a still later period.—No satisfactory reason has been assigned for the choice of the twenty-first of December as the day of commemoration.

*The Nativity of our Lord, or Christmas Day. December 25.*

It is generally agreed that the introduction of this festival into the Christian church took place during the fourth century. The attention of the early church appears to have been directed to the public ministry and acts of our Saviour, rather than to his early personal history; in accordance with an observation of Chrysostom, “Not the day of our Saviour's birth, but the day of his baptism, is to be regarded as his manifestation.” (*CHRYSOST. De Baptismo Christi.*)

The institution of this festival in the fourth century has been variously traced. Some writers have derived it from the Jewish *Encænia*, or feast of the dedication, (1 Maccab. iv. 52, 58, 59; 2 Maccab. x. 6—8; JOSEPH. *Antiq.* lib. xii. cap. 10; St. John x. 22;)—others believe it to have been established in order to take the place of the heathen *Saturnalia*;—Jablonski attempts to show, that it originated with the Basilidians in Egypt;—and Augusti supposes that this festival was established in opposition to the views and representations of certain heretics, and in order to counteract their influence. But, perhaps, the institution may be sufficiently explained by the circumstance, that it was the taste of that age to multiply festivals, and that the analogy of other events in our Saviour's history, which had already been marked by a distinct celebration, may naturally have pointed out the propriety of marking his nativity with the same honourable distinction. It was celebrated with all the marks of respect usually bestowed upon high festivals; and distinguished also by the custom, derived probably from heathen antiquity, of interchanging presents and making entertainments.

The nomenclature of this festival is not very copious. It received the titles of *Festum Nativitatis Christi*, *γενέθλια*,

natalitia Christi; GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 38; ΕΠΙΦΗ. *Hæres.* 51; and γενέθλιος ἡμέρα, BASIL. *Orat.* 25; i. e., *the festival of the nativity*, with which our word *Christmas* is synonymous.

At first, this festival was celebrated in the east on the sixth of January. But towards the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth, we find two distinct festivals, namely, that of the nativity of Christ, on the twenty-fifth of December, and that of our Lord's baptism on the sixth of January. And thus the oriental church came to an agreement with the western, which had previously celebrated the nativity on the twenty-fifth of December. In this matter it will be observed, the victory lay on the same side as in the controversy respecting the times of celebrating Easter. The oriental custom was changed, however, only by degrees. Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, adopted the Roman custom in his diocese for the first time in the year 431. And it was not until the sixth century that the whole Christian world concurred in celebrating the nativity on the same day.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* a distinction is made between the festival of the nativity, and that of our Lord's baptism or Epiphany; but this is only an argument against the high antiquity of that composition;—no proof of the early existence of the distinction which is recognised.

---

The festival of the nativity is distinguished not only by the preparatory season of Advent, but by the observance of three saints' days in succession immediately after it. "Concerning the placing of these days immediately after Christmas day," says Wheatly, "we may make this observation,—that none are thought fitter attendants on Christ's nativity than those blessed martyrs who have not scrupled to lay down their temporal lives for him, from whose birth they received life eternal. And, accordingly, we may observe, that as there are three kinds of martyrdom,—the first both in will and deed, which is the highest, —the second in will, but not in deed,—the third in deed, but not in will,—so the church commemorates these martyrs in the same order:—St. Stephen first, who suffered death both in will and in

deed; St. John the evangelist next, who suffered martyrdom in will, but not in deed (being miraculously delivered out of a caldron of burning oil, into which he was put before *Port Latin* in Rome<sup>13</sup>); the Holy Innocents last, who suffered in deed but not in will; for though they were not sensible upon what account they suffered, yet it is certain that they suffered for the sake of Christ, since it was upon account of his birth that their lives were taken away. And besides, wheresoever their story shall be told, the cause also of their deaths will be declared and made known. For which reason they cannot be denied, even in the most proper sense, to be true martyrs or witnesses of Christ.

“Mr. L’Estrange (in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*) imagines another reason for the order of these days. He supposes St. Stephen is commemorated first, as being the first martyr for Christianity; that St. John has the second place, as being the disciple whom Jesus loved; and that the Innocents are commemorated next, because their slaughter was the first considerable consequence of our Saviour’s birth. To this he adds another conjecture, namely, that martyrdom, love, and innocence are first to be magnified, as wherein Christ is most honoured<sup>14</sup>.”

<sup>13</sup> Allusion is here made to a legend concerning St. John the Evangelist, related in TERTULL. *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 36.

<sup>14</sup> With these observations compare the following passages from Durandus.—“Quemadmodum regi urbem intranti comites additi sunt, sic et ecclesia salvatori mundum ingresso congruos comites voluit adjunctos. Qui autem sunt hi comites? Ea de re in Cantico sic dicitur:—‘Dilectus meus, h. e. puer Jesus, est candidus et rubicundus, electus ex millibus.’ Ecclesia igitur Christo nato comitem rubicundum, sive Stephanem, qui rubicundum pro Christo sanguinem fudit,—comitem candidum sanctum Joannem evangelistam, quem candor virginæ commendat,—et multa millia infantum e quibus electus est puer Jesus, cum reliqui omnes occiderentur in tractu Bethlehemitico, pulchre reddidit.”

DURANDI *Rational. Div. Offic.* lib. vii. c. 42.—In another place the same author says,—“Sicuti natalis Christi est ingressus in hunc mundum, ita natales martyrum dicuntur egressus eorum ex hoc mundo. Ecclesia igitur cum natali Dominico natales martyrum omnis generis apposit. Sunt enim ex veterum mente martyres in triplici differentia. Alii opere et voluntate, qualis S. Stephanus, qui non tantum voluit mori pro Christo, sed et opere ipso mortuus est. Alii sunt martyres voluntate, sed non opere; talis est Joannes evangelista, paratus quidem pro Christo mori, reapse tamen non occisus. Alii denique sunt martyres opere, sed non voluntate, v. g. Pueri innocentes occisi pro Christo antequam ad usum rationis pervenerunt. Merito igitur cum natali Domini natales horum martyrum combinantur.”

We have no means of determining, precisely, at what time these three commemorations began to be connected with the festival of the nativity. The dates of the several commemorations themselves are various; and some of them may have existed before the celebration of the nativity as a distinct festival. The first of the three which was placed in connexion with the nativity appears to be St. Stephen's day. (GREG. NYSSEN. *in Sermone de S. Stephano*.) The feast of the Innocents is connected with that of our Saviour's birth, by Augustin, Leo, and Fulgentius; but it is observable that it is mentioned in their Homilies for the Epiphany, not in Homilies for Christmas. Bernard of Clairvaux is the earliest writer in whose works we find mention of the four feasts in conjunction.

*Saint Stephen's Day. December 26.*

It is certain that this festival was observed in the east as early as the fourth century, and in connexion with the feast of the nativity (GREG. NYSSEN. *Serm. de S. Stephano*); and that it was introduced generally into the western churches in the course of the fifth century. (AUGUSTIN. *De Natali Stephani Martyris; Serm. 323; De Civit. Dei*, lib. xxii. c. 8.)

*Saint John the Evangelist's Day. December 27.*

No mention of this festival occurs in any records of the early centuries. Venerable Bede is the first writer in whose works any trace of it occurs. Perhaps the observance of it was at first only local. The Council of Lyons, A. D. 1240, ordered that from that time forward it should be universally celebrated; from which it may be inferred that it had then already become general.

*The Innocents' Day. December 28.*

This is one of the earliest festivals of martyrs on record. It is mentioned by Irenæus (*Hæres.* lib. iii. c. 18), Cyprian (*Ep. 56 ad Thibar.*), and Origen (*Hom. 3, de Diversis*). It was also observed in connexion with the Epiphany, from the earliest times<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> Salvete flores martyrum,  
Quos lucis ipso in limine  
Christi insecutor sustulit,  
Ceu turbo nascentes rosas!  
Vos prima Christi victima,

Grex immolatorum tener,  
Aram sub ipsam simplices  
Palma et coronis luditis.  
—PRUDENT. *De Epiphania, Cathemer.*  
*Hymn XII.*



Other festivals, more or less ancient, but of inferior note, are the following:—*Cathedra Petri Romana*, January 18; *Cathedra Petri Antiochena*, February 22; *Festum Gregorii Magni*, March 12; *Festum Lancæ et Clavorum Christi*, April 16; *Festum Inventionis S. Crucis*, May 3; *Joannes ante Portam Latinam*, May 8; *Commemoratio Apost. Pauli*, June 30; *Festum Visitationis Mariæ*, July 2; *Festum Divisionis Apostolorum*, July 15; *Festum Mariæ Magdalenæ*, July 22; *Festum Maccabæorum* (generally observed during the fourth and fifth centuries), August 1; *Festum Petri ad Vincula*, August 1; *Dedicatio S. Mariæ ad Nives*, August 5; *Festum Transfigurationis Christi*, *Festum S. Laurentii*, August 10; *Festum Dormitionis S. Assumptionis Mariæ*, August 15; *Festum Decollationis Joannis Baptistæ*, August 29; *Festum Nativitatis Mariæ*, September 8; *Festum Exaltationis S. Crucis*, September 14; *Festum Rosarii Mariæ*, October 2; *Commemoratio omnium pie defunctorum*, November 2; *Festum S. Martini*, November 11; *Festum Præsentationis Mariæ*, November 21; *Festum Immaculatæ Conceptionis R. Virginis*, December 8.

---

## BOOK VI.

## OF SACRED PLACES.

THE expressions "sacred places," and "places of worship," may be regarded as synonymous; although, strictly speaking, the former is a generic term, including the latter as specific, every place of worship being a sacred place, while it cannot be said that every sacred place is a place of worship. Palestine has been called the Holy Land, and Jerusalem the Holy City, as having been peculiarly favoured with manifestations of the divine presence, and having been the scene of most of the transactions recorded in Holy Scripture. And thus, when we speak of sacred persons, or sacred things, we mean persons and things employed in the celebration of divine worship.

## CHAPTER I.

## NAMES OR APPELLATIONS OF CHURCHES.

THE word church is derived from the Greek word *κυριακῆ*, dominica, or the more usual *τὸ κυριακὸν*, dominicum, i. e., *the Lord's house*.

The word *κυριακὸν* occurs in this sense, first in writings of the fourth century, and then in official and public documents (*Conc. Ancyr. c. 15; Neocesar. c. 5; Laodicea. c. 28; EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. ix. c. 10 (τὰ κυριακὰ οἰκεία κατασκευάζειν); EUSEB. de laud. Const. M. c. 17*). The corresponding Latin word is dominicum (and the feminine dominica, sc. domus), which, although in the writings of Cyprian it denotes rather the Lord's day, or the Lord's supper, is yet decidedly used by Jerome (*Chron. Ol. 276 a. 3*) to denote a building set apart for the purpose of divine worship.

Domus dei, domus ecclesie, domus divina. i. e., *the Lord's*

*house, the house of the church, the house of God*, are expressions in frequent use from the third century downwards, denoting the place of religious assembly and worship. In EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 30; viii. c. 13; ix. c. 9, we find *οἶκος ἐκκλησίας*, and *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν οἶκος*, i. e., *the house of the church*, and *the house of the churches*, in the same sense. *Domus divina*, the house of God, was a term employed to designate the palace of the Roman emperor; but the Christians willingly transferred the appellation to their churches, in which the true Jehovah, and not a deified mortal, was adored.

*Οἶκος*, or *τόπος προσευχῆς*, i. e., *the house or place of prayer*, is a term which was applied to the Jewish temple (Matth. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46; Compare Isa. lvi. 7; Jerem. vii. 11; 1 Maccab. iii. 47; vii. 20, 37). *Προσευχή*, *proseucha*, denotes also some other places set apart by the Jews for the purpose of prayer (Acts xvi. 13, 16). Such *proseuchæ* (concerning which see JOSEPH. *Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 10, 23) were also the first Christian churches; and they might have received this appellation, although found in private houses. But they were more commonly entitled *προσευκτήρια*, *εὐκτήρια*, *οἶκοι εὐκτῆριοι*, and in Latin *oratoria*, i. e., *oratories*, or *houses of prayer*. In later times, these titles were appropriated to smaller or domestic chapels; but at first they were given to places of Christian worship in general.

The word "church" appears to have denoted not only the body of believers assembled for worship, but also the place of assembly, e. g. in Acts xix. 40; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 20, 22; conf. Matt. xviii. 17; and in the writings of Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and other early ecclesiastical writers. Some critics, indeed, will not admit this early application of the term; but it seems to be warranted by TERTULL. *de Vel. Virg.* c. 13; *De Pudic.* c. 4; *De Idol.* c. 7; CYPRIAN, *Ep.* 55 *ad Cornel.* In the fourth century, this phraseology was decidedly established, as abundantly appears from the writings of Eusebius, Cyril, Chrysostom, and others. Many writers still preferred *ἐκκλησιαστήριον*, in the sense of "place of worship;" but "ecclesia" was more generally approved, and became finally established and current.

*Basilica* is a word originally applied to the imperial palace and large public buildings, and was not applied to places of divine worship, until the Christian emperors had appropriated such large and splendid edifices to the use of the church.

'*Ἀνάκτορον*, synonymous with *basilica*, i. e., *royal palace*, or *house of the king*, was sometimes, but very rarely, applied to Christian churches (EUSEB. *de Laud. Constant.* c. 9), or, at least, to large churches built by the emperors.

Churches were sometimes called *Tituli* (τίτλοι); but whether from the inscription of dedication, or from the sign of the cross, or from the graves of the martyrs and saints, or from what other cause, is uncertain. Baronius derives the term *a titulo crucis*, which is perhaps the most probable conjecture on the subject.

The term *Τρόπαια*, τροπæα, occurs first in EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 25; *de Laud. Const.* c. 17 (Conf. Hieron. *Ep.* 18, *ad Marc.*). The reason of this name is to be sought in the reported appearance of the cross to Constantine, and the Labarum, on which, according to Eusebius, τοῦ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον was inscribed. According to this interpretation, the term is nearly allied to *Titulus*. Churches erected in honour of martyrs, or dedicated to them, were especially entitled *τρόπαια*.

*Μαρτύριον*, or *memoria*, denoted a church dedicated to the memory of a martyr, according to the import of the name. We find also the term *Προφητεῖον*, and *Ἀποστολεῖον*. According to Eusebius, the large church at Jerusalem, built and consecrated by Constantine the Great, was called *Μαρτύριον*, as being a monument or testimony of the emperor's piety and zeal. In later times, churches were called by the names of the sacred person, or saint to whose memory they were dedicated.

The early Christians were averse from using the words *ναός*, *temple*, or *βωμὸς*, *altar*, with reference to their worship, on account of the use of those terms by the heathen. It was their boast, indeed, that they had neither temples nor altars (MINUC. FEL. *Octar.* c. 10, 32; ORIG. *c. Cels.* lib. viii. c. 9; ARNOB. *Disput.* lib. vi. c. 1); but this is to be understood only relatively, by way of distinction from Jewish and heathen rites, and in the spirit of such passages of Scripture as John iv. 20; ii. 19—21; Acts vii. 48; xvii. 23—25. But when the danger of symbolizing with

either Judaism or heathen idolatry had ceased, and even a suspicion of such union could not be supposed to exist, Christians felt less hesitation in calling their places of worship temples, especially as this was a name rendered both sacred and familiar to them by its occurrence in the writings of the Old Testament. In the same way the scriptural expressions of priest, priesthood, sacrifice, &c., which were at first studiously avoided, were afterwards gradually introduced into the ecclesiastical vocabulary of Christians. The words *ναός* and *templum* are of frequent occurrence in the writings of Lactantius, Ambrose, Eusebins, and Chrysostom. And it appears, from the testimony of Jerome (*Comment. in Ps.* 126), that this phraseology was quite common as early as the fourth century.

On the other hand, the terms *fanum*, and *delubrum*, were at all times rejected as heathenish or profane. Sometimes they were sarcastically applied to the places of worship belonging to heretics. But some exceptions occur in favour of the Greek words, *σηκός* and *τέμενος*.

*Σκηνή* (or *τὸ σκῆνος*), in Latin *Tabernaculum*, i. e. *a tabernacle*, occurs as the name of a place of Christian worship for the first time in Eusebius (*de vit. Const.* iv. c. 56), and Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* i. c. 18); but with reference only to the field or military church of Constantine. The term came into general use during the middle ages; but it was employed to designate not the whole church, but only a part of the altar, and the ciborium (*κιβώριον*, *canopeum*).

Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 17), after Philo, makes use of the term *Μοναστήριον*, with reference to the places of worship belonging to the Egyptian Therapeutæ, whom he regarded as Christians. Afterwards, in the middle ages, it became usual to give this name (*monasteria*) to large parochial and cathedral churches. Hence the word *minster*.

*Σύνοδοι* (*synodi*), *concilia*, *conciliabula*, and *conventicula*, are names sometimes applied by the ancients to places of Christian worship; but these words are only translations or synonyms of *ἐκκλησία*. Of these names, the oldest and most common is *conventiculum* (*conventicle*). After the lapse of several centuries, this word became restricted in its signification, and was used to

denote especially places of worship belonging to sects which were deemed heretical or schismatic.

Some other names of Christian places of worship are worthy of notice on account of their antiquity, or their significancy.

Casa, or casa Dei, was in use during the middle ages. This was merely a synonym of *σκηνή Θεοῦ*, or tabernaculum.

Mensa was used synonymously with *Θυσιαστήριον*, and *Μαρτύριον*, to denote an altar and place of worship erected in honour of a martyr. Thus Augustin speaks of Mensa Cypriani (*Serm. de Div.* 113).

*Κοιμητήριον*, cœmeterium, or *μαρτυρῶν τὸ τάφος*, area sepulchurarum, area martyrum, and the like, are expressions used by Athanasius, Chrysostom, and other writers, to denote houses of worship erected in places where martyrs or other eminent saints were buried.

The term Corpus Christi may be regarded as simply equivalent to "Christ Church," and may have reference to Coloss. i. 18. But this title can hardly claim an earlier date than the period in which the doctrine of transubstantiation was introduced, and when the Festum Corporis Christi was instituted.

Churches were sometimes called *insulæ*, islands; because they were detached from surrounding buildings (STEPH. DURANT. *de Ritib. Eccl. Cath.* lib. i. c. 3).

Churches were distinguished, in the course of centuries, by various epithets, according to their size, their relation to other churches, or some other circumstances connected with them. Thus we read of,

*Ecclesiæ matrices* (matriciales) et *filiales*; or simply *matres et filia*, *i. e.*, mother-churches, and daughters; from their mutual connexion and-dependence.

*Ecclesiæ cathedrales*, cathedral churches, from being the seat of a spiritual superior and governor. And these again were either *episcopales* or *archiepiscopales*, *metropolitanæ*, or *patriarchales*.

*Ecclesiæ Catholice*; so called sometimes by way of distinction from the churches of reputed heretics and schismatics; and sometimes as synonyms with *episcopales*.

*Ecclesiæ diœcesanæ*; usually the same as *episcopales*.

*Ecclesiæ parochiales*, or *parochiæ*, *i. e.*, parish churches. But sometimes this term is equivalent to *episcopales* or *diœcesanæ*.

*Ecclesiæ baptismales*, *Βαπτιστήρια*, *Κολυμβήθραι*, *piscinæ*, *tinctoria*, *baptisterii basilicæ*, *aulæ baptismatis*; *i. e.*, *baptisteries*.

*Ecclesiæ curatæ*, in which service was performed provisionally by a *curatus* (or *curate*); nearly the same as *filiz*.

*Oratoria*, and *capellæ*, are usually synonymous; but, when distinguished, the former denoted a private chapel, the latter a chapel of ease. Both are sometimes called *sacellæ sacræ*, and in the neuter *sacella*, whence *sacellanus*, *i. e.*, *sacelli præfectus*, *capellanus*.

*Ecclesiæ articulares*, churches or chapels dependent on a mother church, same as *filiz*, *capellæ*.

*Ecclesiæ collegiatæ*, *collegiales*, or *conventuales*, collegiate churches.

*Ecclesiæ commendatæ* or *commendariæ*, same as *curatæ*.

Since the middle ages the following distinctions have become common:—

*Ecclesiæ civicæ*, town or city churches.

*Ecclesiæ rurales*, or *villanæ*, country churches.

*Ecclesiæ castellanæ*, churches in fortresses or castles.

*Ecclesiæ cœmeteriales*, churches in burial-grounds.

*Ecclesiæ capitales*, or *cardinales*, *principales*.

*Ecclesiæ majores*, or *primariæ*; *i. e.*, *matres*.

*Ecclesiæ minores*, or *secundariæ*; *i. e.*, *filiz*, *capellæ*.

*Ecclesiæ seniores et juniores*; *i. e.*, *matres et filiz*.

*Ecclesiæ per se*, independent churches; *i. e.*, *parochiales*, *matres*, &c.

## CHAPTER II.

### HISTORY OF CHURCHES.

#### §1.—TO THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

IT has been maintained that the first Christians possessed no separate public buildings set apart for the purposes of religious worship, such as our churches or chapels. In the time of perse-

ention, it has been said, the Christians could not venture to give their worship the character of publicity, but were obliged rather to hold their assemblies in secret, and to change the places of such meetings so as to avoid suspicion. Besides this, the early apologists of Christianity mention, without refutation, the allegations of their adversaries, that Christians had neither altars, nor temples, nor images; and affirm that God could be worshipped in every place, and that his best temple upon earth is the heart of man. (ARNOB. *Disputat. adv. Gent.* lib. vi. c. 1; ORIGEN *c. Cels.* lib. 7, 8; MINUC. FEL. *Octav.* c. 8, 10, 32.)

On the other hand, it has been observed that the persecutions of Christians were neither universal nor permanent, but happened for the most part in particular districts, and at intervals of greater or less duration; and that the Christian apologists, in disclaiming the use of temples and the like, intended only to abjure and pour contempt on the splendid, but formal, worship of Jews and heathens. And the following facts and testimonies have been cited, in establishing the point in favour of the existence of separate places of Christian worship before the time of Constantine the Great.

Lampridius, in his life of Alexander Severus (who reigned from A.D. 222 to 235), relates that the emperor confirmed the Christians in the possession of a certain place which they had occupied for the purposes of divine worship (c. 49).

The chronicle of Edessa (in ASSEMANNI *Bibl. Or.* t. i. p. 387) relates that during the great flood which happened at that place in the year 202, a Christian church (or, as it is termed, a temple of Christian assemblies) was destroyed.

That there were many Christian churches in various provinces of the Roman empire during the third century, known by the name of *ἐκκλησιὰ*, *domus Dei*, and the like, appears from the accounts of many contemporary writers (TERTULL. *de Idol.* c. 7; *adv. Val.* c. 3; *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3; *De Pud.* c. 4; CYPR. *Ep.* lv. 33; GREG. THAUMAT. *Epist. can.* c. 11; GREG. NYSSEN. *vita Greg. Thaumat.*; DIONYS. AL. *Ep. can.* c. 2; LACTANT. *Instit. Div.* lib. v. c. 11; *de Morte Persec.* c. 12, 15; AMBROS. *in Ephes.* 4).

But the most decisive proof is that which may be found in the history of the Diocletian persecution, which was more violent



and more general than any other, and was particularly directed against the Holy Scriptures, and the religious worship of the Christians. In the edict of the year 302 (303, or 305) it was ordered "that the churches should be levelled with the ground, and the Scriptures should be destroyed by fire," (*τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἔδαφος φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ἀφανεῖς πυρὶ γενέσθαι*, EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 2.) See passages from Lactantius and Eusebius in the note<sup>1</sup>.

Optatus mentions that in his time there were forty large churches, or more, in the city of Rome (OPTAT. *MILEVIT. de Schism. Donat.* lib. ii. c. iv.)

## § 2.—FROM CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN.

SOON after the persecution by Diocletian, the facilities for Christian worship were greatly increased. After the defeat of Maximus, the Emperors Constantine and Licinius not only granted to the Christians, by an edict of toleration (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 5), the free exercise of their religion, but directed that all their places of assembly (*τόπους αὐτῶν, εἰς οὓς τό πρότερον*

<sup>1</sup> Qui dies cum illuxisset, agentibus consulatum senibus ambobus octavum et septimum, repente adhuc dubia luce ad ecclesiam profectus cum ducibus, et tribunis, et rationalibus venit; et revulsis foribus, simulacrum Dei queritur. Scripturæ repertæ incenduntur, datur omnibus præda, rapitur, trepidatur, discurritur. Ipsi vero in speculis (in alto enim constituta ecclesia ex palatio videbatur) diu inter se concertabant, utrum ignem potius supponi oporteret. Vicit sententia Diocletianus, caveus ne magno incendio facto pars aliqua civitatis arderet. Nam multæ et magnæ domus ab omni parte cingebant. Veniebant igitur Prætoriani, acie structa, cum securibus, et aliis ferramentis; et immissi undique, tamen [al. tandem] illud editissimum paucis horis solo adæquarunt. LACTANTIUS. *De Morte Persecut.* c. 12 (*Conf.* c. 7).—Constantius, ne dissentire a

majorum præceptis videretur, conventicula, id est, parietes qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. *Ib.* c. 15.—Concerning the same emperor (Constantius Chlorus) Eusebius says,—*τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους φυλάξας, καὶ μήτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοὺς ὄγκους καθελῶν, μήθ' ἑτερόν τι καθ' ἡμῶν καινουργησάς.* EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 13.—The same author, relating the condition of the Christians before the persecution under Diocletian, remarks,—*Πῶς δ' ἂν τις διαγράψειε τὰς μυριάδους ἐκείνας ἐπισυναγωγὰς, καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἀθροισμάτων, τὰς τε ἐπισήμους ἐν τοῖς προσεκηρῖοις συνδρομάς; ὧν δὴ ἔνεκα μηδὲ μὴ ἔτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκοῦμενοι, εἰρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας.*—EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 1.

*συνέρχασθαι ἔθος ἦν αὐτοῖς*) should be restored free of expense. (See also EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 2; LACTANT. *de Mort. Persecut.* c. 48; and EUSEB. *de Vit. Const. M.* lib. iii. c. 25, 64, 65.)

It is well known that after the conversion of Constantine, the Christian churches increased rapidly in number and magnificence. It does not appear that many of the heathen temples were available for the purposes of Christian worship; but some of them, the size and structure of which were convenient, were afterwards converted into churches (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 24; EVAGR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 16; *Cod. Theodos.* 16, tit. 10, leg. 16, 19, 25). Many temples were destroyed by fire or otherwise under Constantius, Theodosius the Great, and his sons.

Accounts of the foundation of several large churches at Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nicomedia, Heliopolis, and Constantinople by the Emperor Constantine have been preserved by Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Nicephorus. But there is no sufficient historical proof that Constantine built any church at Rome.

We do not find that the Emperor Julian shut up or destroyed the Christian churches; although he is celebrated for his attempts to restore the heathen worship, and especially for his efforts to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem.

Theodosius the Great is celebrated rather as a destroyer of heathen temples than as a builder of Christian churches. Under this emperor and his sons heathenism received its final overthrow, as the religion of the state; and was thenceforward called Paganism, or village superstition.

Heathen temples, when converted to Christian use, were purified by a solemn dedication (*ἐγκαίνια*), and by the sign of the cross ("collocatione venerandi religionis Christianæ signi expiari præcipimus," *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. 10, l. 25); they also received new and appropriate names. Thus the *Τυχαῖον*, or Temple of Fortune at Antioch, was converted into a church, dedicated to the martyr Ignatius.

The emperor who was especially distinguished by zeal and liberality in the erection of churches was Justinian I. The churches which he built, says his historian Procopius, were so

large and splendid, that each of them might have led us to suppose that the emperor had bestowed upon it the whole of his care and attention during a long reign. But his great undertaking of this kind was the large and magnificent church of St. Sophia at Constantinople. This church, which had been erected by Constantine on a large scale, had been burnt during a popular tumult in the reign of Anastasius; and was restored by Justinian, in such extent and splendour, that at the dedication of it, in the year 557, he is said to have exclaimed *Νενίκησα σε Σολομών*, "I have surpassed thee, Solomon." The part of the church in which the high altar stood contained ornaments to the value of forty thousand pounds of silver. The ministers and officers attached to the place were no fewer than five hundred and twenty-five in number. Descriptions of this magnificent edifice may be found in EVAGR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 31; PROCOP. *de Ædific. Justin.* lib. i. c. 1, seq.

### § 3.—FROM JUSTINIAN TO THE TENTH CENTURY.

ART seems to have exhausted itself in the building of the great church of St. Sophia; at all events, we hear of no undertaking to be compared with it during many succeeding centuries. The political disturbances by which Asia and Europe were convulsed may indeed have been the chief cause of the decline which became evident in the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting; but the cessation of colossal erections is, doubtless, partly to be attributed to a change in the public taste.

In the West, the fashion of building on so extensive a scale does not appear to have prevailed at any period. And after the irruption of the barbarians, the art of architecture, as well as others, visibly declined. We find few traces of church building from the fifth to the eighth centuries inclusive. During this time, heathen temples were commonly converted into places of Christian worship.

During the sixth and seventh centuries, many churches were erected in Italy, France, Spain, England, Scotland, and Germany, in the Byzantine style and taste, with which these western countries had become acquainted through the instrumentality of the Goths, especially Theodoric, and which, for this reason,

obtained the appellation of Gothic. Theodoric, who reigned in Italy, died A. D. 526.

The numerous palaces and churches erected by Charlemagne and his successors, which are usually regarded as colossal and splendid works of art, are, however, below mediocrity, if compared with the church of St. Sophia, and the German Cathedrals of the thirteenth century.

The total neglect of architecture in the tenth century may be ascribed principally to the belief which at that time prevailed concerning the immediate revelation of antichrist, and the approaching end of the world. In consequence of this belief, people were unwilling either to build new churches, or to restore such as were old and dilapidated.

#### § 4.—DURING THE ELEVENTH, TWELFTH, AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES.

AT the commencement of the eleventh century, the views which had been entertained concerning the near approach of the end of the world began to wear away, and some attention was paid about this time to the neglected apparatus of public worship. But the progress was slow; and monasteries and abbeys, rather than churches, were the objects of care until the end of the twelfth century.

Early in the eleventh century began the system of raising money for ecclesiastical buildings by the sale of indulgences. The example of this practice was set by Pontius, bishop of Arles, in the year 1016. According to Morinus (*De Sacram. Pœnit.* lib. vii. c. 14, 20), the French bishops professed, during the twelfth century, to remit a third or fourth part of penance to persons who should contribute a certain sum of money towards the building or restoring of a place of worship. In this way Mauritius, bishop of Paris, built the splendid cathedral of Notre Dame, and four abbeys; for which, however, he incurred the censure of some of his contemporaries. In later times the example was frequently followed at Rome; and it is well known that the collection of Peter's pence, and the sale of indulgences in raising money for the building of St. Peter's, was one of the proximate causes of the German reformation.

In the thirteenth century, ecclesiastical architecture attained to the height of its perfection. After the introduction of the pointed arch, at the beginning of this period, buildings were erected which exceeded, in size and architectural beauty, all which had hitherto been dedicated to the services of the church. The style of architecture which obtained at this time has been usually denominated Gothic, or new Gothic; but it may more properly claim the title of German, or English. It prevailed in Germany, the Netherlands, England and Denmark; and from those countries it was introduced into Italy, France, and Spain. Some suppose that Saxony is the country to which its origin may be traced.

Some antiquaries regard the beautiful architecture of this period as a sudden effect produced by the invention of the pointed arch; while others contend that it was the result of a gradual improvement in the art during the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Certain, however, it is that this style of building, after having attained its perfection more or less rapidly in the thirteenth century, prevailed almost exclusively during the fourteenth and fifteenth.

Opinions are divided also upon a question relating to the quarter from which this style was originally derived. Some persons suppose that it was brought from the Arabians or Saracens, at the time of the Crusades, or from the same people in Spain and Sicily at a still earlier date. And it seems likely that some of its forms, at least, may have originated in this quarter. Others refer the design to the talent and invention of one or two great masters whom they suppose to have flourished in the early part of the century, but without being able to say who they were. While others again consider that we are indebted for the improvement to the societies of masons, which existed from a very early period, and were greatly encouraged by popes and emperors during the middle ages. They had lodges in England and on the Continent; some place their beginning in Germany, others in France, and others in England under the Saxon kings. These architectural corporations must not be confounded with the modern freemasons.

## CHAPTER III.

## FORMS OF CHURCHES.

ACCORDING to the principles of the early Christians, who deprecated the idea of confining the presence of the object of their worship to any particular spot, their places of religious worship bore no resemblance either to the Jewish temple, or to the temples and altars of the heathen. And hence their apologists could truly enough assert that their worship was conducted “without temples or altars.”

The Jewish synagogues and *proseuchæ* furnished the nearest patterns of the first Christian churches; and perhaps they were even identical, until the overthrow of the Jewish state, and the increasing numbers of Christians, produced the necessity of change and enlargement. Still, however, one circumstance continued to distinguish alike synagogues and churches from the heathen temples; namely, the assembling of the whole body of believers for the purpose of prayer and hearing of the word. This was entitled by the Greeks *δημοσία*, and by the Jews and Christians *ἐκκλησία*. In order to accomplish the end of this society of brethren, united under one invisible head, it was necessary that the assembly should be gathered together in one place where all its members should take an active and equal part in the offices of devotion, and in receiving instruction. This place of meeting should serve as an auditory (*ἀκροατήριον*, such as the philosophers and orators used), in which the wants and convenience of all would be consulted; and in point of size and plan, it would be adapted to the number and circumstances of the congregation.

But churches differed from synagogues inasmuch as the former were provided with a table (at least) for the celebration of the Lord's supper, and a font for baptism.

The use of the two sacraments, together with their initiatory rites, demanded a peculiar construction of Christian churches. Baptism, in particular, occasioned the greatest difficulty in point of locality, especially as long as it was administered only to adults. The necessity of providing for the baptism of a large number of

these persons at the great festivals led to the erection of baptisteries, or large buildings set apart for the celebration of this sacrament. These appear to have been at first the largest edifices which were erected among the Christians for religious purposes. They were appropriated not merely to the ceremony of baptism, but to the previous instruction and preparation of the candidates (catechumens); and hence they were sometimes called *κατηχομενεῖα* or *κατηχούμενα*. The larger baptisteries were often used as houses of assembly for ecclesiastical councils. After the prevalence of infant-baptism, and when the practice of administering that sacrament only at stated times had been discontinued, the necessity of separate and large baptisteries was superseded; and accordingly we find them but seldom mentioned after the sixth century.

The heathen temples were usually of a round form. This shape was not approved by the Christians, among whom an oblong figure, or the form of a ship, was the earliest, and continued to be the favourite<sup>1</sup>. According to Vitruvius and other old writers, the shape of the basilicæ resembled that of a ship, and a parallelogram. But at a very early period in the Christian church, as appears from Cyprian and others, this figure was connected with an allegorical or mystical signification. The early Christians adopted the metaphor of a ship to denote at once the dangers to which the church was exposed, and the safety which it offered to its members. They explained both the boat of Peter and the ark of Noah as emblematic of the church in these two several points of view. (TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 8, c. 12; and *De Pudicit.* c. 13.)

Another shape in which churches were frequently constructed was that of a cross; and this especially from the time of Constantine. Churches which presented this figure, either in their whole plan and structure, or in any of their parts, were called *σταυρωειδῆ*, or *σταυρωτά*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Πρῶτον μὲν ὁ οἶκος ἔστω ἐπιμήκης (i. e., oblong), κατ' ἀνατολὰς τετραμμένως, ἐξ ἑκατέρων τῶν μερῶν τὰ παστοφύρνια πρὸς ἀνατολήν, ὅστις εἶκε νηΐ. *Const. Apost.* lib. ii. 57.

<sup>2</sup> Σὺν τοῖς καὶ μεγάλαινον ἔδος Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν, Πλευραῖς σταυρωτέποις τέτραχα τεμνόμενον.

GREG. NAZ. *Carm.* 9.

The following particulars, also, relating to the shape of churches deserve to be mentioned in this place.

*Figura dromica* (δρομική) relates sometimes to the form of a long square, and sometimes to a long passage or gallery running parallel with the walls of the building.

The term *τρουλλωται* is commonly translated cylindrical, and supposed to be synonymous with *κυλινδρωτά*, *θολωτά*, and *κυκλοειδῆ*, denoting a round oval shape. But this is not quite correct; for the Greek *τρουλλῶς* (*τρουλλίον*, *τρουήλης*) is no other than the Latin *trulla*, which signifies a mason's trowel, and is described by lexicographers as "vas," or "instrumentum oblongum," *i. e.*, an implement of an oblong shape. Bingham says, "But this [viz., round, in the figure of an arch or a sphere], properly speaking, was not so much the form of a church, as the figure of one part of some churches, as particularly that of Sancta Sophia, the body of which was built in the form of a *trulla*, *that is, a great round arch or sphere*, but yet the whole was oblong, resembling the form of other churches." (*Antiq.* b. viii. c. 3, § 1.) The emperor's palace at Constantinople especially was called *Τρουλλῶς*; from which the councils held in the year 680 and 692 are entitled *Concilia Trullana*.

The terms—*polygonæ*, *octaedræ*, *octachoræ*, *octagonæ*, *quadrate*—are derived from Grecian and Roman architecture, and were for the most part confined to common conversation.

## CHAPTER IV.

### SITE AND POSITION OF CHURCHES.

WITH respect to the situation of churches, two particulars are to be noticed: namely, the sites or places in which they were erected, and their position or aspect.

1. *Site*.—By the Christian religion, the worship of God is not limited to place. "The hour cometh," said our blessed Lord to the woman of Samaria, "when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem (*i. e.* exclusively) worship the Father. The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall



worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." (John iv. 21, 23.) And accordingly we find that the early believers held their religious assemblies sometimes in the open country, sometimes in woods and caves, and sometimes in synagogues and private houses, or on board ship. In this respect, Christian liberty continued to be exercised in all ages of the church. But yet, from a very early period, a preference was manifested for certain favourite situations. Among these may be reckoned:—

Mountains and other elevated spots. This choice was made partly for the sake of security and retirement from the bustle of the world, and partly perhaps in accordance with an ancient opinion of the especial sanctity of such places. The Jewish temple had been built on a hill; and the Christians may have remembered the expression of the psalmist, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." (Ps. cxxi. 1.) At first, indeed, it appears that hills and mountains were avoided as sites of religious meetings, which may have happened because such high ground was not favourable to concealment, or because such elevations were frequently chosen for the heathen temples. But when, under altered circumstances, no such impediments remained, a preference was given to lofty situations for the erection of churches.

The tombs of martyrs and confessors; near which either altars (*mensæ*), or chapels and churches (*μαρτύρια*) were built, as memorials (*memoriæ*) of the departed. These were either frequented on certain festivals and other occasions, or appropriated to the offices of religious worship.

Places which had become distinguished by any remarkable event; and such as offered a good foundation,—were situate in a good neighbourhood,—or were eligible on any other account.

Subterranean churches and oratories were sometimes constructed; but this was always on account of some local and special reason. Such churches were called *κρυπταὶ*, *cryptæ* (*oratoria et sacella subterranea*). They were common in Germany during the tenth and eleventh centuries.

2. *Aspect*.—We find that at a very early period churches were built with the sanctuary, or altar part, towards the east.

This, perhaps, was designed as a mark of distinction from the Jewish temple, which had its sanctuary towards the west; and in opposition to the Jewish custom of turning towards the west in prayer. (See 1 Kings viii. 44, 48; xviii. 43; 2 Chron. xxix. 6; Dan. vi. 10.) But to Christians the remembrance of the morning star,—of the Saviour, the Sun of righteousness, who rose in the morning from his grave,—was sacred and dear; and hence they were accustomed, during the celebration of religious worship, to direct their faces toward the east. This idea was mixed up with many of their religious observances. After baptism, the newly-admitted members of the church were placed with their faces eastward. And the dead were usually buried in the same position. (CYRIL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystag.* i. n. 2; GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 40; HIERON. *Comment. in Amos*, vi. 14; DIONYS. AREOP. *de Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 3.)

The first instance in which we find an easterly position prescribed for churches is in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, book ii. c. 57, ὁ οἶκος ἔστω ἐπιμήκης, κατ' ἀνατολὰς τετραμμένος, i. e., “let the edifice be oblong, turned towards the east.” The existence of the rule is evinced also by certain exceptions, which have been noticed by ecclesiastical writers<sup>1</sup>. But these exceptions are neither so numerous, nor described in such manner, as to warrant a conclusion that the rule itself was not of universal or general application.

## CHAPTER V.

### STRUCTURE AND PARTS OF CHURCHES.

THE first three centuries present us with no particular account of the structure and arrangement of churches during that period; and it is probable that, in these respects, there was a difference

<sup>1</sup> Ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀντίστροφον ἔχει τὴν θέασιν οὐ γὰρ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς δύσιν ὄρᾳ. SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 22.—Prospectus Basilicæ non,

ut usitatio mos est, orientem spectat, sed ad Domini mei beati Felicis Basilicam pertinet, Memoriam ejus aspiciens. PAULIN. NOLAN. *Ep.* 12.

according to time and circumstances. But *from the fourth century* we find uniformity prevailing in these matters, in the churches both of the East and of the West. A threefold partition then obtained, corresponding to the threefold division of the Christian community into clergy, the faithful, and the catechumens; and to the division of the Jewish temple into the holy of holies, the sanctuary, and the court. Perhaps there was an intentional reference to both these divisions; for it must be remembered that, by this time, the Levitical services had become an object of imitation in the Christian church, which, in its earlier and better days, had studiously avoided all approach to them. The three parts into which the churches of this date were divided, beginning with the interior, were,—1. The bema, or sanctuary, in which the clergy officiated. 2. The naos, or nave, appropriated to the faithful communicants, or in other words, the lay members of the church. 3. The narthex, or ante-temple, the place of the penitents and catechumens. Sometimes four or five divisions are enumerated; which arise from subdividing the narthex into outer and inner, and reckoning the exedræ, or outer buildings, as a portion of the church. We adhere to the threefold, or more simple division, and proceed to speak of each part in the order already described.

#### § 1.—THE BEMA, OR SANCTUARY.

THIS inner portion of the church, appropriated to the clergy, was variously entitled.

1. *Βῆμα*, from *ἀναβαίνειν*, to ascend; which word was sometimes retained in Latin (*bema*), but more commonly rendered *suggestum*. This name was given sometimes to the raised platform which supported the throne (*θρόνος*) or chair (*καθέδρα*) of the bishop, and the seats of the presbyters,—and sometimes to the whole of that part of the church in which this platform and the altar stood. Hence the clergy were called *τάξις τοῦ βήματος*, or *οἱ περὶ τὸ βῆμα, οἱ ἐκ τοῦ βήματος* (GREGOR. NAZ. *Orat.* 19, 20).

2. *Ἁγιον, ἁγίασμα, ἄγιον ἁγίων*, *sanctum, sanctuarium, sacrarium*. i. e., *the holy or most holy place, the sanctuary*. It was

so called because the most solemn offices of religion, especially the consecration of the eucharist, were performed within it (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* x. 4; vii. 15; *Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 93).

3. Ἱερατεῖον, and πρεσβυτήριον, presbyterium, *presbytery*; because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their functions.

4. Θυσιαστήριον, because the high altar stood here (*Conc. Laod.* c. 44; *Trullan.* c. 69).

5. Ἄδυτον, and ἄβατον, or more often in the plural, ἄδυτα, and ἄβατα, i. e., *places not to be entered or trodden*, because neither laymen nor females were permitted to enter (*Conc. Laod.* c. 19, 44; *Conc. Trullan.* c. 69; THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 18; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 25).

6. Ἀνάκτορον, a common name for a temple with the tragic writers. This term is of comparatively late introduction.

7. Locus intra cancellos, τὰ ἐνδον τῶν κικλίδων (THEODORET, *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 18), *the chancel*, because this part was divided from the nave by a partition of rails, in the form of net-work (cancelli).

8. Chorus, *the choir*, a term of late introduction, and chiefly in the western churches, because here the clergy chanted (*Concil. Tolet.* iv. c. 18; ISIDOR. HISPAL. *Orig.* lib. i. c. 3).

This portion of the church was usually raised above the nave by an ascent of one or two steps. In later times, it was commonly built of a round or oval form, while the nave retained an oblong shape. At least, the upper or front part had the shape of a half-circle, or a bent bow, or a shell; and this was expressed by the words ἀψὶς, apsis or absis, concha, and conchula bematis. In this semicircular space was the throne (θρόνος) or chair (καθέδρα) of the bishop. In a complete church, the presbyters had also their separate seats; and hence the expressions σύνθρονοι, θρόνοι πρῶτοὶ καὶ δευτέροι, θρόνος καὶ συμψέλλια (subsellia) (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 4, 5; vii. 30; GREGOR. NAZ. *Sonn. Anast.* v. 4; *Carm. Iamb.* 23; *Const. Ap.* ii. 57; THEODOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 3). The bishop's seat was usually furnished with curtains, and hence it is sometimes called cathedra velata (AUGUSTIN, *Ep.* 203; ATHANAS. *Apol.* ii.)

In the middle of this sanctuary (chancel, or choir) stood the

high altar, on which the elements of the eucharist were consecrated, and which, in course of time, was variously denominated τὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἁγιον θυσιαστήριον, *the altar of the most holy place*, τράπεζα ἱερὰ, μυστικὴ, πνευματικὴ, *the sacred, mysterious, or spiritual table*, mensa sancta, or tremenda, *the sacred or awful table*. It stood in an open space, quite detached, so that there was a passage all round it; with reference, perhaps, to Ps. xxvi. 6.

On one side of the altar (usually on the right) stood the παρατράπεζον, mensula, i. e., *side table*; sometimes called also πρόθεσις, paratorium, oblationarium, and sometimes sacrarium, or secretarium, on which the oblations were placed after they had been collected by the deacons, before the beginning of the eucharist.

On the other (left) side of the table was the σκευοφυλάκιον, diaconicum bematis, or diaconicum minus,—the place in which the sacred vessels were put after the communion was ended, in order to be cleaned and prepared for removal to the gazophylacium magnum, or diaconicum majus, i. e., *sacristy*.

## § 2.—THE NAVE.

THE two appellations of the middle portion of the church, ναὸς, and navis, may appear, at first sight, to be related to each other, as though the latter had arisen from the former. This, however, is not the fact; for navis is the Greek word ναῦς, a ship; and is used technically to denote the middle, or larger part of the church; while ναὸς is applied to the same part as distinguished from the sanctuary and from the outer portions (προναός). Other names were given to this portion of the church, descriptive of its use. Such were the following:—

Oratorium populi s. Laicorum; because here the people joined in the offices of public worship.

Εκκλησία, the place of assembly.

Quadratum populi, with reference to the square shape of this part, as distinguished from the semicircular chancel.

In the nave, the following details are especially worthy of remark:—

1. The ἀμβων, ambo, or, as it was also called, βῆμα τῶν ἀναγινωστῶν, suggestum lectorum, *the reader's desk*. It was called ambo, from the Greek word ἀναβαίνειν, to mount or ascend; because the desk was raised above the general surface of the nave. In CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 33, 34, we find it entitled pulpitum (pulpit), and tribunal ecclesie (to distinguish it from the βῆμα, or tribunal chori). Here the scriptures, and any other document of public interest were read. The sermon was usually preached in the chancel; and the circumstance that Chrysostom and Augustin delivered their discourses from the ambo, is mentioned as an exception to the general rule. The Gospel and Epistle were recited before the altar, whence the division of the altar into cornu evangelii, and cornu epistolæ. The singers were stationed on or near the ambo (*Concil. Laodic.* c. 15); and the faithful sat round it, so that this was the chief place in the nave, as the altar was in the choir or chancel.

As the size of churches increased, preaching in the chancel became more and more difficult, and it often happened that the officiating bishop or presbyter was inaudible on account of his great distance from the people (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 5). Hence a custom was introduced of placing a suggestum, or pulpit, for the sermon, in front of the partition which divided the chancel from the nave. This was called, on account of its situation, cancellus.

In order to avoid disorder and a breach of decorum, of which even St. Paul complained, care was bestowed upon the division and arrangements of seats for the people, especially at the communion and the agapæ (*Constit. Apost.* ii. 57; viii. 20; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Pro-Catech.* c. 8; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17). According to the old rule, the men and women sat apart (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Pro-Catech.* c. 8; AUGUST. *de Cir. Dei*, ii. 28; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 74 *in Matth.*; STEPH. DURAND. *de Rit. Eccl.* i. 18). The men used to sit on the left hand, or south side; the women on the right, or north; and sometimes the two parties were separated by curtains, or lattice-work. In the eastern churches, the women occupied raised seats, or galleries; while the men sat below (GREGOR. NAZ. *Carm.* 9; EVAGR. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 31). In this upper part were also the κατεχού-

μενα; which, however, were occupied by others besides the catechumens. The Greek writers sometimes speak also of a *ματρονίκιον*, or place of the matrons, as distinct from the *παρθενίκιον*, or place of the younger women.

The catechumens were usually ranged behind the faithful or communicants, according to their different degrees, during those portions of religious worship at which they were allowed to be present. Then followed the *pœnitentes*, penitents, *i. e.*, those who had been lately readmitted into the church. And the *ostiarii*, acolyths, subdeacons, deaconesses, and deacons, were responsible for the observance of the prescribed order, and the maintenance of decorum. (*Constit. Apost.* ii. 57, 58.)

Great controversy has arisen respecting a part of the nave called *Σωλέα*, *Σολία*, *ὁ Σολέας* (*Σωλέας*), *ὁ Σωλεὺς*, *τὸ Σολεῖον*, *Σωλεῖον*, or *Σωλίον*. Latin writers use the word *Solea*; but it is doubtful whether this is formed from *solium*, or is to be taken for *solea*, the ground. But [this place is usually called *Senatorium*; and is supposed to denote certain seats at the entrance of the chancel appropriated to the use of emperors, kings, magistrates, or other persons of distinction. The seats of the inferior clergy, and the monks, are sometimes distinguished by this name.

The nave was surrounded by passages or aisles, and little chambers or cells. It was separated from the chancel by a partition of lattice-work, with a curtain; and the entrance to the choir was by folding doors in this partition. (*CHRYSOST. Hom.* 3, *in Ep. ad Ephes.*; *EVAGR. Hist. Eccl.* vi. 21; *PAUL. NOL. Nat. Felic.* iii. 6.) These doors were provided with curtains (*βῆλα τῆς ἐκκλησίας*); which, as well as the larger curtain, called *καταπέτασμα*, and *καταπέτασμα μυστικόν*, were drawn aside during the celebration of the eucharist (at least, in the earlier times, when the communicants were allowed to approach the table), and during the delivery of the sermon. The business of drawing and undrawing these curtains was committed to the subdeacons and acolyths.

### § 3.—THE NARTHEX, OR ANTE-TEMPLE.

THE outer division of the church (within the walls) was called

πρόναος, *ante-temple*; πρόπυλα, porticus, *portico*; and νάρθηξ, or ferula. The latter name is supposed to have been given to it on account of its oblong or dromical shape, resembling in this respect a rod or staff. It was a long and narrow part of the building, extending across the front of the church. Some of the larger churches had several of these nartheces.

Here were usually three entrances; one on the west side, another on the south, and another on the north. The chief entrance, or great door, was at the west, opposite the altar; it was called (after the corresponding part of the temple at Jerusalem) πύλη ώραία, or βασιλική, *the beautiful, or royal gate*; and, in EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* x. 4, simply πρώτη εἴσοδος, *the chief entrance*. The gates and doors usually consisted of two folding leaves (portæ et januæ bifores). The doors leading from this part into the nave were appropriated to the various classes of the members, and named accordingly, “the priest’s door, the men’s door,” &c.

In the vestibule, or πρόναος in the stricter sense, the catechumens and pœnitentes audientes had their station. (*Const. Apost.* viii. 5; *BASIL. M. Ep. can.* c. 57; *GREGOR. NYSS. Ep. ad Let.* c. 5.) Here, also, a place was accorded to unbelievers and heretics; although this was forbidden by some Eastern synods (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 6), so far as related to heretics and schismatics. The Latin church was more liberal in this respect, as appears from a canon (the eighty-fourth) of the fourth Council of Carthage, by which it was enacted that the bishop should not forbid any one, whether gentile, heretic, or Jew, to enter the church and hear the word of God, until the beginning of the missa catechumenorum.

The πρόπυλα, or portico, properly so called, was used chiefly for the performance of funeral rites. But, in the larger churches, meetings were held in it, and other business transacted, relating to ecclesiastical affairs.

In later times two vessels were placed here which formerly were stationed outside the walls, or in a separate building; namely, a fountain or cistern of water, in which persons about to enter the church washed their hands and face, and the font or baptistery.



Baronius (*Annal.* 57, n. 107), and other Roman Catholic writers, confound the custom of washing before entering the church, as a symbol of purification, with the modern practice of sprinkling with holy water as it exists in their church. But the two customs are, in fact, distinct. The practice of the early Christians is referred to in TERTULL. *de Orat.* c. 11; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* x. 4; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 52, in *Matt.* in *Psalms* cxi.; SYNES. *Ep.* 121. The fountain or vessel which contained water for this purpose was variously called κρήνη, φιάλη, φρέαρ, κολυμβεῖον, λεοντάριον, olymp hæum, cantharus. The custom of sprinkling with holy water may perhaps be regarded as a corruption of this ancient practice; although there is reason to suppose that at its introduction it was distinctly recognised as a Grecian rite, and that its origin is therefore rightly to be referred to the heathen περιρραντήρια, or lustral sprinklings<sup>1</sup>.

Pelliccia says that this vessel was not taken into the church, and placed near the entrance of the nave, until after the ninth century; and he describes it as even then used for washing the hands and face, both at Constantinople and at Rome. The present custom of sprinkling is of more recent origin.

The font was placed within the walls after the prevalence of infant-baptism, and when the neglect of stated seasons for administering the rite had rendered the larger baptisteries needless.

#### § 4.—OUTER BUILDINGS.

THE buildings attached to the church, but on the outside of the walls, were called by the general name of ἐξέδραι, exedræ, *i. e.*, side buildings. This term denoted all erections and places in the area connected with the church. This area was called περίβολος (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 4); with reference to the walls, porticoes, and cloisters, by which it was surrounded. These cloisters were called στοαί, περιστῶον, τετραστῶον, τετράστυλον. The open space between the extreme circumference and the church is called by Eusebius αἶθριον, which is rendered implu-

<sup>1</sup> Ἐπεὶ ἔμελλεν ἰπεραμίβειν τοῦ περιέρρανε τοὺς εἰσιόντας. SOZOM. ναοῦ τὸν ὁδόν, θαλλοῖς τινὰς διαβρόχους κατέχων ὁ ἱερεὺς νόμφ Ἑλληνικῶ | *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 6.

vium, but is in fact no other than the Latin atrium, and is synonymous with the more common term area.

In this court, or churchyard, was the station of the energumens, and that class of penitents called *προσκλαίοντες*, or flentes. These persons were commonly entitled *χειμάζοντες*, or *χειμαζόμενοι*, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all changes of the weather.

In the earliest times, the dead were not buried in this piece of ground. Some examples of this practice occur in the fourth century; and after the sixth century it became general.

The chief buildings in the area were the Baptisteries (*βαπτιστήρια*), which are spoken of as quite common in the fourth century. (PAULIN. NOL. *Ep.* 12; CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech. Mystagog.* i. 2; ii. 1; SIDON. *Ep.* iv. 15; AUGUST. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8; AMBROS. *Ep.* 33; GREGOR. TURON. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 11; ii. 31; JUSTIN. *Nor.* lviii. 42.) In these places the candidates were instructed and prepared for baptism (whence they are sometimes called *κατηχούμενα*), and there were separate apartments for males and females; here, also, councils and other ecclesiastical meetings were held; and hence it may be inferred that they were of capacious dimensions.

But it must not be supposed that such baptisteries were attached to all churches. They belonged peculiarly to cathedral churches, which were on this account sometimes denominated *ecclesiæ baptismales*; and they must be referred to times in which the bishop himself administered the sacrament of baptism at stated seasons. Remains of these baptisteries are still extant.

Among the other buildings in the area, some of which were attached to the church, and others not, the following are the most worthy of notice.

The Diaconicum magnum; so called by way of distinction from the diaconicum minus, which stood in the chancel. This was a place ordinarily detached from the church, in which were deposited all the vessels, implements, and vestments which were entrusted to the custody of the deacons and inferior clergy. (PHILOSTORG. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 3.) This place was called also *κειμηλιαρχεῖον*, *γαζοφυλάκιον*, and *σκευοφυλάκιον*, with reference to the jewels and sacred vessels which it contained

(DU CANGE *Comment. ad Paul. Silent.* p. 597; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. *de hæc.* l. 30);—secretum, or secretarium, either because it was regarded as a place of safety, or as being the robing-room of the officiating clergy, or because the bishop held audiences and examinations here;—saluatorium, *audience-chamber*;—receptorium, either *audience-chamber*, or *repository*;—vestiarium, and metatorium, or mutatorium, *vestry*, or *robing-room*. The δικάρικὰ, decanica, or decaneta, carceres ecclesie, a prison or place of correction for refractory officers of the church, was either part of this building, or formed a separate edifice. (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, l. 30; JUSTIN. *Nor.* LXXIX. c. 3; DU CANGE *Comment. in Paul. Silent.* p. 594; GREGOR. 2 *Ep. ad Leon. Isaur.*

The Παστοφόρια, pastophoria. The learned are divided in their opinions respecting the nature and use of the buildings distinguished by this name. They appear to have been chambers on either side of the church, appropriated to the habitation of the clergy, and the keepers of the church. Perhaps the gazophylacium was included in these buildings; or, at all events, certain implements or vessels belonging to the church were laid up here. The word pastophoria is borrowed from the Septuagint translation of Ezek. xl. 17, where it denotes the chambers in the outer court of the temple. The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* says that the deacons used to carry thither the remains of the eucharist when all had communicated. (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57; viii. 13.)

Libraries were attached to many churches, as appears from EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 20; HIERON. *Cat. Script. Eccl.* c. 3, 75, 113; *Comment. in Tit.* c. 3; AUGUSTIN. *de Hæres.* c. 80; BASIL. M. *Ep.* 82. In these collections were included not only the liturgical and other church books, and the manuscript copies of the Holy Scriptures, in the original languages and translations, but also homilies, catechisms, and other theological works. We may conclude that they were of some value and importance, from the manner in which they are referred to by Eusebius and Jerome, who mention having made use of these ecclesiastical libraries at Jerusalem and Cæsarea. Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople possessed large separate buildings of this description near the churches.

At a very early period, schools were established in connexion with the churches; and, although there may have been no separate building appropriated to their use, yet the work of instruction was carried on in places belonging to the church, especially the baptisteries and decanica. "Here it is probable," says Bingham, "that those famous catechetical schools of Alexandria and Cæsarea were kept; for Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, is said by Ruffin to have authorized Origen to teach as catechist in the church. Which cannot be understood of teaching publicly in the church; for Origen was then but eighteen years old, and not in orders, when he first entered upon the catechetical school; but it must mean his private teaching in the school of the church. Which, whether it was in the catechumenia within the church, or in the baptisteria or pastophoria without the church, is not very easy, nor very material, to be determined; since it appears to have been in some place belonging to the church, but not precisely determined by any ancient writers." (*Antiq.* book viii. chap. vii. § 12.) Parochial schools were formed at an early period. Councils of the seventh century enacted that presbyters, in even small towns and villages, should superintend schools, in which children of members of the church might be taught to read gratuitously. (*Conc. Constant.* vi. A.D. 680, c. 4, 5; *Conc. Trull.* A.D. 692, c. 297.) In later times, these schools were to a great extent superseded by others in connexion with monasteries.

Other buildings are sometimes mentioned as adjacent to churches, or connected with them (*EUSEB. Vit. Const. M.* lib. iv. c. 29; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 45, l. 4). The οἴκοι βασιλικοὶ were, doubtless, the habitations of the bishop and clergy. There were sometimes λουτρά, baths. Ἀνακαμπτήρια are supposed to have been places for walking in, or rather a kind of lodgings (diversoria); and this term, as well as καταγώγια, may be referred to the more general ξενοδοχεῖα, or houses in which strangers, the poor, and sick were lodged and taken care of. These hospitals, which at first were connected with churches, were afterwards more commonly attached to monastic establishments.

## § 5.—OF TOWERS, BELLS, AND ORGANS.

TOWERS, bells, and organs, which in more modern times have been almost inseparable additions to churches, were wholly unknown in the first places of Christian worship. They were introduced, however, in the early portion of the middle ages, and furnish interesting subjects of inquiry in subsequent centuries.

*Towers.*—It is uncertain at what period towers were first introduced into ecclesiastical architecture. Certain it is that no churches had towers during the first seven centuries; nor can we find any trace in ecclesiastical antiquity, long afterwards, of such towers as became common in the west after the thirteenth century. The word *πύργος*, *turris*, as first applied to churches, does not signify a tower in the modern acceptation of the word, but is synonymous with *βῆμα*, *ἄμβων*, *suggestum*.

It seems that wooden towers were in use in the time of Charlemagne. Express mention is made of a tower for bells, belonging to a church built in the year 837, and two of such towers, which, with the chancel and nave, constituted the form of a cross, attached to a church finished in 873.

It appears probable that towers are contemporary with bells in churches; and that they were designed at first as repositories for them and for the purpose of ringing. In the language of the middle ages, *turris*, and *campanarium* or *campanile*, are synonymous expressions. In one word, church-towers appear to have been, in their origin and first destination, little more than belfries. It has been suggested that the idea of a tower may have originated in that of the mast of a ship; but, on this supposition, it is difficult to account for the absence of towers in the earlier centuries, when the idea of a ship was especially prevalent in the construction of churches.

*Bells.*—Bells were unknown alike to the Jews, Greeks, and Romans; and the words *campana* and *nola* are of comparatively modern origin. Even if the *tintinnabula* used in the Roman

baths were a kind of bells, they were in no respect similar to our large church bells. The lebetes used at sacrifices, the æs dodonæum, godones, and petasus, were instruments corresponding to church-bells to a certain extent, so far as relates to their use and application, but not by any means in regard of size or structure.]

The invention and introduction of large bells belong exclusively to the Christian church, and must be referred to the seventh century at latest.

Paulinus, bishop of Nola in Campania, who flourished towards the end of the fourth century, is usually regarded as the inventor of church-bells; and hence the term nola or campana is supposed to have been derived. But there is reason to believe that this is altogether a mistake; and it is remarkable that no mention of church-bells is found either in the (fifty) epistles of Paulinus, in which he frequently mentions the construction and ornaments of his churches, or in his poems, or in the account of his life, which was compiled from his own works and the panegyrics of his contemporaries.

There appears, however, good reason for regarding Sabianus, bishop of Rome, who succeeded Gregory the Great in 604, if not as the inventor of large bells, yet as the first who applied them to ecclesiastical purposes. (POLYDORUS VERGIL, *De Invent. Rer.* 6, 11.)

Proof exists that bells were common in France as early as the seventh and eighth centuries. During the reign of Charlemagne they became universal in France and Germany. (FLODOARD, *Hist. Rhemens.* ii. 12; VINCENTIUS *Specul. Hist.* xxiii. 9, 10; *De Gestis Caroli M.* i. 31, in CANISIUS, *Thesaur. Monum.*)

Nearly three centuries afterwards bells were introduced into the east (BARONII *Annal. ad a.* 865); but, if ever they became general there, which is doubtful, they were speedily suppressed by their avowed enemies, the Arabs and Turks. In default of bells, the oriental Christians made use of the original methods of convening their assemblies by—

1. Θεοδρόμοι, couriers or messengers, who gave notice of the days and hours of holding religious assemblies. (BARONII *Annales ad. a.* 58, n. 102; JOACH. HILDEBRAND, *Enchirid. De Sacris Publ. Eccl. Primit.* c. 3.) This was the earliest, but most troublesome, kind of notice.

2. The tuba, trumpet, a kind of wind instrument used for signals. It was common in Egypt, as among the ancient Jews.

3. Wooden (or sometimes iron) rattles, shaken or struck by the hand.

In the west, the use of bells continued to increase, and came to be regarded even as an integral part of divine worship. Bells themselves were accounted sacred; they were formally consecrated to their use, and even baptized. The custom of giving names to bells cannot be traced beyond the eleventh or tenth century. The various uses of church-bells, real or supposed, are enumerated in the following well-known distich, with which they were frequently inscribed:

Laudo Deum verum, plebem voco, congreco clerum—  
Defunctos ploro, nimbum [al. pestem] fugo, festaque honoro.

During the middle ages, which are characterized by the colossal dimensions of their ecclesiastical buildings and appurtenances, bells of enormous size and weight, such as are found at Moscow, Paris, Vienna, Toulouse, Milan, Erfurt, and other places, were cast. But it is not easy to say precisely at what date this practice was introduced.

The following extract from (BREWSTER'S) *Edinburgh Encyclopaedia* may be interesting to those who desire further information on this subject:—"The period of introducing bells into England is not completely ascertained. Bede, in alluding to the year 680, or near that time, says 'audivit subito in aëre notum campanæ sonum quo ad orationes excitari vel convocari solebant.' After that they probably became common, and were the subject of pious donations, both here and on the continent. Turketulus, abbot of Croyland, who died in 975, caused a very large bell to be made, and presented it to his abbey. It was called Guthlac. His successor Egelricus also caused two large bells, called Bartholomæus and Bettelmus, to be made; two of middle size, called Turketulus and Tatwinus; and two smaller called Pega and Bega. When the bell Guthlac was rung along with these, Ingulphus affirms that such wonderful harmony was produced, that there was no ringing in all England to be compared to it.

"Thus we see that bells bore certain names, which has led to

an animated controversy, whether they were<sup>r</sup> baptized or not. . . . The ceremony used, if not baptism in the strict sense, was undoubtedly consecration or benediction, and at the same time a name was given. The bishop performing the consecration made five crosses, pronouncing these words,—‘Sanctificetur et consecretur Domine, signum istud, in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. In honorem sancti N. Pax tibi.’ By this formula the bell was consecrated in honour of a certain saint; but some of the chroniclers go further, and compare the ceremony to actual baptism: ‘Signa quinque: unum ex his mirabile in quo duo millenaria metallæ et sexcentæ libræ fuerunt, cui imprimi jussit signum baptismi de oleo et chrismate facti: sicut ordo deposcit ecclesiasticus, et ut vocaretur Robertus attribuerit Spiritus Sanctus.’ In the *Chronicon Montis Sereni* it is said that a Bishop Humbert consecrated a bell of fifty hundred weight, calling it Petronilla. Pope John XIII., in 968, consecrated a new bell of great size in the Lateran, and gave it the name of John. All the more remarkable bells were named or had legends inscribed on them. . . . Such inscriptions were often in honour of some saint, as if to remind the people of a sanctified name when the bell was rung, or to render the saint propitious to the donor and his flock. They expressed the weight and quality of the bell, or the properties which it possessed; and this sometimes to the elucidation of historical facts. In a tower of St. Peter’s at Rome were five bells, most of which were explanatory of some fact, and inscribed with several Latin verses; one was hung in 1258 during the ministry of a certain person; another was cast in 1353 after the lightning had destroyed former bells in the preceding year. Bells frequently bear the date, and an apposite legend. In the church of the Jesuits at Rome there was one brought from England which was inscribed, ‘Facta fuit A. Dom. 1400 die vi. mensis Septembris; Sancta Barbara ora pro nobis.’ Five bells being cast for a parish-church in England, each had an inscription in Latin hexameter, expressing its name, or that it was to be rung in memory of those individuals whose names were recorded on them.

“In regard to the superstitious uses of bells, we shall probably find the ringing of them at funerals to have originated in



the darkest ages, but with a different view from that in which they are now employed. . . . Reasoning from the customs of the ancients, that have been transmitted to us in innumerable superstitions, which extensive analogies only enable us to recognise, we may partly connect the ringing of bells for persons in the agonies of death with the virtue supposed to reside in the sound of brass. It was to avert the influence of demons. But if the superstitions of our ancestors did not originate in this imaginary virtue, while they preserved the practice, it is certain that they believed the mere noise had the same effect; and as, according to their ideas, evil spirits were always hovering around to make a prey of departing souls, the tolling of bells struck them with terror. We may trace the practice of tolling bells at funerals to the like source. This has been practised from times of great antiquity; the bells being muffled for the sake of greater solemnity, in the same way as we see drums muffled in military funerals. Possibly it was also with the view of averting the influence of evil spirits; as the soul was not believed to pass immediately to the regions of light or darkness. The efficacy of bells, and other noises, in putting demons to flight, is recorded among the ancients; and from them was widely extended during the more barbarous ages. . . . In Italy, during great tempests, the women assembled, ringing bells and beating cymbals, in the noise of which, the learned Moresin observes, they confided more than in the efficacy of fasting and prayer. On St. John's day, the bells were violently rung, and other superstitions practised, to put devils to flight, and avert the effect of storms which they were supposed to raise in the air.

“ We are therefore entitled to conclude that the ringing of bells for persons in the agonies of death, at funerals, and to dispel tempests, has originally had relation to one common object, the expulsion of demons. Here also we may seek the consecration or exorcising of bells, practised in the Roman Catholic churches, and perhaps the cause of naming them after particular saints. In the council of Cologne it is said, Let bells be blessed, as the trumpets of the church militant, by which the people are assembled to hear the word of God; the clergy to announce his mercy by day, and his truth in their nocturnal

vigils: that by their sound the faithful may be invited to prayers, and that the spirit of devotion in them may be increased. The fathers have also maintained that demons affrighted by the sound of bells calling Christians to prayers, would flee away; and when they fled, the persons of the faithful would be secure: that the destruction of lightnings and whirlwinds would be averted, and the spirits of the storm defeated.' All these things were promoted by consecration; and a credulous bishop narrates several miracles displayed by consecrated bells, which, without much difficulty, we can trace to natural causes. Durand, the author of the *Rituals of the Roman Church*, says, 'For expiring persons bells must be tolled, that people may put up their prayers. This must be done twice for a woman, and thrice for a man: for a clergyman as many times as he had orders: and at the conclusion a peal of all the bells must be given to distinguish the quality of the persons for whom the people are to offer up their prayers.'

*Organs.*—These instruments of music were introduced into the Christian church about the ninth century. They were unknown alike to the early church, and to all the ancients. The word organ is derived indeed from ὄργανον, organum, which not only is of common occurrence in Greek and Roman writers, but is frequently used by them to denote a musical instrument. But these instruments, as we shall see presently, were of a size and construction altogether inferior to the modern organ. The word ὄργανον occurs in the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew קְנֹוֹר (otherwise rendered κιθάρα), נַבֵּל (πάβλα or ναῦλον), and עֶגְבֵי; but we have no certain information respecting the nature of the instruments denoted by these appellations.

Besides the "organ" so often mentioned by the Greek and Roman poets as the invention of Pan, which usually consisted of seven reeds or metal pipes, we find that the Romans possessed also a water-organ (organum hydraulicum). This was a favourite instrument of the Emperor Nero, as we learn from Suetonius, who says concerning him, "Reliquam diei partem per organa hydraulica novi et ignoti generis circumduxit,"—he spent the

remainder of the day with water-organs of a new and unknown kind (Suet. *Vit. Ner.* c. 41; conf. c. 54). It does not follow from this that the original invention of this instrument is to be ascribed to the times of Nero. According to Tertullian, the “organum hydraulicum” was a wonderful invention (portentosissima munificentia) of Archimedes.

The large wind-organ was known, however, long before it was introduced into the churches of the west. It appears, from the testimony of Augustin and others, that it was known in Africa and Spain, as early as the fifth and sixth centuries<sup>2</sup>. The first organ used in a church was one which was received by Charlemagne as a present from the emperor Constantine Michael<sup>3</sup>. In the latter end of the fifteenth century, the number of pipes was

<sup>2</sup> Organa dicuntur omnia instrumenta musicorum. Non solum illud organum dicitur, quod grande est, et infatur follibus, sed quidquid aptatur ad cantilenam, et corporeum est, quo instrumento utitur, qui cantat, organum dicitur. AUGUSTIN. in *Ps.* 56.—Organum, vocabulum est generale vasorum omnium musicorum. Hoc autem, cui folles adhibentur, alio Græci nomine appellant. Ut autem organum dicatur, magis ea est vulgaris consuetudo Græcorum. ISIDOR. HISPAL. *Orig.* lib. ii. c. 20.—In *Glossar. man. lat. med.* t. v. p. 36, we find the following description by Senator (*i. e.* CASSIODORUS, in *Ps.* 150):—Organum est quasi turris diversis fistulis fabricata, quibus flatu follium vox copiosissima destinatur, et ut eam modulatio decora componat, linguis quibusdam ligneis ab inferiore parte construitur, quas disciplinabiliter magistrorum digiti reprimentes grandisonam efficiunt et suavissimam cantilenam.

<sup>3</sup> Adduxerunt etiam iidem Missi (Legati) omne genus organorum, sed et variarum rerum secum, que euncta ab opificibus sagacissimi Caroli, quasi dissimulanter adspecta, accuratissime sunt in opus conversa; et precipue illud musicorum organum præstantis-

simum, quod *doliis ex ære conflatis, follibusque taurinis, per fistulas æreas mire perflantibus rugitu quidem tonitruæ boatum, garrulitatem vero lyre vel cymbali dulcedine coæquabat.* MONACHUS SANGALLENSIS de *Carol. M.* lib. ii. c. 10.—

The following is a description of the great organ in Winchester cathedral, given by Wolstan, or Wolfan (about A. D. 980) in his *Vita S. Swithini Monachi* (see MABILLON *Act. S. Benedict.* sæc. v. p. 630):—

Talia et auxistis organa, qualia nusquam  
Cernuntur gemina constabilia solo.  
Biseni supra sociantur in ordine folles,  
Inferiusque jacent quatuor atque  
decem.

Flatibus alterius spiracula maxima red-  
dunt,

Quos agitant validi septuaginta viri,  
Brachia versantes, multo et sudore  
madentes;

Certatimque suos quisque movet  
socios,

Viribus ut totis impellant flamina  
sursum,

Et rugiat plena capsâ reserta sinu,  
Solas quadringentas, que sustinet or-  
dine musas,

Quas manus organici temperat in-  
genii.

increased, and the pedal and stops were added. Many improvements were made in the course of the sixteenth century.

In the east, organs were never approved as instruments of sacred music; nor did the use of them continue without opposition in the west<sup>4</sup>. The sober and discreet use of this noble instrument has been the subject of many ecclesiastical rules and regulations<sup>5</sup>.

#### § 6.—OF CHURCH DOORS, PAVEMENTS, AND WINDOWS.

*Doors.*—Churches were usually provided with three separate doors, in imitation of the Jewish temple. Sometimes the terms *πύλη* (porta), and *θύρα* (janna), were interchanged; but for the most part the principal entrance at the west, over against the altar, was called, by way of eminence, *πύλη*, and *πύλη ὡραία*, or *βασιλική*.

Doors were for the most part constructed of the most durable kinds of wood; sometimes they were made of brass. Great pains were bestowed upon their workmanship; and they were often richly ornamented with carving, gold and silver plates, &c. Subjects of sacred history were often represented by the art of the carver or engraver, on the sacred portals; or the place of these emblems was supplied by instructive and appropriate inscriptions.

It was an early custom to affix to the church-doors (ad valvas ponere, valvis affigere), the names of excommunicated persons,

<sup>4</sup> Unde cessantibus jam typis et figuris, unde in ecclesia tot organa, tot cymbala? Ad quid, rogo, terribilis ille folium flatu, tonitruum potius fragorem quam vocis exprimens suavitatem? Ad quid illa vocis contractio et infractio? Hic succinit, ille discinit, alter medias quasdam notas dividit et incidit.—ÆLNEÐUS, or EALNEÐUS (a Cistercian abbot of the twelfth century), *Speculum Caritatis*, lib. li. c. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Ab ecclesiis vero musicas eas, ubi sive organo, sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur, item sæculares omnes actiones, vana atque adeo

profana colloquia, deambulationes, strepitus, clamores arceant; ut domus Dei vere domus orationis esse videatur ac dici possit. *Conc. Trident.* sess. xxii. c. 9.—Cantores ecclesiasticos admonéo, ne ad usum illicitæ voluptatis assumant, quod S. Patres ad effectum pietatis instituerunt. Talis enim debet esse sonus, tam gravis, tam moderatus, ut non totum animum ad sui rapiat oblectationem, sed eorum quæ cantantur sensui et pietatis affectui majorem relinquant portionem. BOSSA, *de Dic. Psalm.* c. xvii. § 2.

and of those about to be married, together with other notices, proclamations, &c., relating to ecclesiastical affairs.

*Pavements.*—From the fourth century downwards, great attention was paid to the pavement of the church, especially in the larger and more sumptuous edifices. In this matter, perhaps, some respect was had to the Jewish temple, which had a wooden floor, adorned with gold plate. In the large churches, the narthex had a pavement of plaster; the nave, a wooden (or plastered) floor; and the sanctuary, or part immediately surrounding the high altar, was adorned with mosaic work.

The custom of burying the dead in the nave and choir of the church, which was gradually introduced from the seventh century to the tenth, naturally led to the practice of covering the pavement and walls with funeral emblems, inscriptions, and monuments.

*Windows.*—The Christian churches were well provided with windows from early times, except in the days of persecution, when concealment was necessary for the performance of religious worship.

The origin of glass windows is usually referred to the third century; but many antiquaries conclude, from some of the remains of Herculaneum, that it may be traced to an earlier date.

Venantius Fortunatus, who lived in the fifth century, says of the cathedral church at Paris,—

Prima capit radios vitreis oculata fenestris  
Artificisque manu clausit in arce diem.

And it is certain that glazed windows were common in France during the sixth century; some of which were variegated. The art of painting on glass, which, according to Pliny, was not unknown to the Romans, reappeared at the beginning of the eleventh century; and, in the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it attained to a height of perfection from which it has since that period declined.

## CHAPTER VI.

## RESPECT SHOWN TO CHURCHES; THEIR IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES.

GREAT respect was paid to places set apart for religious worship; and many laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, were enacted, to secure such places from profanation. The substance of these laws, which were for the most part negative or prohibitory, may be reduced to the following heads:—

1. Churches, with their furniture, utensils, &c., could not be sold, pledged, or taxed. This is the so-called *libertas et immunitas ecclesiarum*, which often was carried to an immoderate extent, and became subject to many exceptions.

2. The use of sacred edifices for any other than religious or ecclesiastical purposes was forbidden by various laws. It was forbidden to use them:

i. As courts of civil or criminal judicature.

ii. For the purposes of deliberative assemblies, or elections; except for the business of ecclesiastical synods, visitations, coronations, and other religious solemnities.

iii. As markets, exchanges, &c., for the purposes of buying and selling. Several laws forbid also the holding of fairs within the precincts, or in the neighbourhood, of churches.

iv. As banqueting-houses, or places for eating and drinking. Even the *agapæ*, or love-feasts, at the celebration of which abuses had arisen in the days of the apostles (1 Cor. xi. 18; Jude 12), were excluded from churches by the twenty-eighth canon of the council of Laodicea<sup>1</sup>.

v. As places of entertainment, or lodging-houses, for strangers and travellers.

3. The following regulations are of a more positive character:—

i. Washing of the hands before entering the church; for

<sup>1</sup> Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγομένας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσθίειν καὶ ἀκούβιτα (accubitus) στρωπνύειν. *Conc. Laodic. c. 28* — Conf. CHRYSOST. *Homil. in 1 Cor. xi.*

which purpose a cistern or basin full of water was placed in a convenient position. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* x. 4; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 52 *in Matth.*; 72 *in Johan.*; 3 *in Ep. ad Ephes.*)

ii. Pulling off the shoes. But this practice was observed only in particular countries, as Abyssinia; and chiefly by the monks.

iii. Persons in authority, as generals, governors, and even emperors themselves, laid aside their arms and insignia, and dismissed their guards, on entering a church.

iv. We read of kissing the doors and threshold, the altar and its appurtenances, as an old and prevalent custom in the church. In later times, this practice was extended to the kissing of images, and the sacred vessels and utensils of the church. (AMBROS. *Ep.* 33; PRUDENT. *Hymn 2 in S. Laur.* v. 519, 520; PAULIN. NOL. *Natal. 6 Fel.*: CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 29 *in 2 Ep. ad Cor.* v.)

v. Tertullian speaks (but in terms of disapprobation) of a custom which had obtained in his time of laying aside the upper garment on entering the church<sup>2</sup>.

vi. A quiet and reverent demeanour, gravity, silence, and devotion, were especially enjoined, in all places of worship, during the celebration of religious ordinances. These regulations relate chiefly to decency of apparel, standing or kneeling at prayer, uncovering of the head, bowing of the head, folding of the hands, and the avoiding of clamour or vociferation, spitting, and all kinds of irreverent actions and behaviour.

It may be remarked here, that we do not find any accounts of the formal consecration of churches earlier than the fourth century: a circumstance which may be easily accounted for by considering the circumstances of the times before Constantine.

<sup>2</sup> Sed quoniam unum aliquod attigimus vacuæ observationis, non pigebit cetera quoque denotare, quibus merito vanitas exprobranda est: si quidem sine ullius aut Dominici aut apostolici præcepti auctoritate fiunt. Hujusmodi enim non religioni, sed superstitioni deputantur, affectata et coacta, et curiosi potius quam rationalis officii,

certe vel eo coercenda, quod gentilibus adæquent. *Ut est quorundam, positis penulis orationem facere; sic enim adeant ad idola nationes.* Quod utique si fieri oporteret, apostoli, qui de habitu orandi docent, comprehendissent, nisi, si qui putant, Paulum penulam suam in oratione penes Carpum reliquisse.—TERTULL. *De Orat.* c. 12.

(See EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. 3; *De Laud. Const.* c. 17; *De Vit. Const.* iv. 43; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 28; SOZOM. ii. 26; THEODOR. i. 30.) In times of war or other public danger, churches and altars were made places of refuge and safety for men's persons and property. Heathens and Jews, as well as Christians, repaired for safety to these sanctuaries; which were regarded as inviolable, sometimes even by barbarians; as we learn from Socrates, Sozomen, Orosius, Augustin, Jerome, and other writers.

From the fourth century, the Christian churches and altars possessed *the privilege of asylum* (*jus asyli, libertas asyli*) or the right of protecting criminals. It is well known that this privilege had been attached to sacred places among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans; from the former of whom it may perhaps have been adopted by the Christians. Certain however it is, that it was not introduced into the church before the time of Constantine, and that it was first regulated by law under the emperors Theodosius the Great, Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius the Younger, and Justinian.

The multiplication of these privileged places soon became exceedingly inconvenient, being found to present a serious impediment to the administration of justice. And hence it was found necessary, from time to time, to circumscribe the ecclesiastical right of sanctuary by various restrictions and limitations. (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 45, l. 1, 16; *Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. 12, l. 1; SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 5; SOZOM. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. 7; JUSTIN. *Nov. Constit.* xvii. c. 7.) Bishops and councils, however, were jealous of the interference of the civil power in this matter; they contended strongly for the right of sanctuary, and continued to uphold it, to an injurious and demoralizing extent. The privilege of asylum was vindicated, and extended even to the worst of malefactors, by the councils of Orange (A. D. 441), of Orleans (A. D. 511), of Arles (A. D. 541), of Maçon (A. D. 586), of Rheims (A. D. 630), of Toledo (A. D. 681). Charlemagne recognised and confirmed this privilege of asylum in its fullest extent (*Capitul. Car. M.* a. 789. c. 2; *Capit.* ii. a. 803, c. 3); and his successors adopted the same line of policy. The privilege subsequently extended to church-yards, bishops' houses,



chapels, crosses erected in public places, and the habitations of parish-priests.

The evils of the practice thus extensively established became so enormous, that even popes and councils were obliged to set limits to the privilege which had been so jealously retained. Since the sixteenth century the right of asylum has been gradually abolished; even in Roman Catholic countries it has become extinct, or at least has been extensively reformed.

## CHAPTER VII.

### ORNAMENTS OF CHURCHES.

AFTER the establishment of the church in the time of Constantine, churches were adorned with various ornaments, more or less costly. SEE APPENDIX F.

Among these may be reckoned the *anathemata*, or gifts from different individuals, which were suspended on pillars, or placed in some other conspicuous situation, and intended as memorials of some particular mercy or benefit received from God. (EUSEB. *de Vit. Const.* lib. iii. c. 38, 40; THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 2, c. 27; SOZOMEN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 25; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 34; HERON. *Ep.* 27 *ad Eustoch.*; *Ep.* 13 *ad Paulin.*) Certain gifts of this kind, called *ἐκτυπώματα*, consisting of figurative or hieroglyphical representations of the benefit commemorated, came into use probably about the middle of the fifth century. Such offerings may be regarded as an imitation of the well-known practice of suspending votive tablets, shields, and the like, in the heathen temples; but it is not without precedent also in sacred history. (1 Sam. vi. 4.)

Portions of Scripture, or other inscriptions, were frequently written upon the walls of the church; a mode of adorning the sacred edifice which is perhaps the most ancient, as it is certainly the most appropriate and instructive, of any which have from time to time prevailed. (AMBROS. *ad Virgin. Laps.*; PAULIN. *Ep.* 12 *ad Sever.*)

Eusebius, Paulinus of Nola, and Jerome, speak of gilding

and mosaic work as among the ornaments of churches in their days. (EUSEB. *de Vit. Const.* lib. iii. c. 36; PAULIN. *Ep.* 12 *ad Sever.*; HIERON. *Ep.* 2 *ad Nepotian.*; *Ep.* 8 *ad Demetriad.*)

During the first three centuries, no pictures or images were allowed in churches; although it is likely that during that period some attempts were made to introduce such ornaments. (*Conc. Illiber.* A.D. 305, c. 36;—conf. EPIPHAN. *Ep.* *ad Johan. Hierosol.*) “Tertullian indeed,” says Bingham, “once mentions the picture of a shepherd bringing home his lost sheep, upon a communion-cup in some of the catholic churches. But as this is a singular instance only of a symbolical representation or emblem, so it is the only instance Petavius pretends to find in all the first three ages.” It appears that the use of pictures of saints, martyrs, and Scripture-histories in churches was gradually introduced about the latter end of the fourth century. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, favoured the introduction of such ornaments. (PAULIN. *Natal.* 9 *Felicis*; *Id.* *Natal.* 10; *Ep.* 12 *ad Sever.*; conf. AUGUSTIN. *contr. Faust.* lib. xxii. c. 73; *De Consensu Evangel.* lib. i. c. 12; *De Morib. Eccl. Catholic.* lib. i. c. 34.) No images of God, or representations of the Holy Trinity, were tolerated in churches until after the second Nicene Council, as Bingham observes from Petavius, who cites ORIGEN. *contra Cels.* lib. vi.; AMBROS. *in Psalm.* cxviii. *Octonar.* 12; AUGUSTIN. *de Fide et Symbolo*, c. 7. Conf. GREGOR. *Ep.* 1 *ad Leon.* in *Act.* iv. *Conc. Nic.* 2; GERMAN. *Ep.* *ad Leon.* *Act.* 4 *Conc. Nic.* 2; DAMASCEN. *de Fide Orthodox.* lib. iv. c. 17; *Id.* *Orat.* 1, 2, *de Imagin.* Statues, or images, were of later introduction than pictures. SEE APPENDIX F.

A simple and harmless custom of adorning churches with flowers, or branches of trees, is probably of great antiquity; it is mentioned by Augustin (*De Cic. Dei*, lib. xxii. c. 8), Paulinus (*Natal.* 3 *Felicis*), and Jerome (*Ep.* 3, *Epitaph. Nepotian.*).

Crosses do not appear to have been set up in churches until about the middle of the fourth century.

BOOK VII.  
OF OCCASIONAL OFFICES AND SPECIAL  
INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHURCH.

---

CHAPTER I.  
OF MARRIAGE.

§ 1.—HISTORY OF LAWS AND CUSTOMS RELATING TO MARRIAGE  
IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

IN early ecclesiastical writers we find more frequent reference to the Roman laws and institutions respecting marriage, than to those of the Mosaic dispensation; nor was it until the sixth or seventh century that the latter appear to have received any especial attention in the Christian church. By the Roman laws, it should be remembered, polygamy was strictly forbidden; and so well was the spirit of these laws maintained, that when Julius Cæsar endeavoured to establish the prohibited practice, his proposal met with universal opposition. An edict of the (Christian) Emperor Valentinian I. declared it lawful for a man to have two wives at once (SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 26, al. 27); but this edict, which was intended to screen the emperor's own misconduct, was not admitted into the body of the laws, nor did it produce any permanent effect.

The early Christians borrowed from the Romans some of their marriage-ceremonies. Tertullian, Ambrose, and others, protest against the adoption of heathen customs in this respect, not absolutely and entirely, but so far as they were observed to the neglect of Christian or religious consecration. (TERTULL. *Apolog.* c. 6; *De Idolol.* c. 16; *De Corona Mil.* c. 13; *De Pudic.* c. 4; AMBROS. *Ep.* 24, 70; OPTAT. MILEV. *De Schism. Donat.* l. xvi.; CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* lib. iii. c. 11; AUGUST. *Ep.* 234; *De Fide et Oper.* c. 19; *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xv. c. 16.)

In the early church, not only did the more strict Novatians and Montanists esteem a second marriage unlawful, but that error

was upheld by several councils. (*Conc. Nic.* c. 8; *Ancyran.* c. 19; *Laodic.* c. 1; *Neocæsar.* c. 3; *Constit. Apost.* lib. iii. c. 2; *ATHENAG. Legat.*; *THEOPHIL. ANT. ad Autol.* lib. iii.; *IREN. adr. Hæc.* lib. iii. c. 19.) And when the severity of this principle was relaxed with regard to lay members of the church, it was still retained with reference to the clergy. (*TERTULL. de Monog.* c. 11; *Ad Uxor.* lib. i. c. 7; *De Pœnit.* c. 9; *ORIGEN. Hom.* 17 *in Luc.*; *AMBROS. de Offic.* lib. i. c. 50; *HIERON. Ép.* 2, 11, 83.)

At length, this law was rendered nugatory by the enforcement of celibacy among the clergy.

The state always possessed and claimed the power of enacting the laws of marriage; the church at the same time possessing a subordinate or concurrent jurisdiction. In the middle ages, the church possessed a preponderating power in these matters; but even during that period a claim to exclusive ecclesiastical jurisdiction was by no means universally established or allowed. William Occam, in a treatise entitled *Tractatus de jurisdictione Imperatoris in Causis Matrimonialibus*, declared all persons enemies of the empire who should maintain that matrimonial causes were exclusively under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical tribunal.

After the lapse of several centuries from the institution of Christianity, the Mosaic prohibitions and other regulations respecting marriage were adopted, with certain modifications, in the church. The canonists are very careful in their enumeration of the degrees of consanguinity or affinity within which it became unlawful to contract marriage. They enumerate thirteen such cases<sup>1</sup>, whereas the number of those which the Jewish lawgiver recounts, is seventeen or nineteen;—an instance of deviation from the original law, which was deemed necessary. (*ARGUST. Quæst.* 59 *sup. Levit. quæst.* 76.)

The celibacy of the clergy was gradually established. It was at first partially adopted in compliance with the advice of zealous leaders of the church, who judged it expedient, or supposed it to

<sup>1</sup> These are comprised in the following lines:—

Nata, soror, neptis, matertera fratris et uxor,  
Et patrum conjux, mater, privigna, noverca,  
Uxorisque soror, privigni nata, nurusque  
Atque soror patris, conjungi lege vetantur.

tend to the promotion of piety; afterwards it was represented as a moral duty, and was enforced by the decrees of councils; and at last it was enjoined and established by the papal authority of Hildebrand in the eleventh century. The constrained celibacy of the clergy, therefore, does not come within the range of Christian antiquities; and the whole question belongs rather to a history of the opinions and doctrines of the church, than to a survey of its institutions and practices.

Mixed marriages, *i. e.*, marriages between Jews and Gentiles, were strictly prohibited by the Mosaic law. The New Testament, if it be thought to contain no positive prohibition of the intermarriage of Christians and heathens, yet, to say the least, strongly represents such a proceeding as inconsistent with a Christian profession. (1 Cor. vii. 39; 2 Cor. vi. 14.) The early fathers denounce the practice as dangerous and even criminal, (TERTULL. *Ad Uxor.* lib. ii. c. 2—9; *De Coron. Mil.* c. 13; CYPRIAN. *ad Quirin.* lib. iii. c. 62; AMBROSIVS *De Abrahamo*, lib. i. c. 9; *Ep.* lib. ix. ep. 70; *De Fide et Oper.* c. 19; HIERON. *in Jovin.* lib. i. c. 10;) and it was afterwards positively prohibited by the decrees of councils and the laws of the empire. (*Conc. Chalced.* c. 14; *Arclat.* i. c. 11; *Illiberit.* c. 15, 16, 17; *Aurelian.* ii. c. 18; *Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. 9, l. 6; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. iii. tit. 7, l. 2; lib. ix. tit. 7, l. 5; lib. xvi. tit. 8, l. 6.) These prohibitions extended to the marriage of Christians with Jews, Pagans, Mahometans, and certain heretics, namely, those whose baptism was not admitted as valid by the church. The first interdiction of marriage with heretics, on record, is one which was made about the middle of the fourth century. (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 10, 31; See also *Conc. Agath.* c. 67; *Chalced.* c. 14.) It does not appear that such marriages, although prohibited, were declared null and void, whenever they had actually taken place<sup>2</sup>; and we read of some illustrious examples of the breach of the rule, as in the cases of Monica, the mother of Augustin (AUGUST. *Confess.* lib. ix. c. 9), and Clotildis, the queen of Clovis

<sup>2</sup> And thus Bellarmin, in opposition to the canonists, says:—*Matrimonium inter fidelem et infidelem non est irritum* | *jure divino, naturali, vel positivo, vel certa aliqua lege ecclesiastica.*

(GREGOR. TUROŃ. *Hist. Franc.* lib. ii. c. 28), who became instrumental in the conversion of their respective husbands to Christianity.

With respect to divorce, the primitive church adhered to the rules laid down by our Lord and his apostles. (Mark x. 2, 12; Luke xvi. 18; Matt. v. 31, 32; xix. 2—10; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11; Rom. vii. 2, 3<sup>3</sup>.) Many of the fathers indeed contended, that idolatry, witchcraft, and the like offences, were included within the meaning of the term *πορνεία*, and therefore formed a sufficient or necessary ground for separation; and this opinion, although disputed, was favoured by the laws of Constantine, Honorius, Theodosius the Younger, Valentinian the Third, Anastasius, and Justinian. The canonists enumerate no less than twelve grounds of divorce (*impedimenta quæ matrimonium contrahendum impediunt, et contractum dirimunt*<sup>4</sup>).

In early times, parties about to contract marriage were required to give notice of their intention to their proper bishop or pastor, whose approbation or sanction was necessary. If any persons proceeded with a marriage declared unlawful by the ecclesiastical superior, the union was not admitted as good by the church, although valid in point of law; and the offence was

<sup>3</sup> Deus præcepit, non dimitti uxorem, nisi crimine adulterii devictam, et nunquam conjugalis federis vinculum, nisi ruperit, resolvatur. LACTANT. *Epil. Institut. Divin.* c. 3.—Præcepit Dominus, uxorem non debere dimitti, excepta causa fornicationis, et si dimissa fuerit, manere innuptam. Quidquid viris jubetur, hoc consequenter redundat in feminas. Neque enim adultera uxor dimittenda est, et vir mœchus retinendus. Si quis meretrici jungitur, unum corpus facit: ergo et quæ seortatori impuroque sociatur, unum cum eo corpus efficitur. Aliæ sunt leges Cæsarum, aliæ Christi. Aliud Papi-nianus, aliud Paulus noster præcipit. Apud illos viris impudicitia fræna laxantur, et solo stupro atque adulterio condemnato, passim per lupanaria

et ancillulas libido permittitur; quasi culpam dignitas faciat, non voluntas:—apud nos, quod non licet feminis, æque non licet viris, et eadem servitus pari conditione censetur. IHERON. *Ep.* 30, in *Epith. Fab.* c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> These twelve grounds or causes are enumerated in the following memorial verses:—

Error; conditio; votum; cognatio;  
crimen;  
Cultus disparitas; vis; ordo; liga-  
men; honestas;  
Si sis affinis, si forte coire nequibus  
(al. negabis);  
Hæc socianda vetant comubia, facta  
retractant;

a full explanation of which may be found in GENARD, *Loc. Theol.* 16.

visited with the imposition of penance, or sentence of excommunication. Ignatius and Tertullian refer to this practice of giving notice to the bishop, and seeking his consent<sup>5</sup>.

This notice originally answered the purpose of a public proclamation in the church. We have no express testimony of the early use of such proclamation or notice; nor do we find any canons of councils ordering the publication of banns until the twelfth century. (*Conc. Lateran.* ii. A.D. 1139, c. 51; *Conc. Later.* iv. A.D. 1215, c. 12.)

It appears from the testimony of Tertullian, that it was usual as early as the second century for the marriages of Christians to be consecrated by the benediction of the church, pronounced by her ministers. Bingham has proved at large, against Selden, that for the first three hundred years the solemnities of marriage were usually performed by the ministers of the church. (*Antiq.* book xxii. chap. 4, § 1.) Allusions to this practice are found in the writings of Ambrose, Augustin, Chrysostom, Basil the Great and Siricius (bishop of Rome<sup>6</sup>). We do not find any office or form for the solemnization of matrimony among the ancient liturgies; probably no such form was prescribed until the eighth or ninth century, when the celebration of marriage by the church was recognised and sanctioned by the state.

<sup>5</sup> *Ἡρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμοῦσαις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἔνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι, ἵνα ὁ γάμος ᾖ κατὰ Κύριον, καὶ μὴ κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν.* IGNAŦ. *Ep. ad Polycarp.* ii. 5.—Unde sufficiamus ad enarraudam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio, Angeli renuntiant, pater rato habet! Nam nec in terris filii sine consensu patrum rite et juste nubent. TERTULL. *ad Uxor.* lib. ii. c. 8, 9.—Occultæ conjunctiones, id est, non prius apud ecclesiam professæ, juxta mœchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur. TERTULL. *De Pudicit.* c. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Cum ipsum conjugium velamine sacerdotali et benedictione sanctificari oporteat, quomodo potest conjugium dici ubi non est fidei concordia? AMBROS. *Ep.* 70.—Etiam si nostræ absolutæ sit potestatis quamlibet puellam in conjugium tradere, tradi a nobis Christianam nisi Christiano non posse. AUGUSTIN. *Ep.* 234, *ad Rusticum.*—*Δέον—ιερέας καλεῖν, καὶ δι' εὐχῶν ἐδλογίων τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τοῦ συνοικεσίου συσφίγγειν κ. τ. λ.* CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 48, *in Gen.*—CONF. SIRIC. *Ep.* 1, *ad Himmerium*, cap. 4, *et ap. GRATIAN* caus. 27, quæst. ii. cap. 50.

## § 2.—MARRIAGE RITES AND CEREMONIES.

IN the works of early ecclesiastical writers, especially in those of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Augustin, Jerome, Basil, and Chrysostom, we find many incidental allusions to particular marriage-rites and ceremonies, which were observed in their time, but not any entire or general account of them. The first writer who attempts any such description is Isidorus Hispalensis (in the former part of the seventh century), who undertakes to enumerate those marriage-ceremonies which the church had recognised as innocent and convenient, or symbolical. (*De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 19.) We possess also an official account of the ceremonies used in the Roman church, A.D. 860, from the pen of the Pope Nicholas I. in his *Respons. ad Consulta Bulgarorum*, c. 37. The following account of marriage-ceremonies in the ancient church, is, for the most part, extracted directly from BINGHAM. *Antiq.* book xxii. chap. 3, 4.

7 Morem, quem sancta Romana suscepit antiquitus et hactenus in hujusmodi conjunctionibus tenet ecclesia, vobis monstrare studebimus. Nostrates siquidem tam mares quam femine non ligaturam auream, vel argenteam, aut ex quolibet metallo compositam quando nuptialia fœdera contrahunt, in capite deferunt. Sed post sponsalia, quæ futurarum sunt nuptiarum promissa fœdera, quæcumque consensu eorum, qui hæc contrahunt, et eorum, in quorum potestate sunt, celebrantur, et postquam anctis sponsam sibi sponsus per digitum fidei a se annulo insignitum desponderit, dotemque utrique placitam sponsus ei cum scripto pactum hoc continente coram invitatis ab utroque parte tradiderit; aut mox, anto apto tempore, ne videlicet ante tempus lege definitum tale quid fieri præsumatur, ambo ad nuptialia fœdera perducuntur. Et primum in ecclesia Domini cum oblationibus, quas offerre debent Deo per sacerdotis manum, statuuntur, sicut demum benedictio-

nem et velamen celeste suscipiunt. . . . Veruntamen velamen illud non suscipit, qui ad secundas nuptias migrat. Post hæc autem de ecclesia egressi coronas in capitibus gestant quæ in ecclesia ipsa sunt solite reservari. Et ita festis nuptialibus celebratis ad ducendam individuum vitam Domino disponente de cetero dirigitur. . . . Tanta solet arctare quosdam rerum inopia, ut ad hæc præparanda nullum his suffragetur auxilium: ac per hoc sufficiat, secundum leges, solus eorum consensus, de quorum conjunctionibus agitur. Qui consensus, si solus in nuptiis forte defuerit, cetera omnia etiam cum ipso coitu celebrata frustantur. . . . Hæc sunt præter alia, quæ ad memoriam non occurrunt, pacta conjugiorum solemnia. Peccatum autem esse, si hæc cuncta in nuptiali fœdere non interveniant, non dicimus, quemadmodum Græcos vos adstruere dicitis. NICOL. I. *Respons. ad Consulta Bulgar.* c. 3.



When persons, against whom there lay no lawful impediment, were disposed to join in matrimony with each other, they were obliged to go through certain preliminaries appointed by custom or law, before they could ordinarily complete the marriage. These went by the general name of *sponsalia*, espousals or betrothing; and they consisted chiefly in a mutual contract or agreement between the parties concerning their future marriage, to be performed within a certain limited time; which contract was confirmed by certain gifts or donations, called *Arrhæ* et *Arrhabones*, the earnest of marriage; as also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry, a writing or instrument of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses to attest it.

The free consent of parties contracting marriage was declared necessary by an old Roman law (*Lex Papia et Julia*), which was confirmed by Diocletian, and inserted by Justinian into his Code. No espousal could stand firm but such as was voluntarily agreed upon by the free consent of each contracting party, without any force or violence of any kind intervening to compel them.

When the contract was thus made, it was usual for the man to bestow certain gifts upon the woman, as tokens and pledges of the espousal; and sometimes, but not so commonly, the woman made presents to the man upon the same account. These are sometimes called *sponsalia*, espousals, and sometimes *sponsalitia donationes*, espousal gifts, or *arrhæ*, and *pignora*, earnest or pledges of future marriage; because the giving and receiving of them was a confirmation of the contract, and an obligation on the parties to take each other for man and wife, unless some legal reason gave them liberty to do otherwise. To make these donations more firm and sure, it was required that they should be entered into public acts, and set upon record.

Together with these espousal gifts, or as a part of them, it was usual for the man to give the woman a ring, as a further token and testimony of the contract. This was an innocent ceremony, used by the Romans before the time of Christianity, and in some measure admitted by the Jews, whence it was adopted among the Christian rites of espousal. But it does not appear that the ring was originally used in the solemnity of marriage itself<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> In proof of this position, that the ring was used among the early Christians,

Another ceremony, used in espousals sometimes, was a solemn kiss, which the man gave to the woman, in confirmation of the contract; which was an ancient rite used by the heathen, together with joining of hands, in their espousals (TERTULL. *de Veland. Virg.* cap. 11).

These ceremonies, being innocent in themselves, seem to have been adopted by Christians, with other such customs, into their espousals, who never rejected any innocent rites because they had been used by heathens, except such as naturally tended to defile them with some unavoidable stain of idolatry or superstition.

Another part of the espousals was the husband's settling a dowry upon the woman, to which she should be entitled after his death,—a stipulation commonly made in writing or with public instruments under hand and seal.

To make the business of espousals not only the more solemn, but also the more firm and sure, it was usual to transact the whole affair before chosen witnesses, the friends of each party. Custom appears to have determined the number of witnesses to ten (AMBROS. *ad Virginem Lapsam*, c. 6). It seems, also, that a ministerial benediction was sometime used in espousals, as well as in marriage. When the contract of future marriage was thus settled by espousals, it was not lawful for either party to join in marriage with any other, under very severe penalties (which both the civil and ecclesiastical law inflicted), unless the time of marriage was fraudulently protracted beyond two years, which was the time limited for the duration of espousals. But the laws relating to this matter included certain necessary provisions

at their espousals, or as an earnest of future marriage, but not in the actual solemnization of marriage, Bingham refers to the words of Pope Nicholas I., already quoted, and to passages in AMBROS. *Ep.* 34; TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 6; *de Idololatr.* c. 16. Isidorus Hispalensis mentions this ring in the following passage:—Quod autem in nuptiis annulus a sponso sponsæ datur, id fit vel propter mutue dilectionis signum, vel propter id magis, ut hoc pignore corda eorum jungantur;

unde et quarto digito annulus inseritur, ideo quod vena quedam (ut fertur) sanguinis ad cor usque perveniat, quæ de re A. Gellius (*Noct. Att.* lib. x. c. 10) dixit. *De Eccles. Off.* lib. ii. c. 19. —Calvoer (*Ritual. Eccles.*) traces the origin of the marriage-ring to the tenth century. He supposes it to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops; and to have been regarded as a kind of phylactery, or charm.

and restrictions. It should be added, that it does not appear that the ceremony of espousals was simply and absolutely necessary to go before a marriage, in order to make it just and legal:—all necessaries were sometimes provided in the act of marriage itself, as with us at the present day.

At the time of marriage, the contracting parties having been presented to the priest, by their parents or by the paranymphs, or bridemen, and the ceremony of joining of hands (GREG. NAZ. *Ep.* 57), and of untying the woman's hair (OPTAT. MILEV. *contra Donat.* vi. 97), of covering the bride with a veil<sup>9</sup>, and of spreading the vitta nuptialis (pallium, jugale) over both<sup>10</sup>, having taken place, and the married persons being now ready to depart, it was usual to crown them both with crowns or garlands, the symbols of victory. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* ix. *in 1 Tim.*) This was, indeed, an old ceremony, used in heathen marriages; but it was innocent in itself, and therefore the Christians never made any scruple to adopt it into the rites of marriage which they made among themselves, as significant of the innocency of the parties joined together. It is still retained in the Greek church.

Lighted tapers appear to have been used at marriages, in early times (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* iv. *in Ep. ad Heb.*; HESYCH. HIEROSOL. *in Levit.* lib. iv.; NICEPHOR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. xviii. c. 8). With respect to the convivial entertainments, and other festivities, which usually attended the celebration of a marriage, we may observe that it was the object of the church not to abolish them, but to restrain them within the bounds of decency and good order (*Concil. Laodic.* c. 53; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 12 *in Ep. ad Coloss.*; *Hom.* 48 *in Gen.*;

<sup>9</sup> TERTULL. *de Veland. Virg.* lib. xvii. c. 11.—The velamen nuptiale, of which Ambrose (*Ep.* 70) says, "Conjugium velamine sacerdotali sanctificari oportet," is usually regarded as "signum pudoris et verecundiæ." According to Isidor. Hispal. (*De Off. Eccl.* ii. c. 19) it is rather "signum humilitatis et subjectionis erga maritum." He says, *Feminae, dum maritantur, velantur, ut noverint per hoc se viris esse subjectas et humiles.*

<sup>10</sup> Quod nubentes post benedictionem vitta invicem quasi uno vinculo copulantur, videlicet ideo fit, ne compagem conjugalis unitatis dirumpant. Ac eadem vitta candido purpureoque colore permiscetur; candor quippe est ad munditiam vite, purpura ad sanguinis posteritatem adhibetur, ut hoc signo et continentia et lex continendi ab utrisque ad tempus admoneantur, et post hoc reddendum debitum non negetur. ISIDOR. HISPAL. *de Offic. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 19.

*Hom. 56 in Gen.*) For the old Roman custom of throwing about nuts at the time of marriage (*CATULL. Carm. 62*; *PERS. Sat. 1*), the early Christians appear to have substituted the better practice of distributing alms to children and the poor.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE ANOINTING OF THE SICK.

THE ceremony of extreme unction, as now used by the church of Rome, cannot be traced to an earlier date than the end of the twelfth century. The anointing mentioned in Mark vi. 13, and James v. 14, 15, was altogether different in its design; nor is there any reason to suppose that the practice was intended to be continued in the church after the cessation of those miraculous gifts which it accompanied. When the ceremony of anointing is mentioned by early fathers or councils, the reference is, for the most part, to the offices of baptism and confirmation. Allusion is indeed made by Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Hierarch. Eccl. c. 7*, to a practice of anointing the corpse immediately before it was lowered into the grave; but it is obvious that this does not agree with the ceremony of extreme unction, in the present acceptation of the term. In asserting the antiquity of the modern practice, its advocates have appealed to Hieron. *Comment. in Marc. vi.*; Augustin. *de Visitat. Infirm. c. iv.*; and Chrysostom. *de Sacerdot. lib. iii.*; (see Durand. *De Rit. Eccl. Cathol. lib. i. c. 20.*) but it has been proved that the two former of these treatises are spurious, and that the expressions of Chrysostom do not bear the sense ascribed to them: (MART. CHEMNIUS *Examen Concil. Trident. P. ii. p. 388, seqq.*) Bellarmin, abandoning that position, refers to the testimony of Innocent I., bishop of Rome, in the beginning of the fifth century; who (in *Ep. 1 ad Decent. c. 8*) speaks of an “unctio infirmorum,” *anointing of the sick.* (BELLARM. *De Extr. Unct. lib. i. c. 4.*) The Greek church practises the rite of extreme unction, corresponding in part, but not entirely, with that of Rome (MARTENE *De Antiq. Eccl. Ritib.*

lib. i. c. 7, art. 2); grounding the usage upon the authority of oral tradition.

After the twelfth century, the ceremony of extreme unction was universally adopted in the western church; and was exalted by the scholastic writers to the dignity of a sacrament. (PET. LOMBARD. *Sentent.* lib. iv. distinct. 23; THOM. AQUIN. lib. iv. distinct. 23; HUGO DE S. VICTORE *De Sacrament.* lib. ii. c. 2, 3.)

Martene (*De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* P. ii.) enumerates thirty different offices for extreme unction; one of which (namely, Ordo I, Ex Pontificali Anglicano Monasterii Gemmeticensis) he supposes to be about nine hundred years old.

On the whole, it appears that extreme unction originated in the act of anointing, which, in early times, was immediately connected with absolution and the Lord's supper. These rites were often administered to dying persons; and the anointing being regarded, at first partially, but by degrees more commonly, as a separate act, was at last viewed as altogether distinct, and made a separate sacrament. Extreme unction, in the usual acceptation of the term, has therefore no place among Christian antiquities.

## CHAPTER III.

### FUNERAL RITES AND CEREMONIES

THE early Christians were distinguished by their care of the dead, —which was one of the three points for which they were particularly commended by the apostate Julian<sup>1</sup>. They regarded the celebration of funeral solemnities with becoming gravity, but without immoderate expression of grief, as a public religious duty; not indeed as adapted to convey any benefit to the deceased, but as being decent in itself, and a likely means of edification or consolation to survivors.

In the first ages of the church, Christians felt, and often expressed in strong terms, a decided attachment to the practice

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ περὶ τοῖς ξένοις φιλανθρωπία, κατὰ τὸν βίον. JULIANI. IMP. *Ep.* 49, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν νεκρῶν προμήθεια, καὶ ἡ πεπλάσμενη σεμνότης. *ad Arsac. Opp. ed. Spanhem.* p. 429.

of inhumation of the corpse, in preference to that of burning, which at that time prevailed throughout the Roman empire<sup>2</sup>. At first they had no separate burying-places; and it is evident that the nature of their circumstances would not even admit of such a design. The public burial-grounds, according to both Jewish and Roman laws, were on the outside of cities. (Matt. xxvii. 60; Luke vii. 12; John xi. 30; CICERO *De Legib.* lib. ii. c. 58; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. 9, tit. 17, l. 6; *Concil. Bracar.* c. 36.) In the course of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, open spaces around the churches were set apart for the interment, at first of princes, the bishops and clergy, and afterwards of others who died in communion with the church. The first recorded instance of a formal consecration of such burial-place, or church-yard, belongs to the sixth century (GREG. TURON. *De Gloria Confessor.* c. 6); but there is every reason to suppose that such places were set apart from the first with peculiar solemnities, inasmuch as all persons and things designed for the more immediate service of religion or any religious purpose, were solemnly dedicated to their use and employment, and especially as burial-places were declared inviolable and sacred even by the Roman laws. The

<sup>2</sup> The Romans, in ancient times, used to bury their dead. The dictator Cornelius Sylla is supposed to have been the first among them whose corpse was burnt, and that was done in compliance with his own desire. Afterwards this practice became general, especially among the higher orders; and continued to prevail until the fourth century of the Christian era. (CIC. *De Legg.* ii. c. 25; VIRG. *Æn.* vi. 177;—PLIN. *Hist. Nat.* vii. c. 54, "ipsum cremare apud Romanos non fuit veteris instituti, terra condiebantur;"—conf. PLUTARCH. *Vit. Numæ*; ETOBÆI, *Serm.* 122; MACRON. *Saturn.* vii. c. 7; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 6, leg. 6.)—The first Roman emperor whose corpse was interred was Commodus, as we learn from Niphilinus. The early Christians protested against the custom of burning the bodies of the dead, and advocated inhumation,

—a practice which was always observed in the Christian church.—Corpus omnne, sive areseit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis; sed Deo, clementorum custodi, reservatur. Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum sepulturæ timemus, sed veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus. MINUC. FEL. *Octav.* c. 34.—Ego magis ridebo vulgus, tunc quoque cum ipsos defunctos atrocissime exurit, quos postmodum gulosissime nutrit, iisdem ignibus et promerens et offendens. O pietatem de crudelitate ludentem! TERTULL. *De Resurr.* c. 1. Conf. TERTULL. *De Anima*, c. 51; LACTANT. *Instit. Div.* lib. vi. c. 12; ORIG. *contr. Cels.* lib. viii.; AUGUSTIN. *De Civ. Dei*, lib. i. c. 13; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 16; v. 1.

Greeks gave to these burial-grounds the appropriate name of *κοιμητήρια*, cœmeteria, *i. e.*, dormitories; hereby not only denoting, as Chrysostom observes, that the dead rest from their earthly labours and sorrows, but also pointing out the hope of a future resurrection. We do not find that the dead were ever buried within the walls of churches before the ninth century. Christians did not hesitate to adopt the practice of erecting monuments, usually marked with inscriptions (*τίτλοις*, *titulis*) in memory of the dead. (PRUDENT, *Peristeph. Hymn* 11; HIERON. *Comment. in Matth.* xxiii.) Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and others, inveigh against luxury and extravagance in these matters.

The Romans used to conduct their funeral solemnities in the night (GOTHOFREDI *Observat. in Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 57, l. 5); but the Christians, on the contrary, preferred the day-time for the solemn service, retaining, however, the custom of carrying lighted tapers in the funeral procession. In times of persecution, indeed, they were often compelled to bury their dead by night, for the sake of security; consoling themselves, as we are told, with the example of Tobias. (Tob. i. 20, 21; ii. 2.) But, under Constantine and his sons, the funeral solemnities of the Christians were conducted in the day-time, and sometimes with great pomp; and it is probable that those emperors enacted laws on the subject, since the apostate Emperor Julian found it necessary to issue an edict in order to restore the nocturnal celebration of funeral rites<sup>3</sup>. The space which elapsed between the period of death and that of interment was probably determined by the custom of the country, by the wishes of individuals, or other circumstances. The special reason for a speedy interment which existed among the Jews and heathens, namely, the desire of avoiding ceremonial pollution by the touch or presence of a corpse, had no place among Christians<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Efferri cognovimus cadavera mortuorum per confertam populi frequentiam et per maximam insistentium densitatem: quod quidem oculos hominum infaustis infestat aspectibus. Qui enim dies est bene auspicatus a finire? aut quomodo ad Deos et templa venietur? Ideoque quoniam

et dolor in exsequiis secretum amat, et diem functis nihil interest, utrum per noctes an per dies efferantur, liberari convenit totius populi aspectus, ut dolor esse in funeribus, non pompa exsequiarum, nec ostentatio videatur. *Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 17, l. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Quæso, fili dulcissime, ne me *ante*

It was usual among Christians for relatives or friends to close the eyes and mouth of the dying (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 22; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 1 *De Pat. Jobi*); a decent circumstance, as Bingham observes, observed by all nations<sup>5</sup>. The body was then washed in water, and clothed with a funeral garment, usually of white linen, but sometimes made of more splendid and costly materials. (TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 42; *De Idolol.* c. 11; CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* 3, 8; MIN. FEL. *Octav.* p. 38; EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. c. 22, 15; *De Vit. Const. M.* iv. c. 66; AUGUST. *in Ps.* 40; *Serm.* 177, 361; GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 40.) Being placed in a coffin<sup>6</sup>, it was watched and attended until the time fixed for the funeral; when it was carried to the grave, by the nearest relations of the deceased, or by persons of rank or distinction (as a mark of respect), or by persons appointed to that office<sup>7</sup>.

During the funeral procession, appropriate psalms were sung.

*diem quartum sepeliatis, ut venientes famuli famuleque omnes videant corpusculum meum, nec ullus frustretur ab exsequiis meis de his, quos studiosissime enutrivit.* GREG. TURON. *De Gloria Confessor.* c. 104, *ap. Baron. Annal.* a. 310, n. 10.

<sup>5</sup> "The Romans added another ceremony to it, which had nothing of nature, but superstition, in it; which was, as Pliny describes it (*Nat. Hist.* lib. xi. c. 37), to open their eyes again at the funeral pile, and show them to heaven; which, according to the Roman superstition, was as necessary to be done as it was necessary first to close their eyes against the sight of men. The ground of this superstition I will not stand to inquire into, but only observe, that as the Christians rejected this ceremony because it was a mere superstition, so they retained the other as agreeable to that decency which is taught by nature." BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xxii. c. iii. § 2.

<sup>6</sup> In this respect, as Bingham observes, the Christians "chose rather to follow the heathens than the Jews; the Jews using no coffins, but only grave-clothes to wrap up the body, and

biers to carry it to the grave." *Antiq.* book xxiii. c. iii. § 5.

<sup>7</sup> "In the first ages the poor were buried at the common charge and charity of the church, as we learn from TERTULLIAN'S *Apology*, cap. 39. But afterward, in some of the greater churches, where there were multitudes of poor, in the beginning of the fourth century, we find two orders of men set up in the church, with a sort of clerical character, whose particular business was to attend the sick, especially in infectious diseases, and to do all offices that were necessary to be done, in order to give the poor a decent funeral. The one were called Parabolani, from venturing their lives among the sick in contagious distempers; and the other Copiatae, Laborantes, Lecticarii, Fossarii, Sandapilarii, and Decani, answerable to the old Roman names Libitinarii and Vespillones, whose office was to labour in digging of graves for the poor, and carrying the coffin or bier, and depositing them in the ground, as most of the names signify." BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xxiii. c. iii. § 7.



“ We cannot expect to find much of this in the first ages, while the Christians were in a state of persecution; but as soon as their peaceable times were come, we find it in every writer. The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. vi. c. 30) gives this direction, that they should carry forth their dead with singing, if they were faithful. ‘ For precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.’ And again it is said, ‘ Return to thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee. And the memory of the just shall be blessed: and the souls of the just are in the hand of the Lord.’ These, probably, were some of the verses which made up their psalmody on such occasions. For Chrysostom, speaking of this matter, not only tells us the reason of their psalmody, but also what particular psalms or portions of them they made use of for this solemnity. ‘ What mean our hymns?’ says he; ‘ do we not glorify God and give him thanks, that he hath crowned him that is departed, that he hath delivered him from trouble, that he hath set him free from all fear? Consider what thou singest at that time; Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee. And again, I will fear no evil, because thou art with me. And again, Thou art my refuge from the affliction which compasseth me about. Consider what these psalms mean. If thou believest the things which thou sayest to be true, why dost thou weep and lament, and make a mere pageantry and mock of thy singing? If thou believest them not to be true, why dost thou play the hypocrite, so much as to sing?’ (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 4 in Hebr.*) He speaks this against those who used excessive mourning at funerals, showing them the incongruity of that with this psalmody of the church.” (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xxiii. c. 3.) Other testimonies on this subject are found in CHRYSOST. *Hom. 30 de Dormient.*; HIERON. *Ep. 27*; GREG. NYSSEN. *vit. Macrin.*; GREG. NAZ. *Orat. 10*; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 46.

For the sake of order, notice of the moving of a funeral-procession was sometimes given by the tuba, wooden clappers, or such other methods of giving public notice as were in use. In the eighth or ninth century, the tolling of bells was introduced.

The custom of carrying a cross or crucifix before the corpse is of comparatively recent date. The first traces of it occur in the

sixth century (*ap.* GREG. TURON. *vit. SS. Pat.* c. 14) and in the ninth (*ap.* ODO. CLUNIAC. *de Translat. Corp. S. Martini*). Afterwards it became common.

As early as the fourth century, it was usual to carry in the processions palm and olive-branches, as symbols of victory and joy, and to burn incense (BARON. *Annal. ad a.* 310, n. 10). Rosemary was not used in this manner until a late period. Cypress (which the Romans used on such occasions) was rejected, as being a symbol of sorrow and mourning. Laurel or ivy leaves were sometimes put into the coffin (GREG. TURON. *de Glor. Conf.* c. 8†; SURIUS *Act. S. d.* 6 September)<sup>a</sup>.

Lighted torches were carried before and behind the coffin; in token of victory over death, and union with Christ at “the marriage-supper of the Lamb.” (GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* 10 *in Cæsar.*; GREG. NYSSEN. *Vit. Macrin.*; THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 36; HIERON. *Ep.* 27 *ad Eustoch.*; JUSTIN. *Novell.* lix. c. 5.)

The Christians repudiated the custom of crowning the corpse and the coffin with garlands, as savouring of idolatry. (CLEM. ALEX. *Pædagog.* lib. ii. c. 8; TERTULL. *de Coron. Mil.* c. 10<sup>a</sup>.) It was usual with them, however, to strew flowers upon the grave. (AMBROS. *de Ob. Valent.* c. 56; HIERON. *Ep.* 26; PRUDENT. *Hymn. pro cæseq.*)

It was usual to make funeral orations (λόγοι ἐπικήδειοι, epiccedia, ἐπιτάφια, orationes funebres) in praise of those who had been distinguished during life by their virtue or merits. Several orations of this kind are extant; as that of Eusebius at the funeral of Constantine; those of Ambrose on the deaths of Theodosius

<sup>a</sup> Hedera quoque vel laurus et hujusmodi, que semper servant virorem, in sarcophago corpori substernebantur, ad significandum, quod qui moriuntur in Christo, vivere non desinant: nam licet mundo moriantur secundum corpus, tamen secundum animam vivunt et reviviscunt Deo. Et in hoc infelices Ethnici hallucinarunt, qui, absque resurrectionis cognitione, ornabant corpora cyparisso, quod semel abscissum, amplius non germinat. DURAND. *Ration. Div. Offic.* lib. vii. c. 35.

<sup>a</sup> Nec mortuos coronamus. Ego vos

in hoc magis miror, quemadmodum tribuatis exanimi aut sentienti facem [fors. fascem], aut non sentienti coronam, cum et beatus non egeat, et miser non gaudeat floribus. At enim nos exsequias adornamus eadem tranquillitate, qua vivimus, nec annectimus arescentem coronam, sed a Deo æternis floribus vividam sustinemus, qui et modesti Dei nostri liberalitate, securi spe [al. secuti spem] futuræ felicitatis, fide presentis ejus majestatis animamur. MINUC. FELL. *Octav.*

and Valentinian, and of his own brother Satyrus; those of Gregory of Nazianzum upon his father, his brother Cæsarius, and his sister Gorgonia; and that of Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of Melitus, bishop of Antioch.

It was customary in the early church to celebrate the Lord's supper at funerals, sometimes at the grave itself, (*Conc. Carth. iii. c. 29*; POSSID. *Vit. August. c. 13*; EUSEB. *Vit. Constant. M. 4, c. 71*); by which was intimated the communion subsisting between the living and the dead, as members of one and the same mystical body, while a testimony was given to the fact, that the deceased had departed in the true faith and as a recognised member of the church. This ancient custom made way for the more modern and corrupt practices of offerings and masses for the dead. An early abuse of administering the consecrated elements to the deceased was speedily forbidden; (*Conc. Antissidor., A. D. 578, c. 12*; *Conc. Carth. iii. c. 6*; *Conc. Trullan. c. 133.*) A practice which had prevailed of giving a parting kiss of charity, (*φίλημα ἁγίου, osculum sanctum,*) to the corpse before the interment<sup>10</sup>, was likewise abolished.

“But whether they had a communion or not at the funeral, they always had prayers; as is evident from the canons of the third Council of Carthage and the Council of Milevi, which give directions about the use of them. And in these prayers, when there was no communion, they particularly commended the soul of the deceased to God, whence probably those prayers more especially had the distinguishing names of Commendations (*παραθέσεις, commendationes, commendatory prayers*). Besides these, it was usual to pray for them by private or sudden ejaculations, as we find examples in St. Ambrose's several orations upon the emperors Theodosius, Valentinian, and Gratian, and his own brother Satyrus, and Gregory Nazianzen's funeral speech upon his brother Cæsarius, and St. Austin's private prayers for

<sup>10</sup> The corpse was laid in the grave in the same position as that which is usual at the present day. Various reasons for this practice are assigned by Bede Venerab., Isidorus Hispal., and Durandus, which are thus represented by Andr. Quenstedt (*De Sepult. Vet. p. 133*), Christiani solent

sepelire. 1. *Supinos*, quia mors nostra proprie non est mors, sed brevis quidam somnus. 2. *Vultu ad cælum converso*, quia solo in cælo spes nostra fundata est. 3. *Versus orientem*, argumento sperandæ et exoptandæ resurrectionis.

his mother Monica; not to mention the prayers made for them annually upon their anniversary-days of commemoration. One of these forms of prayer used at funerals is still remaining in the *Constitutions*, which fully shows that there was no relation to purgatory in these prayers, but quite the contrary; namely, a supposition that the soul of the deceased was going to a place of rest and happiness in Abraham's bosom." (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book xxiii. ch. 3.)—For a more particular account of this whole matter, see book iv. chap. 1, sect. 7.

The practice of praying for the dead is undoubtedly in accordance with the untutored feelings of human nature; but it has received no sanction in holy Scripture; and the existence of such a practice in the early church must be regarded as one proof of an imperfect acquaintance with the doctrines and genius of Christianity. It is certain that the teachers of the church, during the second, third, and fourth centuries, either were obliged to yield in some respects to the ignorance and superstition of the people, or had themselves attained to but an imperfect acquaintance with Christian truth. The following passages from Chrysostom and Jerome, quoted by Bingham, relating to the distribution of alms at the burial of the dead, tend to lead us to the conclusion, that even those pious and excellent men were not without some serious errors or defects in their views of Christian doctrine.—“Why do you call the poor after the death of a relation?” says Chrysostom in one of his Homilies; “why do you desire the presbyters to pray for him? I know you will answer, that he may go into rest, that he may find a merciful judge.” He commends this practice a little after, and thus addresses rich men who bury their heirs:—“If many barbarous nations burn their goods together with their dead, how much more reasonable is it for you to give your child his goods when he is dead! Not to reduce them to ashes, but to make him the more glorious; if he be a sinner, to procure him pardon; if righteous, to add to his reward and retribution.” (CHRYSOST. *Hom. 32 in Matth.*) Jerome bestows the following commendation upon Pammachius:—“Whilst other husbands throw thorns, violets, roses, lilies, and purple flowers upon the graves of their wives, our Pammachius waters the holy ashes and bones of his

wife with the balsam of alms." (HIERON. *Ep.* 26, *ad Pammach. de Obitu Uxoris.*)

All immoderate grief or mourning for the dead was regarded as inconsistent with Christian faith and hope. And hence, the custom which prevailed among the Jews and Romans of hiring women to make lamentations at funerals (*mulieres præficæ*) was severely reprov'd and denounc'd by the teachers of the church. (TERTULL. *De Patient.* c. 7; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 32 *in Matth.*; *Hom.* 61, *in Johan.*; *Hom.* 6 *in 1 Ep. ad Thessal.*; HIERON. *Ep.* 25, *ad Paul.*; *Ep.* 34 *ad Julian*<sup>11</sup>.) And these declarations of the fathers were enforced by the decrees of councils. But it must not be supposed that a stoical apathy, or want of natural affection, was either enjoined or recommended; the church condemn'd only such grief and lamentations as were immoderate, artificial, or otherwise inconsistent with Christian profession, and the hopes of a blessed immortality. (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 4 *in Hebr.*) We find many passages of ancient authors in which the right and power of nature in this respect are recognis'd, and a becoming sorrow, occasioned by the death of friends, is justify'd both on principles of reason and by reference to scriptural examples<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Fratres nostri non lugendi<sup>9</sup> acer-  
sione Dominica de sæculo liberati,  
cum sciamus, non eos omitti, sed præ-  
mitti, recedentes præcedere, ut profi-  
ciscentes et navigantes, desiderari eos  
debere, non plangi; nec accipiendas  
heic *atras vestes*, quando illi *ibi indu-  
menta alba* jam sumserint: occasionem  
non dandam esse gentilibus, ut nos  
merito et jure reprehendant, quod  
quos vivere apud Deum dicimus ut  
extinctos et perditos lugeamus, et  
fidem, quam sermone et voce depromi-  
mus, cordis et pectoris testimonio  
reprobemur. CYPRIAN. *De Mortal.*

<sup>12</sup> Non omnis infidelitatis aut infir-  
mitatis est fletus; alius est naturæ  
dolor, alia est tristitia in diffidentia, et  
plurimum refert, desiderare, quod  
habueris, et lugere, quod amiseris . . .  
Fecerunt et fletum magnum sui, cum  
Patriarchæ sepelirentur. Lacrymæ

ergo pietatis indices, non illices sunt  
doloris. Lacrymatus sum ergo, fateor,  
et ego, sed lacrymatus est et Dominus;  
ille alienum, ego fratrem. AMBUOS.  
*Orat. in obit. Fratris.*—Quorum nos  
vita propter amicitie solatia delecta-  
bat, unde fieri potest, ut eorum mors  
nullam nobis ingerat mæstitudinem?  
Quam qui prohibet, prohibeat, si  
potest, amica colloquia, interdicat ami-  
calem societatem, vel intercidat ad-  
fectum omnium humanarum necessi-  
tudinum, vineula mentis inmiti stupore  
disrumpat, aut sic eis utendum esse  
censeat, ut nulla ex eis animum dul-  
cedo perfundat. Quod si fieri nullo  
modo potest, etiam hoc, quo pacto  
futurum est, ut ejus nobis amara mors  
non sit, ejus dulcis est vita? Hinc  
enim est luctus quidem [al. quidam]  
humano corde quasi vulnus aut ulcus,  
cui sanando adhibentur officiosæ cou-

In token of mourning, the Jews used to tear their clothes, and to wear sackcloth and ashes; the Romans used to wear black (toga pulla). We find strong disapprobation of the custom of wearing black in the writings of some of the fathers (CYPRIAN. *Serm. de Mortal.*; CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 69, *ad Pop.*; HIERON. *Ep.* 34<sup>13</sup>); but others did not so severely condemn the use of a mourning-habit; and the practice soon became prevalent among Christians, especially in the east.

No precise rules were made respecting the duration of mourning for the dead; this matter being left to custom, and to the feelings of parties concerned. "The heathen had a custom of repeating their mourning on the third, seventh, and ninth days, which was particularly called the *Noventiale*: and some added the twentieth, thirtieth, and fortieth, not without a superstitious opinion of those particular days, wherein they used to sacrifice to their manes with milk, and wine, and garlands, and flowers, as the Roman antiquaries inform us. Something of this superstition, abating the sacrifice, was still remaining among the ignorant Christians in St. Austin's time; for he speaks of some who observed a novential in relation to their dead (*Quest.* 172 *in Gen.*), which he thinks they ought to be forbidden, because it was only an heathen custom. He does not seem to intimate that they kept it exactly as the heathen did; but rather that they were superstitious in their observation of nine days of

solutiones. Non enim propterea non est, quod sanetur; quoniam quanto est animus melior, tanto in eo citius faciliusque sanatur. AUGUSTIN. *De Civ. Dei* lib. xix. c. 8.—Premebam oculos ejus [sc. matris], et confluebat in præcordia mea mœstitudo ingens, et transflebat in lacrimas, ibidemque oculi mei violento animi imperio resorbabant fontem suum usque ad siccitatem, et in tali luctamine valde male mihi erat. Tum vero ubi efflavit extremum spiritum; puer Adeodatus exclamavit in planctum, atque ab omnibus nobis coërcitus tacuit. Hoc modo etiam meum quiddam puerile, quod labebatur in fletus, juvenili voce cordis coërcēbatur et tacebat. Neque enim decere

arbitrabamur, funus illud questibus lacrimosis genitibusque celebrare, quia his plerumque solet deplorari quædam miseria morientium, aut quasi omnimoda extinctio. At illa nec misere moriebatur, nec omnino moriebatur. AUGUSTIN. *Confess.* lib. ix. c. 12. Conf. CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 29, *De Dormient.*; *Hom.* 61, *in Johann.*

<sup>13</sup> Augustin expresses himself very strongly on this subject:—Postremo etiam, qua ratione vestes nigras tingimus, nisi quos vere infideles et miseros, non tantum fletibus, sed etiam vestibus approbemus? *Aliena* sunt ista, frates, *extranea* sunt; non licent, et si licerent, non decent. *Serm.* ii. *De Consolat. Mort.*

mourning, which was without example in Scripture. There was another way of continuing the funeral offices for three days together, which was allowed among Christians, because it had nothing in it but the same worship of God repeated. Then Euodius writing to St. Austin (EUODII. *Ep.* 258 *inter Ep. August.*), and giving him an account of the funeral of a very pious young man, who had been his votary, says that he had given him honourable obsequies, worthy of so great a soul: for he continued to sing hymns to God for three days together at his grave, and on the third day offered the sacraments of redemption. The author of the *Constitutions* (*Const. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 42) takes notice of this repetition of the funeral office on the third day, and the ninth day, and the fortieth day, giving peculiar reasons for each of them:—‘Let the third day be observed for the dead with psalms, and lessons, and prayers, because Christ on the third day rose again from the dead; and let the ninth day be observed in remembrance of the living and the dead; and also the fortieth day, according to the ancient manner of the Israelites mourning for Moses forty days; and finally, let the anniversary-day be observed in commemoration of the deceased.’

“On the anniversary-days of commemorating the dead, they were used to make a common feast or entertainment, inviting both the clergy and people, but especially the poor and needy, the widows and orphans, that it might not only be a memorial of rest to the dead, but an odour of sweet smell to themselves in the sight of God, as the author under the name of Origen words it. St. Chrysostom says (CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 47 *in 1 Ep. ad Cor.*) that they were more tenacious of this custom, than they were of some others of greater importance.—But this often degenerated into great abuses. (ARG. *de Moribus Eccles.* c. 34; *Ep.* 64 *ad Aurelium.*)” (BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book 23, chap. 3.)

---

CHAPTER IV<sup>1</sup>.

## A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE AGAPÆ, OR FEASTS OF CHARITY.

## § 1.—ORIGIN OF THE NAME, AND OF THE CUSTOM.

THE Greek word Agape (*ἀγάπη*), which signifies love or charity, is used in ecclesiastical antiquities to denote a certain feast, of which all members of the church, of whatever rank or condition, partook together; intended to denote and cherish those dispositions of humility and brotherly affection which the gospel prescribes to the disciples of Jesus. In the New Testament the word occurs only once in this sense of *feast of charity*, or *love-feast*, namely, in the Epistle of St. Jude, verse 12, and there it is found in the plural number; but the observance itself is alluded to in the sacred records under other names, as *meat, tables*, Acts ii. 46; vi. 2. The word was retained by ecclesiastical writers, but not to the exclusion of other significant appellations; *e. g.*, *συνπόσια*, *banquets*; *κοινὰ τράπεζαι*, *public tables*; *κοινὰ ἐστιάσεις*, *public feasts*; *δεῖπνα κοινά*, *public suppers*. This use of the term *Ἀγάπη* is not found in the writings of any profane authors before the Christian era; but it occurs in the works of Plutarch and Celsus, who doubtless borrowed it from the Christians.

It is certain that the feast of charity was celebrated in the earliest period of the Christian church; (see Acts ii. 46; vi. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 16—34.) Some writers suppose that this custom had its remote origin in the practice of the heathen; while others regard it as derived from the Jewish synagogue. But it is perhaps still more probable that it originated simply in the circumstances of our Lord's last supper with his disciples; or that, at all events, it is to be attributed entirely to the genius of a religion which is eminently a bond of brotherly union and concord among its sincere professors.

<sup>1</sup> For the substance of this chapter I am especially indebted to SIEGEL, *Handbuch der Christlich-Kirchlichen Alterthümer*.



## § 2.—MODE OF CELEBRATION.

IN the earliest accounts which have come down to us, we find that the bishop or presbyter presided at these feasts. (JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apolog.* 2; see also 1 Cor. xii.) It does not appear whether the food was dressed in the place appointed for the celebration of the feast, or was previously prepared by individual members of the church at their own homes; but perhaps either of these plans was adopted indifferently, according to circumstances. Before eating, the guests washed their hands; and a public prayer was offered up. A portion of Scripture was then read, and the president proposed some questions upon it, which were answered by the persons present. After this, any accounts which had been received respecting the affairs of other churches were recited; for, at that time, such accounts were regularly transmitted from one community to another, by means of which all Christians became acquainted with the history and condition of the whole body, and were thus enabled to sympathize with, and in many cases to assist, each other. Letters from bishops and other eminent members of the church, together with the Acts of the Martyrs, were also recited on this occasion. And hymns or psalms were sung. (CYPRIAN. *Ep. de Spectac.*; TERTULL. *de Coron.* c. 3; SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 22.) At the close of the feast, money was collected for the benefit of widows and orphans, the poor, prisoners, and persons who had suffered shipwreck. Before the meeting broke up, all the members of the church embraced each other, in token of mutual brotherly love; and the whole ceremony was concluded with a philanthropic prayer. (JUSTIN MART. *Apol.* ii.; ORIGEN. *in Ep. ad Rom.* xvi. 16.)

As the number of Christians increased, various deviations from the original practice of celebration occurred; which called for the censure of the governors of the church. (CLEM. ALEX. *Pedagog.* ii. 1, 2.) In consequence of these irregularities, it was appointed that the president should deliver to each guest his portion separately, and that the larger portions should be distributed among the presbyters, deacons, and other officers of the church.

While the church was exposed to persecution, these feasts

were not only conducted with regularity and good order, but were made subservient to Christian edification, and to the promotion of brotherly love, and of that kind of concord and union which was specially demanded by the circumstances of the times. (TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 39.) None but full members of the church were allowed to be present; catechumens, penitents, Jews, and heathens, being carefully excluded. (JUSTIN MART. *Apol.* ii. c. 97.) A custom of admitting baptized children, which was introduced at an early period, was afterwards abandoned as inconvenient. (CYPRIAN. *De Lapsis.*)

### § 3.—TIME AND PLACE OF CELEBRATION.

1. *Time of Day.*—These feasts, as well as all Christian assemblies, were held, at first, whenever and wherever opportunity would permit, consistently with safety. The passages of the New Testament which refer to the Agapæ afford no intimation of the time of day in which they were celebrated, unless indeed we regard Acts xx. 7, as supplying some information on this point. From Tertullian it would appear that they were held in the night; for he calls them *Cœnæ* and *Cœnulae*, in contradistinction to *prandia*; and this writer gives us to understand that lights were required in the place in which the feast was made. But it is probable that this nocturnal celebration was more a matter of necessity than of choice.

According to the account of Pliny in his letter to Trajan, it would seem that in his time (in Bithynia, at least) these feasts were held in the day-time. (See CHRYSOSTOM *ad* 1 Cor. xi. *Hom.* 54, and *Hom.* 22 on the text *Oportet hæreses esse.*)

On the whole, it may be concluded that the nature of the case did not permit the uniform observance of any fixed hour or time of day in the celebration of this feast, during the earliest period of the church, while it was exposed to persecution.

2. *Day of the Week.*—These feasts were ordinarily held on the first day of the week, or Sunday; but the celebration does not appear to have been exclusively confined to that day. (Acts xx. 7; TERTULL. *ad Uxor.* lib. ii.; CYPRIAN. *de Orat. Domini.*)

3. *Place of Meeting.*—At first, the Agapæ were celebrated in private houses, or in other retired places, in which the Christians

met for the purpose of religious worship. After the erection of churches, these feasts were held within their walls; until, abuses having occurred which rendered the observance inconsistent with the sanctity of such places, this practice was forbidden. In the middle of the fourth century, the Council of Laodicea enacted "that Agapæ should not be celebrated in churches;" a prohibition which was repeated by the third Council of Carthage, in the year 391; and was afterwards strictly enjoined during the sixth and seventh centuries. (*Conc. Aurelian.* ii. A.D. 535; *Conc. Trullan.* A.D. 692.) By the efforts of Gregory of Neocæsarea, Chrysostom, and others, a custom was generally established of holding the Agapæ only under trees, or some other shelter, in the neighbourhood of the churches; and from that time the clergy and other principal members of the church were recommended to withdraw from them altogether.

Respecting the connexion which subsisted between the feasts of charity and the celebration of the Eucharist, see book iv. chap. iii. § 8, no. 5.

In the early church, it was usual to celebrate Agapæ on the festivals of martyrs (agapæ natalitiæ) at their tombs; a practice to which reference is made in the epistle of the church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp. (See also THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 15; *Evang. Verit.* viii. p. 633-4, ed. Schultz.)

These feasts were sometimes celebrated on a smaller scale, at marriages (agapæ connubiales) and funerals (agapæ funerales).

#### § 4.—ABOLITION OF THE CUSTOM.

THE celebration of the Agapæ was frequently made a subject of calumny and misrepresentation by the enemies of the Christian faith, even during the earliest and best ages of the church. In reply to these groundless attacks, the conduct of the Christians of those times was successfully vindicated by Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Origen, and others. But real disorders having afterwards arisen, and having proceeded to considerable lengths, it became necessary to abolish the practice altogether; and this task was eventually effected, but not without the application of various means, and only after a considerable lapse of time.

## CHAPTER V.

## OF STATIONS, PROCESSIONS, AND PILGRIMAGES.

THE custom and practices about to be considered in this chapter cannot be numbered among those which existed in the church during the first three centuries of Christianity. And we may account for this fact partly from the circumstances in which the early church was placed, and partly from the principles and opinions of the primitive Christians concerning divine worship.

During the prevalence of persecution, when Christians were not suffered to possess and frequent any public places of worship, and when heathen magistrates were employed in even searching out their places of private assembly, it was impossible that religious processions or any such solemnities could be performed, nor was it likely that they would be invented or desired. During that period, indeed, some fanatical professors of the Christian religion, such as were sometimes found among the Montanists and Novatians, courted notoriety and persecution by holding public assemblies, and by the open and obtrusive celebration of sacred rites. But this was not the practice of the church in general. It was adopted by most Christians as a rule that, as long as the church was in an oppressed and suffering state, its worship could be conducted only in a private and unobtrusive manner. And hence it was sometimes objected to them by the heathen, that were afraid to show themselves, and to conduct their proceedings openly<sup>1</sup>.

It appears also that the earliest professors of the Christian faith were disposed conscientiously to abstain from such public religious ceremonies as those which are now to be described, and were more than content to be even destitute of temples, altars, priests, and sacred pomp or show. They received in its literal

<sup>1</sup> Such was the reproach to which *ut busta despiciunt, Deos despaunt,* Mimucius Felix refers, *Octav. c. 3,* *rident sacra, miserentur miseri, si fas* *Latebrosa et lucifugax natio, in publi- est, sacerdotum honores, et purpuras* *cum muta, in angulis garrula; templa despiciunt, ipsi seminudi.*

and broadest meaning the precept of our Saviour, that his disciples should worship God in spirit and in truth; and they thought that they had discovered, in the overthrow of the Jewish polity and the destruction of the Temple, an intimation of the Divine will that religious worship should be no longer limited by time and place. The Jewish Christians, indeed, continued to evince an attachment to places, times, and seasons; but the early Gentile converts regarded temples and altars as remnants or indications of heathen superstition,—an opinion which is strongly developed, for example, in the Apologies of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Tertullian, and even in the writings of Origen (*contra Celsum*, lib. viii.)

In course of time, however, when Christianity was protected, and even adopted by the state, and opportunity was thus given of establishing public forms and ceremonies of worship without fear of danger, and when it seemed expedient to recommend it to the favour of half-converted pagans by outward pomp and circumstance, it was thought to be at once safe and seasonable to increase the number of sacred solemnities, both ordinary and extraordinary, to restore many parts of the Jewish ritual, and even to incorporate into the system of Christian worship various rites and ceremonies from the customs of the declining pagan superstition. And it is to this period of church history, and to these (mistaken) principles of polity, that we may chiefly refer the origin of stations, processions, and pilgrimages.

These ceremonies are more or less connected with each other, and may be considered as forming one family or class; but for the sake of accuracy and distinctness, the history of each may claim to be treated separately.

### § 1.—OF STATIONS.

IN ecclesiastical language, the word *statio* (*στάσις*) is employed especially to denote—

1. A certain fixed post or place, and especially, an appointed place in which prayer might be made, either publicly or pri-

vately (locus sacer; oratorium, *προσευχή*; conventus et cœtus sacer)<sup>2</sup>.

2. A standing posture at prayer; opposed to *γονυκλισία*, procumbere in genua, prostratio, humiliatio, &c. The early church insisted strongly upon the propriety of offering public prayer in a standing posture on every Lord's day, and during the whole interval between Easter and Whisuntide; regarding that posture as commemorative of our Lord's resurrection, and emblematical of the future general resurrection of the dead. (TERTULL. *De Coron.* c. 3; CYPRIAN. *De Orat.* (quando stamus ad orationem); CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* lib. vii.; *Constit. Apost.* lib. ii. c. 59.) This observance having begun to decline towards the beginning of the fourth century, it was strongly enjoined by the great council of Nicæa (c. 20). Similar regulations were made, in support of the ancient practice, by *Conc. Trullan.* c. 90; *Conc. Turon.* iii. c. 37. Conf. BASIL. M. *de Spiritu Sancto ad Amphil.* c. 27. Many traces of this custom are found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and in the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom. The privilege of standing at prayer was denied for a time to penitents (whose various classes, it may be here remarked, are often called *στάσεις*, stationes, *i.e.*, gradus): whence they were entitled *γονυκλίνοντες* and *ὑποπίπτοντες*, prostrati, substrati. (See book iv. chap. 4, sect. 1.)

It was usual in the early church for all the members of the congregation, ministers as well as people, to stand during the reading of the Gospels, and during the singing of Psalms and doxologies. Hence the select portions of the Gospels were entitled *στάσεις*, stationes; while other portions of Scripture, during the reading of which the people sat, were called *καθίσματα*, sessiones. (SUICERI *Thesaur. Eccl.*)

3. Statio is also frequently employed by early writers as nearly equivalent to jejuniun. (See book v. chap. ii.)

<sup>2</sup> Statio veteribus dictus cœtus, sive conventus fidelium in ecclesia, maxime is qui die Dominico fiebat, apud Tertullianum de Corona Militis: ita autem vocantur ejusmodi conventus, metaphora sumta a militibus, qui dum præsidium certo loco collocant *statio-*

*nem facere dicuntur.* DU CANGE, *Glossar.* s. v. *Statio*, n. 2.—Conf. TERTULL. *Apologet.* c. 3. Nonne philosophi de auctoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? *etiam a locis conventiculorum et stationum suarum*, Stoici Academici?

All the meanings of the word *statio*, as employed by ecclesiastical writers with reference to the customs or discipline of the church, may be reduced to one or other of these three leading significations. The term, however, is most frequently used by the later writers in connexion with processions and pilgrimages; and in that case it usually denotes some particular place or object, such as an altar, a cross, an image, a *tabula votiva*, either within the walls of a church or elsewhere, at or near which a worshipper performed his devotions, either standing or kneeling, sometimes singing a psalm, sometimes repeating a prayer, sometimes performing only an act of mental worship, or engaging in religious meditation.

There are some comparatively modern words and phrases of this class which may deserve a brief explanation in this place. Thus, certain altars or churches at Rome in which the pontiff officiates on certain days are designated by the name of stations (*ecclesiæ stationales*; *templa stationum*). The clergy who accompany or assist the Roman bishop on those occasions are called *stationarii*,—a term which bears reference to the *milites stationarii*, *apparitores*, et *officiales præsidum*, in the time of the Roman emperors,—or *mansionarii*, corresponding to the Greek word *ἐπισταθμοὶ*. We find also sometimes *ecclēsia mansionaria* instead of *ecclēsia stationalis* (DU CANGE, *Glossar. s. v. Mansionarius*).

*Crux stationalis* denotes a cross or crucifix, carried in religious processions, and serving as a kind of chief standard, or to denote a place of rendezvous or head-quarters.

*Calix stationarius* is the cup or chalice which is taken from one station to another, where mass is to be celebrated, or a *sortitio sacra* to be performed.

*Indulgentiæ stationariæ* are indulgences published at certain stations, and especially in the *ecclēsiæ stationales*.

## § 2.—OF PROCESSIONS.

IN the earliest ecclesiastical phrasology, *processio* denotes merely *the act of frequenting a religious assembly, and taking part in public worship*. It is distinguished from private offices of devo-

tion, and includes the idea of *social* worship, but without any additional idea of public ceremony, pomp, or the like. *Procedere* in short is synonymous with *sacris interesse, sacra frequentare*<sup>3</sup>. In many canons, and other ecclesiastical writings, we find the word *processio*, without any explanation or addition, used in the sense of a *religious assembly* (*conventus et cætus populi in ecclesia*). The Greek word *συναξίς* (as well as *συναγωγή, σύλλογος*, conf. *Suiceri Thesaur.*) is translated sometimes by *collecta*, sometimes by *conventus*, and sometimes by *processio*. When Christian worship began to be conducted openly, and churches were publicly frequented, the meaning of the word *processio* was exactly equivalent to our term *church-going*.

The term was afterwards applied to processions usual at funerals, marriages, and public baptisms;—and to the series or line of communicants at the Lord's supper.

Penitential processions, and processions of persons employed in offering deprecatory prayers (*Litaniæ, Rogationes*), afterwards became common. (See book v. chap. 2, § 2.) And processions during the high festivals of the church, and on other occasions, were, in course of time, introduced and greatly multiplied.

<sup>3</sup> Thus in *TERTULLIAN Ad Uxor.* lib. ii. c. 4, "Si procedendum erit" refers to the act of joining a religious assembly, as distinguished from a *statio* or *jejunium* observed at home, or other private exercises of religion. The following passages from the same author serve to illustrate the meaning of the terms *processio, procedere*, in his days.—*Ubi metus in Deum, ibi gravitas honesta, et diligentia attonita, et cura sollicita, et allectio explorata, et communicatio deliberata, et promotio emerita, et subjectio religiosa, et apparitio devota, et processio modesta, et ecclesia unita, et Dei omnia. De Præscript. Hæret. c. 43.*—*Quæ autem vobis causa exstructius prodeundi, cum remotæ sitis ab his, quæ talium indigent? Nam nec templa circumitis, nec spectacula postulatis, nec festos dies gentilium nostis. Propter*

*istos etiam conventus, et mutuum videre ac videri, omnes pompæ in publicum proferuntur, aut ut luxuria negotietur, aut gloria insoleseat. Vobis autem nulla procedendi causa non tetrica. Aut imbecillus aliquis ex fratribus visitatur, aut sacrificium offertur, aut Dei sermo administratur. Quidvis horum gravitatis et sanctitatis negotium est, cui opus non sit habitu extraordinario, et composito, et soluto. Ac si necessitas amicitiarum officiorumque gentilium vos vocat, cur non vestris armis indutæ procedatis, tanto magis quanto ad extraneas fidei? ut sit inter Dei ancillas et Diaboli discrimen: ut exemplo sitis illis, ut ædificentur in vobis: ut (quomodo ait Apostolus) magnificetur Deus in corpore vestro. De Cultu Fæminar. lib. ii. c. 11.*



Laws were made (*e.g.*, an edict of Justinian, A.D. 541), by which such processions were protected from interruption, all persons who should offer any annoyance being subjected to severe punishment.

Many and various ceremonies were observed in these processions, according to the objects for which they were instituted, the spirit of the times in which they were celebrated, and the countries wherein they took place. Crucifixes, images, and other emblems, were carried, peculiar dresses were worn, and various ceremonies observed, according to the different circumstances of time and place. The clergy usually attended processions in their official capacity, sometimes taking their place at the head of the line, sometimes in the middle, and sometimes in the rear. In processions celebrated on occasions of joy or thanksgiving, the clergy attended in their most splendid vestments, the laity were dressed in their best attire, adorned with garlands and other ornaments, and the sound of bells and music was heard throughout the whole line; but on occasions of mourning or penitence, all this was reversed, and the procession was distinguished by plain vestments, bare feet, dejected countenances, a deep silence, or sounds of lamentation and mournful prayer, and sometimes the exercise of penitential flagellation. It was usual for the members of the procession to walk two by two at regular distances<sup>4</sup>. The sexes walked apart; and the line of procession was arranged with reference also to the various ranks and classes of the persons who composed it. Lighted wax tapers were often carried in procession, especially on the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which was hence called *festum* or *missa candelarum*. Prayers or litanies, and psalms or hymns, many of which were composed expressly for the occasion, were repeated, in Latin, as the procession moved on. The seven penitential psalms, (reckoned as Ps. vi., xxxi., xxxvi., l., ci., cii., *i.e.*, according to our order, Ps. vii., xxxii., xxxvii., li., cii., ciii.,) and the psalmi *graduales*, Ps. cxix. (cxx.) to cxxxiii. (cxxxiv.), were frequently employed on these occasions; as well as the appointed

<sup>4</sup> In Processionibus bini et bini, | quibus omnino caveant ne confabu-  
servato ordine et justa distantia, incedant, vultibus in terram demissis, in | lentur. *Ordo Eccles. Paris.* in MAR-  
TENE *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* t. iii.

litanies, and many well-known Latin hymns, *e.g.*, *Salve Regina*,—*Vexilla Regis prodeunt*,—*Pange, lingua, gloriosi*,—*Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem*, &c.

We cannot descend to further particulars on this subject; indeed, I feel that I have already wandered, perhaps too far, out of the department of Christian antiquities, into the region of ecclesiastical superstition and folly.

### § 3.—OF PILGRIMAGES.

THE earliest recorded examples of Christian pilgrimages, real or supposed, belong to the third and fourth centuries. These histories relate to—the journey undertaken by Alexander from Cappadocia to Palestine, the real nature and object of which has occasioned much debate (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 11),—that of Origen from Jerusalem to Rome (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 14, 19, 23, 26, 27),—neither of which perhaps can be properly designated as a pilgrimage,—and that which was undertaken by Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, to Jerusalem (EUSEB. *De Vita Const. M.* lib. iii. c. 40, seq.; RUFIN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 7). The journey of Helena does indeed appear to deserve the name of a pilgrimage, in the proper acceptation of the term; and it is probable that to this famous example, and to the facilities which occurred during a period of universal toleration and of external prosperity to the church, the custom of making religious pilgrimages owes its origin. Certain it is that this custom prevailed extensively during the fourth century,—that period in which many of the foundations of ecclesiastical corruption were deeply laid, or strengthened and widely extended. Several of the great writers of that age inveighed strongly against the abuses to which pilgrimages had already given rise, but they did not sufficiently denounce or disown the principle on which they were undertaken, or the act itself considered as religious; while the encouragement which they themselves gave to the veneration of saints and relics could not but contribute to increase the passion for pilgrimages to spots rendered famous by the supposed possession of those treasures. (See GREGORY NYSSEN, *Περὶ τῶν ἀπύκτων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*,—a treatise generally

regarded as genuine, although some have entertained doubts concerning it;—CHRYSOST. *Hom.* 1 in *Ep. ad Philem.*; *Hom.* 3, 4, *ad Pop. Antioch.*; *Hom.* 8 in *Ep. ad Ephes.*;—HIERON. *Epist.* 86 *ad Eustochium Virginem*; *Epitaphium Paulæ matris*; *Epist.* 49 (*al.* 3) *ad Paulin.*;—AUGUSTIN. *Serm.* 1 *de Verb. Apost.*; *Serm. de Sanctis*; *Epist.* 137, 52; *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xxii. c. 8.)

The places of principal resort for pilgrims in successive ages of the church were the following:—Palestine, and especially Jerusalem, with the holy sepulchre;—Rome;—Loretto;—and Compostella—the credit of the two latter places of resort, as indeed of many others, having been founded upon fabulous legends. A particular account of the journeys undertaken to these places, of the efficacy ascribed to such expeditions, and of the repute in which each particular place of resort, or the whole system of pilgrimages, was held from time to time, and in different countries, or by various individuals, belongs to the department of ecclesiastical history, rather than to the subject-matter of the present manual<sup>5</sup>.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### OF MONACHISM AND MONASTERIES.

#### § 1.—OF MONACHISM.

I. *Origin of Monachism.*—The institutions of monachism by no means accord with the real genius of Christianity. Nor are they to be regarded as being, in any respect, the work of its divine Founder or his apostles; who solemnly enjoined upon all men the duties of an active life, and the practice of social and benevolent intercourse with their fellow-creatures.

Ascetics, hermits, and monks, existed in Egypt, Assyria, Persia, India, and other countries, long before the Christian era. The Essæans, or Essenes, who probably first retired into solitude during the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, may almost be

<sup>5</sup> Some interesting notices with reference to pilgrimages in the earlier and middle ages of the church may be found in SCHROEDER'S *Kirchengeschichte*, part v. 133; viii. 268; xix. 134; xxiii. 201; xxv. 33.

called Jewish monks. The institutions of the Therapeutæ, a religious society mentioned by Philo and Josephus, appear to have had considerable influence in the subsequent formation of monastic establishments. Many of the Pythagorean institutes also bore a great resemblance to the monastic rules and observances of later date. Some have referred to the Nazarites and the Rechabites of the Old Testament, as patterns of monachism; and others have spoken of the prophet Elias, the schools of the prophets, and John the Baptist, as its forerunners or founders. The latter representation is as old, at least, as Jerome<sup>1</sup>.

As early as the second century, the foundations of monachism were laid, in a vain admiration of the supposed virtues of fasting, solitude, and celibacy. Bodily mortification, and a contemplative life, were regarded by many Christians as indications and means of extraordinary piety, not long after the age of the apostles. In the time of Cyprian and Tertullian, the "sacred virgins of the church," or "canonical virgins," were recognised as a distinct class, and celibacy was extolled as a piece of supereminent sanctity. (CYPRIAN. *Rp.* 62, al. 4. *ad Pompon.*) And such superstition, with its pernicious adjuncts and consequences, made rapid progress in the church.

But the origin of the monastic life, properly so called, is to be referred to the third century; and the country in which it took its rise was Egypt. It may be traced partly to the existence of persecution, and partly to the influence of the Platonic and Pythagorean philosophy. Gnosticism, also, may have contributed, indi-

<sup>1</sup> Inter multos sæpe dubitatum est, a quo potissimum monachorum eremus (ζηρημος) habitari cœpta est. Quidam enim altius repetentes, a beato Elia et Joanne sunsere principium. Quorum et Elias plus nobis fuisse videtur, quam monachus; et Joannes ante prophetare cœpisse, quam natus est. Alii autem, in qua opinione vulgus omne consentit, asserunt Antonium hujus propositi caput fuisse. Quod ex parte verum est. Non enim tam ipse ante omnes fuit, quam ab eo omnium incitata sunt studia: Amathus vero et Macarius discipuli Antonii, quorum superior

magistri corpus sepelivit, etiam nunc affirmant, Paulum quendam Thebæum principem istius rei fuisse; quod non tam nomine, quam opinione, nos quoque comprobamus. HIERON. *Vit. S. Pauli.*—Episcopi et Presbyteri habeant in exemplum apostolos et apostolicos viros: nos autem habeamus propositi nostri principes Paulos et Antonios, Julianos, Hilarionem, Macarios; et ut ad Scripturarum auctoritatem redeam, noster princeps Elias, noster Elisæus, nostri duces filii Prophetarum. *Id. Ep. ad Paulin. de Instit. Monach.*

rectly, to its growth. Its founders and earliest promoters were Paul of Thebes, Antony, Pachomius, Hilarion, Eustathius, Athanasius, and Martin of Tours; and to these may be added, as among the patrons and supporters of the system, Basil the Great, Ephraim the Syrian, the two Gregories, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerome, Cassian, and many other leading men.

During the fourth and fifth centuries, monachism became prevalent in the West as well as in the East; and a passion for the ascetic life pervaded all ranks and classes of society. But, at that period, monks were not included in the clerical order; and although many eminent ecclesiastics obtained great reputation by their adoption of a monastic life, yet it was not the custom to place monks, as such, on an equal footing with the clergy. At an early period, indeed, they ceased to be reckoned among the *sæculares*, from whom they were distinguished by the name of *religiosi*, or *regulares* (*canonici*); but this appellation itself served to distinguish them from the clergy as well as from the laity, nor were they regarded as part of the clerical body until the tenth century. Even after that date a distinction was carefully made between *clerici sæculares*, i. e., parish-priests and all who were charged with the cure of souls, and *clerici regulares*, i. e., those belonging to monastic orders; and the former vehemently protested against the right of the latter to interfere with their own peculiar duties. In fact, no complete amalgamation of the two bodies ever took place; and all monasteries continued to include a certain number of lay brethren, or *conversi* (*frères convers*, *monachi laici*; see DU CANGE, *Glossar. s. v. Conversus*), who, without discharging strictly spiritual functions, formed, as in the ancient church, a middle order between the clergy and laity.

II. *Names and different classes of Monks.*—At different periods in the history of the church, monks were distinguished by various names, and distributed into several orders. Of these, the following were the chief:—

1. Ἀσκητῆς, *Ascetic*. This name, borrowed from Greek

profane writers, was originally applied to athletes, or prize-fighters in the public games. In early ecclesiastical writers it is usually equivalent to ἐγκρατής, *continent*; and Tertullian renders both words alike by *continens* (in a technical sense). Sometimes they use ἀσκητής in the sense of ἄγαμος, *cœlebs*, *unmarried*. Concerning the early ascetics, properly so called, and the difference between them and the monks of later times, see book ii. chap. 8, and APPENDIX G.

2. Μοναχοὶ, or (more rarely) μονάζοντες, i. e., *solitaries*, is a term which denotes generally all who addict themselves to a retired or solitary life; and it was usually applied, not merely to such as retired to absolute solitude in caves and deserts, but also to such as lived apart from the rest of the world, in separate societies<sup>2</sup>. Since the third and fourth centuries this name has been almost universally employed as the common designation of religious solitaries, or members of religious societies, and has passed into various languages of Europe (Angl. *monk*). The Syrians translate it by *jehidoje* (*solitarii*).

3. The term ἀναχωρηταὶ, *anachoretæ* or *anachoritæ*, Angl. *anchorite*, is used in the rule of Benedict as synonymous with ἐρημίται, *eremitæ*, *hermits*<sup>3</sup>. Other writers observe a distinction in conformity with the etymology of the two words: restricting the application of the term *Anachoretæ* to those persons who led a solitary life, without retirement to a desert, and of *Eremitæ* to those who actually retired to some remote or inhospitable region. The Syrians contracted the word *anachoreta* into *nucherite*; they translated *eremitæ* into *madberoje*.

4. The term *cœnobitæ*, *cœnobites*, is evidently derived from the Greek κοινὸς βίος (*vita communis*), and refers at once to the monastic custom of living together in one place, hence called κοινόβιον, *cœnobium*, and to that of possessing a community of property, and observing common rules of life. The term συνοδίται, *synoditæ*, *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xi. tit. 30, l. 37, has the same

<sup>2</sup> An old Glossary interprets Μοναχὸς by ὁ μόνῳ ζῶν Θεός.—Interpretare vocabulum *Monachi*, hoc est, nomen tuum: quid facit in turba, qui solus est? Hieron. *Ep.* 1.—Ipsi se Mona-

chos Graio cognomine dicunt, Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt. RUTIL.

<sup>3</sup> Secundum genus monachorum est anachoretarum, id est, eremitarum. *Regula S. Benedicti*, c. 1.

signification, being derived from *σύνοδος*; so that it may be literally rendered *conventuales*<sup>4</sup>. The Syrians express the same by the words *dairoje* and *oumroje*.

5. In the rule of Benedict we find mention of *gyrovagi*, certain wandering monks, who are there charged with having occasioned great disorders<sup>5</sup>.

6. *Στυλίται*, *stylitæ*, *pillarists*,—a kind of monks so called from their practice of living on a pillar. Symeon Stylites, and a few others, made themselves remarkable by this mode of severe life; but it was not generally adopted. (EUVAGR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 13; lib. vi. c. 23; THEODOR. LECT. lib. ii.)

7. We find, also, a large number of other classes of monks and ascetics, which are worthy of remark only as furnishing a proof of the high esteem in which a monastic life was held by the early church. Such are,—

i. *Σπουδαῖοι* (*studiosi*), a set of ascetics who practised uncommon austerities. (EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 11; EPIPHAN. *Expos. Fid.* c. 22.)

ii. *Ἐκλεκτοὶ*, or *ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι*, *the elect, or elect of the elect*. (CLEM. ALEX. *Quis Dives Salv.* n. 36.)

iii. *Ἀκοίμητοι*, *insomnes, the sleepless, or the watchers*; a term applied especially to the members of a monastery (*στούδιον*) near Constantinople. (NICEPH. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 15, c. 23; BARON. *Annal.* a. 459.)

<sup>4</sup> Οἱ ἐν συνοδίῳ ζῶντες. SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Quartum genus est monachorum, quod nominatur Gyrovagum, qui tota vita sua per diversas provincias ternis aut quaternis diebus per diversorum cellas hospitantur: semper vagi et nunquam stabiles; propriis voluptatibus et gula illecebris servientes, et per omnia deteriores Sarabaitis: de quorum omnium miserrima conversatione melius est silere, quam loqui. *Regul. S. Benedict.* c. 1.—The Sarabaitæ here spoken of were a kind of disorderly monks, who lived together in very small societies. Jerome describes them in the following terms:—*Hi bini*

vel trini nec multo plures simul habitant, suo arbitrato ac ditione viventes.

. . . Habitant autem quamplurimi in urbibus et castellis: et quasi ars sit sancta, non vita, quicquid vendiderint majoris est pretii. Inter hos sæpe sunt jurgia, quia suo viventes cibo, non patiuntur se alieni esse subjectos. Revera solent certare jejuniis, et rem secreti victoriæ faciunt. Apud hos affectata sunt omnia, laxæ maniere, caligæ follicantes, vestis crassior, crebra suspiria, visitatio virginum, detractio clericorum. Et si quando dies festus venerit, saturantur ad vomitum. HIERON. *Fp.* 22 *ad Eustoch.*

iv. *Βοσκοί*, i. e., *the grazers*; so called because they professed to subsist upon roots and herbs, like cattle. (SOZOMEN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 33; EVAGR. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 21.)

v. *Ἠσυχασταί*, quiescentes, or quietistæ, *quietists*; monks who lived by themselves, in perpetual silence. (JUSTIN. *Novell.* v. c. 3; SUICER. *Thesaur. Eccl.* s. v. *ἡσυχαστής*.)

vi. *Ἀποταξάμενοι*, renunciantes, *renouncers*; so called from their formal renunciation of the world, and all secular enjoyments. (PALLAD. *Hist. Laus.* c. 15.)

vii. *Culdei*, *colidei*, *keldei*, *keledei*; certain ancient monks in Scotland and the Hebrides, supposed to have been so called as cultores Dei, worshippers of God, because they were wholly occupied in preaching the gospel. Some suppose that they were priests; others regard them as canons regular. Others, again, believe that they constituted a secret society, and were the forerunners of the modern Freemasons.

viii. *Apostolici*, *apostolicals*. Monks in England and Ireland, before the arrival of the Benedictines, with Augustin, at the latter end of the sixth century.

It may here be remarked, that the *canonici regulares*, *canons regular*, are the clergy who lived in monasteries, or elsewhere, under a certain rule, as distinguished from *canonici seculares*, i. e., the clergy charged with the cure of souls, or parish-priests. The *monachi seculares* were members of religious fraternities, who lived under a certain rule and presidency, but without submitting to the confinement of a cloister. They were the forerunners of the religious fraternities which arose during the ninth century in France, Italy, and Germany, and were greatly multiplied and extended during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The members of these fraternities formed a class between the laity, monks, and clergy.

As early as the fourth century, we find traces of monastic establishments for females. The word *μοναχή* (*monacha*) is rarely used; we more frequently find *μόνη* (*mona, sola, vidua*); whence the common appellation, *monialis*. The word *nonna*, which occurs first in HIERON. *Ep.* 22 *ad Eustochium*, is regarded by some as equivalent to *matrona*, and *sancta vidua*, but is supposed by others to be no other than the Ægypto-Greek *ρονίς*, i. e.,



virgo (PALLAD. *Hist. Laus.* c. 46 (*al.* 86); HOSPINIAN. *de Monach.* lib. i. c. 1). They were entitled, also, sanctimoniales, virgines Dei vel Christi, ancillæ Dei, sorores ecclesiæ; with obvious allusion to their profession and state of life.

## § 2.—OF MONASTERIES.

IN order to avoid the disorders which had arisen among various monastic societies and orders, especially among the smaller bodies, it was soon found expedient to collect the monks into large societies, living under common government, and within the walls of separate buildings, appropriated to the purpose. In the year 340, Pachomius built a large cœnobium, or monastery, on an island of the Nile; and the example was soon extensively followed. In these establishments, which in some places (especially in the East) were very large, the members lived in strict subordination to their superiors. “Monasteries were commonly divided into several parts, and proper officers appointed over them. Every ten monks were subject to one, who was called the *decanus*, or *dean*, from his presiding over ten; and every hundred had another officer called *centenarius*, from presiding over a hundred. Above these were the *patres*, or fathers of the monasteries, as St. Jerome and St. Austin commonly term them; which in other writers are called *ablates*, *abbots*, from the Greek word ἀββάς, a father; and *hegumeni*, *presidents*, and *archimandrites*, from *mandra*, a sheepfold, they being, as it were, the keepers or rulers of these sacred folds in the church. The business of the deans was to exact every man’s daily task, and bring it to the œconomus, or steward of the house, who himself gave a monthly account to the father of them all. (HIERON. *Ep.* 22 *ad Eustoch.*; AUGUSTIN. *de Morib. Eccl. Cathol.* c. 31<sup>e</sup>.)”

But the rules and regulations of these houses varied according to the difference of founders, and other circumstances. Monasteries, also, received various distinctive appellations, derived from the names of the founders of the order; from that of the patron or guardian saint, to whom they were dedicated; from the site which they occupied; from the peculiar design of the founda-

<sup>6</sup> BINGHAM, *Antiq.* book vii. chap. 3, § 11.

tion, or occupation of the monks; from the particular colour of the habit worn within the walls; and from other circumstances.

The following classification represents the four leading monastic orders, to one or other of which a monastery was usually referred:—

1. *The order of Basil*—including all Greek monks, and the Carmelites.

2. *The order of Augustin*—in its three classes of canons regular, monks, and hermits; together with the congregations of nuns.

3. *The order of Benedict*—with its various branches, male and female.

4. *The order of Francis*—with its numerous ramifications.

The common appellations of monasteries may be reduced to the following:—

1. *Μοναστήριον*, *monasterium*, *monastery*: so called as being the residence of *μονάζοντες*, *μοναχοὶ*, *μοναχαὶ*, *μόναχαι*, or religious solitaries.

2. *Clastrum*, or *claustra*, æ, f., *cloister*, literally, a place of confinement. This was the prevailing name in the West; and the choice of this term indicates the strict seclusion which prevailed in these parts, more than in the East.

3. *Cœnobium*; *i. e.*, a common dwelling-place<sup>7</sup>.

4. *Laura*, *λαῦρα*, or *λάβρα*, is the old name for the residence of anchorites. It appears to denote a narrow, confined, and inconvenient abode. According to Epiphanus (*Heres.* 69), this was the name of a narrow dirty street in Alexandria; whence it was applied to the wretched habitations of anchorites in the Thebaid, Palestine, and Syria. By Latin writers, *laura* is usually employed in contradistinction from *cœnobia*.

5. *Σεμνεῖον* is the name applied by Philo to the abodes, or places of resort, of the Therapeutæ; and hence it was sometimes

<sup>7</sup> Liceat a nonnullis soleat indifferenter *monasteria* pro cœnobiis appellari, tamen hoc interest, quod monasterium est diversorii, nihil amplius, quam locum, id est, habitaculum significans monachorum; cœnobium vero etiam professionis ipsius qualitatem disciplinamque designat: et monasterium potest etiam unius monachi habitaculum nominari, cœnobium autem appellari non potest, nisi ubi plurimorum cohabitantium degit unita communio. CASSIAN. *Collat.* xviii. c. 18.

given to monasteries. The Latins retained the word *semmium* (*simnium*, or *seimnium*).

6. Ἀσκήτηριον, i. e., ἀσκητῶν καταγωγῆ, a place of religious exercise and contemplation. The Latins retained the word *asceterium*, which, however, was greatly corrupted in course of time. According to Du Cange, we find corruptions of only one and the same word in the various forms *archisterium*, *architerium*, *arcisterium*, *architrium*, *assisterium*, *acistarium*, *acisterium*, and *aseyterium*.

7. Φροντιστήριον is the same as ἀσκήτηριον, but with especial reference to meditation, and spiritual exercises. Monasteries retained this name chiefly on account of their schools, and various establishments for education.

8. Ἠσυχαστήριον, place of silence and repose. This term was peculiarly applicable to those monasteries, the members of which were bound, to a certain extent, to observe silence.

9. *Conventus*, a *convent*, and cognate terms, were applied to monasteries, with reference to the social connexion, and common life, of their inmates.

10. Ἡγουμενεῖον denoted properly the residence of the ἡγούμενος, or ἡγουμένη, the president (abbot or prior, abbess or prioress); but hence it was sometimes used to denote the whole establishment.

11. Μάνδρα, *mandra*, is a term frequently employed in this signification, by both Greek and Latin writers. The word signifies, properly, a *pen*, or *sheep-fold*, and probably refers either to the residence of early anchorites in remote and rustic districts, or to their congregating together, as it were, in flocks or herds, in separate societies. In the latter case, the figure is the same as that contained in the ecclesiastical terms *flock*, *congregation*. Hence the heads or presidents of monasteries were sometimes called *archimandrites*.

12. The Syrians and Arabians, almost without exception, use the word *dairo*, *dairon*, to denote a monastery. This word is derived from another, which is specially applied to the tents and other habitations of the Nomadic tribes.

---

## I.

## A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF

## ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS TO GREGORY THE FIRST.

	A.D.
CLEMENT OF ROME succeeded Anaclelus (or Cletus) as bishop of Rome, about A.D. 91 or 93; died about . . . . .	100
IGNATIUS, bishop of Antioch, suffered martyrdom at Rome, some say as late as A.D. 116, but more probably . . . . .	107
POLYCARP, bishop of Smyrna, visited Rome, A.D. 158; suffered martyrdom about . . . . .	160 or 167
JUSTIN MARTYR; born probably about A.D. 100; left Palestine, 132; presented his first Apology to Antoninus about (140 or) 148; wrote his second Apology in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, probably about 162—4; suffered martyrdom at Rome about . . . . .	165
HERMIAS wrote his work against the heathen philosophers, probably about . . . . .	170
HEGESIPPUS wrote his history about . . . . .	175
TATIAN died probably about . . . . .	176
DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, fl. . . . .	170
ATHENAGORAS, wrote his Apology . . . . .	176
THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, wrote his work To Autolyceus, about 180; died . . . . .	181
IRENÆUS, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 177; wrote his work Against Heresies in the reign of Commodus, <i>i. e.</i> , after the year 180; died about . . . . .	202
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, succeeded Pantænus in the catechetical school of that city, A.D. 188 or 189; quitted Alexandria, 202; died about . . . . .	218
TERTULLIAN became a Montanist about the year 200; his Apology (198 or) 205; his work Against Marcion, 207; died about . . . . .	220
MINUCIUS FELIX wrote his Octavius about . . . . .	208
ORIGEN, born A.D. 185; his father Leonides suffered martyrdom, 202; head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, 204; went to Rome, and returned to Alexandria, 213; went to Cæsarea in Palestine, 215; ordained at Cæsarea, and	

afterwards settled there, about 230; retired to Cappadocia, 235; returned to Cæsarea, 239; thrown into prison, 250; died . . . . .	254
CYPRIAN, bishop of Carthage, A. D. 248; fled from Carthage, 250; returned, 251; banished, 257; suffered martyrdom . . . . .	258
DIONYSIUS, surnamed THE GREAT, bishop of ALEXANDRIA, A. D. 247 or 248; died . . . . .	265
GREGORY (THAUMATURGUS), bishop of NEOCÆSAREA, flourished A. D. 245; died about . . . . .	270
ARNOBIUS wrote his treatise Against the Gentiles, about A. D. 305; died probably about . . . . .	325
LACTANTIUS, finished his Institutes about A. D. 320; died . . . . .	325
EUSEBIUS (PAMPHILI), born about A. D. 270; bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, 315; died . . . . .	340
JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS flourished about . . . . .	340
EUSTATHIUS, bishop of Antioch, died about . . . . .	360
HILARY, bishop of Poitiers, born A. D. 305; banished to Phrygia, 356; died . . . . .	368
ATHANASIUS, born at Alexandria, about A. D. 296; present, as deacon, at the Council of Nicæa, 325; bishop of Alexandria, 326; fled to Rome, 341; returned to Alexandria, 346; fled to the deserts of Egypt, 356; died . . . . .	373
BASIL, surnamed THE GREAT, born A. D. 329; bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 370; died . . . . .	379
EPHRAIM, the Syrian, deacon of Edessa, died about . . . . .	379
CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, born about A. D. 315; bishop of Jerusalem, 350; died . . . . .	386
OPTATUS, bishop of Milevi, in Numidia, flourished about . . . . .	386
GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM, born A. D. 328; ordained deacon, 361; bishop of Suzima, 372; bishop of Constantinople, 381, (succeeded by Nectarius); died about . . . . .	390
GREGORY OF NYSSA, born A. D. 351; bishop of Nyssa, 372; died about . . . . .	395
AMBROSE, born A. D. 340; archbishop of Milan, 374; died about . . . . .	397
SIRICIUS, bishop of Rome, died . . . . .	398
EPIPHANIUS, bishop of Salamis, born about A. D. 330; at Constantinople, 402; died . . . . .	403
CHRYSOSTOM, born at Antioch, about A. D. 344; ordained presbyter in that church, 386; bishop of Constantinople, 398; deprived and restored, 403; banished, 404; died . . . . .	407
RUFFIN, presbyter of Aquileia, engaged in controversy with Jerome, A. D. 394; died . . . . .	410
THEOPHILUS, bishop of Alexandria, died . . . . .	412
INNOCENT I., bishop of Rome, died . . . . .	417
JEROME, born A. D. 331; in Rome, 363; ordained presbyter about 378; died . . . . .	420

	A.D.
THEODORUS, bishop of [Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about A.D. 392; died about . . . . .	428
AUGUSTIN, born A.D. 354; baptized, 387; ordained presbyter at Hippo, 391; coadjutor of Valerius, bishop of Hippo, 395; began his work <i>De Civitate Dei</i> , 402; engaged in controversy with the Pelagians and Donatists, about 420; wrote his <i>Retractationes</i> , 426; died . . . . .	430
SYNESIUS, bishop of Ptolemais, 410; died about . . . . .	430
PAULINUS, bishop of Nola, died . . . . .	431
CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, bishop of Alexandria, 415; died . . . . .	444
VINCENT OF LERINS (Vincentius Lirinensis), wrote his <i>Commonitorium</i> , A.D. 434; died about . . . . .	448
ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM, died . . . . .	449
SEDULIUS, poet, flourished about . . . . .	449
THEODORET, born A.D. 386 (or 393), bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, 423; deprived 449; restored 451; died . . . . .	456
N.B. The church history of Soocrates extends from A.D. 306 to 439 (continued by Theodorus to 526); that of Sozomen from 323 to 423; that of Philostorgius (an Arian bishop), from 300 to 425; that of Theodoret, from 325 to 429; that of Evagrius, continuator of Soocrates and Theodoret, from 431 to 593.	
PETRUS CHRYSOLOGUS, died about . . . . .	456
LEO I., surnamed the Great, died . . . . .	461
CLAUDIUS MAMERTUS, a presbyter at Vienne (brother of Mamertus, at the same time bishop of Vienne), flourished about A.D. 468.	
VIGILIUS, bishop of Thapsus, who wrote against the errors of Arius, Nestorius, and others, flourished about . . . . .	480
SALVIAN, a presbyter at Marseilles, died . . . . .	480
SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, died . . . . .	488
GENNADIUS, continuator of Jerome's list of ecclesiastical writers, flourished about . . . . .	490
SYMMACHIUS, bishop of Rome, died . . . . .	514
BOETHIUS, put to death . . . . .	525
PROCOPIUS OF GAZA, a commentator on Scripture, flourished about . . . . .	525
FULGENTIUS, bishop of Ruspe, died . . . . .	533
ARATOR, a poet, flourished about . . . . .	534
ARETAS, a commentator on the Apocalypse, flourished about . . . . .	549
CASSIODORUS, retired to a monastery, A.D. 539; died . . . . .	562
VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS, a poet, flourished about . . . . .	565
GREGORY, bishop of TOURS (TURONENSIS), died . . . . .	596
GREGORY I., surnamed THE GREAT, bishop of Rome, 590; died . . . . .	604

## II.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS  
ENUMERATED IN THE FOREGOING TABLE.

Ambrose . . . . .	d. 397	Ignatius . . . . .	d. 107
Arator . . . . .	fl. 534	Innocent I. . . . .	d. 407
Aretas . . . . .	fl. 549	Irenæus . . . . .	d. 202
Arnobius . . . . .	d. 325	Isidore of Pelusium . . . . .	d. 449
Athanasius . . . . .	d. 373		
Athenagoras . . . . .	fl. 176	Jerome . . . . .	d. 420
Augustin . . . . .	d. 430	Justin Martyr . . . . .	d. 165
Basil . . . . .	d. 379	Lactantius . . . . .	d. 325
Boëthius . . . . .	d. 525	Leo I., or the Great . . . . .	d. 461
Cassiodorus . . . . .	d. 562	Mamertus . . . . .	fl. 468
Chrysologus . . . . .	d. 456	Maternus . . . . .	fl. 340
Chrysostom . . . . .	d. 407	Minucius Felix . . . . .	fl. 208
Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	d. 218		
Clement of Rome . . . . .	d. 100	Optatus . . . . .	fl. 386
Cyprian . . . . .	d. 258	Origen . . . . .	fl. 251
Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	d. 444		
Cyril of Jerusalem . . . . .	d. 386	Polycarp . . . . .	d. 167
		Paulinus of Nola . . . . .	d. 431
Dionysius of Alexandria . . . . .	d. 265	Procopius of Gaza . . . . .	fl. 525
Dionysius of Corinth . . . . .	fl. 170		
		Ruffin . . . . .	d. 140
Ephraim . . . . .	d. 379	Salvian . . . . .	d. 480
Epiphanius . . . . .	d. 403	Sedulius . . . . .	fl. 449
Eusebius (Pamphili) . . . . .	d. 340	Sidonius Apollinaris . . . . .	d. 488
Eustathius . . . . .	d. 360	Siricius . . . . .	d. 398
		Symmachus . . . . .	d. 514
Fortunatus . . . . .	fl. 565	Synesius . . . . .	d. 430
Fulgentius . . . . .	d. 533		
		Tatian . . . . .	d. 176
Gennadius . . . . .	fl. 490	Tertullian . . . . .	d. 220
Gregory the Great . . . . .	d. 604	Theodorus of Mopsuestia . . . . .	d. 428
Gregory of Nazianzum . . . . .	d. 390	Theodoret . . . . .	d. 456
Gregory of Neocæsarea . . . . .	d. 270	Theophilus of Alexandria . . . . .	d. 412
Gregory of Nyssa . . . . .	d. 395	Theophilus of Antioch . . . . .	d. 181
Gregory of Tours . . . . .	d. 596		
		Vigilius . . . . .	fl. 480
Hegesippus . . . . .	fl. 175	Vincentius . . . . .	d. 488
Hermias . . . . .	fl. 170		
Hilary . . . . .	d. 368		

## III.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL COUNCILS  
MENTIONED IN THIS BOOK.

A. D.	A. D.
215 Africa, under Agrippinus.	465 Rome, under Hilary.
240 Africa, under Donatus.	494 Rome, under Gelasius.
251 } Africa, several under Cyprian.	499 Rome, under Symmachus.
to }	506 Agde.
256 }	511 Orleans 1.
265 Antioch 1.	516 Tarragona.
269 Antioch 2.	517 Epone.
313 Rome, against the Donatists.	524 Lerida.
313 Elvira, (al. 305, al. 324.)	529 Orange 2.
314 Ancyra, in Galatia.	529 Vaison 2.
314 Arles 1.	531 Toledo 2.
315 Neocæsarea.	533 Orleans 2.
324 Gangra, in Paphlagonia.	538 Orleans 3.
325 Nicaea 1, (Gen. 1.)	553 Constantinople 2, (Gen. 5.)
344 Sardica.	561 Braga 1.
348 Carthage 1.	567 Tours 2.
359 Ariminum, or Remini.	572 Braga 2.
361 Laodicea.	578 Auxerre.
362 Alexandria.	581 Macon 1.
381 Aquileia.	585 Macon 2.
381 Constantinople 1. (Gen. 2.)	589 Narbonne.
381 Saragossa.	589 Toledo 3.
390 Carthage 2.	590 Seville 1.
393 Hippo.	619 Seville 2.
397 Carthage 3.	633 Toledo 4.
399 Carthage 4.	636 Toledo 5.
400 Toledo 1.	638 Toledo 6.
401 Carthage 5.	646 Toledo 7.
402 Turin.	653 Toledo 8.
402 Milevi 1.	655 Toledo 9.
416 Milevi 2.	656 Toledo 10.
419 Carthage 6.	670 Autun.
419 Carthage 7.	675 Toledo 11.
431 Ephesus, (Gen. 3.)	680 Constantinople 3, (Gen. 6.)
441 Orange 1.	681 Toledo 12.
442 Vaison 1.	692 Constantinople, Trullan.
451 Chalcedon, (Gen. 4.)	787 Nicaea 2, (Gen. 7.)
452 Arles 2.	788 Aix-la-Chapelle.
455 Arles 3.	815 Mentz.
461 Tours 1.	869 Constantinople 4, (Gen. 8.)



## IV.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE SAME COUNCILS WITH  
LATIN TITLES.

	A. D.		A. D.
Africanum, sub Agrippino . . . . .	215	Constantinopolitanum 3	
——— sub Donato . . . . .	240	(Ecum. 6)	630
Africana, sub Cypriano 251—256		——— (Trullanum)	692
Agathense . . . . .	506	——— 4 (Æcum. 3)	869
Ancyranum . . . . .	314		
Antiochense 1 . . . . .	265	Epaonense . . . . .	517
——— 2 . . . . .	269	Eliberitanum (or Illiberit.)	313
Alexandrinum . . . . .	362	Ephesinum (Æcum. 3)	431
Antissiodorensis . . . . .	578		
Aquiliense . . . . .	381	Gangrense . . . . .	324
Aquisgranense . . . . .	788		
Arausicanum 1 . . . . .	441	Hipponense . . . . .	393
——— 2 . . . . .	529	Hispalense 1 . . . . .	590
Arelatense 1 . . . . .	314	——— 2 . . . . .	619
——— 2 . . . . .	452		
——— 3 . . . . .	455	Ierdense . . . . .	524
Ariminiense . . . . .	359	Illiberitanum (or Eliberit.)	313
Aurelianense 1 . . . . .	511		
——— 2 . . . . .	533	Laodicenum . . . . .	361
——— 3 . . . . .	538		
Augustodunense . . . . .	670	Matisconense 1 . . . . .	581
		——— 2 . . . . .	585
Bracarense 1 . . . . .	561	Milevitanum 1 . . . . .	402
——— 2 . . . . .	572	——— 2 . . . . .	416
		Moguntiacum . . . . .	815
Cæsaraugustanum . . . . .	381		
Carthaginense 1 . . . . .	348	Narbonense . . . . .	589
——— 2 . . . . .	390	Nicænum 1 (Æcum. 1) . . . . .	325
——— 3 . . . . .	397	——— 2 . . . . .	787
——— 4 . . . . .	399	Neocæsarensis . . . . .	315
——— 5 . . . . .	401		
——— 6 . . . . .	419	Quinisextum (Trullanum) . . . . .	692
——— 7 . . . . .	419		
Chalcedonense (Æcum. 4) . . . . .	451	Romanum, contra Donatistas	313
Constantinopolitanum 1		——— sub Hilario . . . . .	465
(Ecum. 2)	381	——— sub Gelasio . . . . .	494
——— 2 (Æcum. 5)	553	——— sub Symmacho . . . . .	499

	A. D.		A. D.
Sarlicense . . . . .	344	Toletanum 8 . . . . .	653
		——— 9 . . . . .	655
Tarragonnese . . . . .	516	——— 10 . . . . .	656
Taurinense . . . . .	402	——— 11 . . . . .	675
Toletanum 1 . . . . .	400	——— 12 . . . . .	681
——— 2 . . . . .	531	Trullanum (Quinisextum)	692
——— 3 . . . . .	539	Turonense 1 . . . . .	461
——— 4 . . . . .	633	——— 2 . . . . .	567
——— 5 . . . . .	636		
——— 6 . . . . .	638	Vasense 1 . . . . .	442
——— 7 . . . . .	646	——— 2 . . . . .	529

## APPENDIX.

---

### A.

#### PUBLIC PRAYER IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

SOME writers strongly insist upon the propriety of a different interpretation of Justin's words. The following are the remarks of Lord Chancellor King on the whole subject :—

“Though they frequently used the Lord's Prayer, yet they did not only use that, but other prayers also; for immediately to the foregoing encomium of the Lord's Prayer, Tertullian adjoins, ‘that we may add thereunto, and offer up prayers unto God according to the variety of our circumstances and conditions,’ (*Posse nos superadjuvare—et sunt quæ petantur pro circumstantia cujusque. De Oratione.*) From which passage of the said father, we may guess their usual method of prayer was first to begin with the Lord's prayer, as the ground and foundation of all others, and then, according to their circumstances and conditions, to offer up their own prayers and requests. Now that this conjecture may appear to have some foundation, it will be necessary to translate at large this place of Tertullian, and to show the introduction or occasion of it, which was this:—After this father had, as before, commented on, summed up, and magnified the Lord's Prayer, he concludes that nevertheless, ‘We may add thereunto; for since the Lord, the observer of all human necessities, has in another place, after He had delivered this prayer, said, “Ask and ye shall receive:” and every one has particular circumstances to beg for; therefore having premised the lawful and ordinary prayer, there is place for accidental requests, and a liberty of offering up other petitions, so as they do agree with the precepts: as far as we are from the precepts so far are we from God's ears: the remembrance of the precepts makes way for our prayers to heaven of which it is the chief.’ (*Posse nos superadjuvare. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum seorsum post traditam orandi disciplinam, Petite, inquit, et accipietis, et sunt quæ petantur, pro circumstantia cujusque, præmissa legitima et ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desideriorum, jus est superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones, cum memoria tamen præceptorum: ne quantum à præceptis tantum ab auribus Dei longè simus. Memoria*

præceptorum viam orationibus sternit ad cœlum quorum præcipuum est, *Ibid.* p. 659).

Now these other prayers which made up a great part of divine service, were not stinted and imposed forms, but the words and expressions of them were left to the prudence, choice, and judgment of every particular bishop or minister.

I do not here say, that a bishop or minister used no arbitrary form of prayer; all that I say is, that there was none imposed; neither do I say, that having no imposed form they unpremeditatedly, immethodically, or confusedly vented their petitions and requests; for without doubt they observed a method in their prayers; but this is what I say, that the words or expressions of their prayers were not imposed or prescribed, but every one that officiated delivered himself in such terms as best pleased him, and varied his petitions according to the present circumstances and emergencies: or, if it be more intelligible, that the primitive Christians had no stinted liturgies, or imposed forms of prayers.

Now this being a negative in matter of fact, the bare assertion of it is a sufficient proof, except its affirmative can be evinced. Suppose it was disputed, whether ever St. Paul writ an epistle to the Church of Rome, the bare negation thereof would be proof enough that he did not, except it could be clearly evidenced on the contrary that he did. So unless it can be proved that the ancients had fixed liturgies and prayer-books, we may very rationally conclude in the negative, that they had none at all.

Now as to these prescribed forms, there is not the least mention of them in any of the primitive writings, nor the least word or syllable tending thereunto that I can find, which is a most unaccountable silence, if ever such there were, but rather some expressions intimating the contrary: as that famous controverted place of Justin Martyr, who, describing the manner of the prayer before the celebration of the Lord's supper, says, 'that the bishop sent up prayers and praises to God with his utmost ability, ὅση δύναις (*Apolog.* ii. p. 92), that is, that he prayed with the best of his abilities, invention, expression, judgment, and the like. I am not ignorant that there is another sense given of ὅση δύναις, or 'according to his ability.' But I must needs say, that I generally, if not always, found this phrase to include personal abilities. Thus, as to the explanation of Scripture, Origen writes that he would expound it, according to his ability, ὅση δύναις (*Com. in Matth.* tom. xvii. p. 487, vol. i.), and that he would comment on that Parable of the blind man that was healed near Jericho, mentioned in Luke xviii. 35 (*Com. in Matth.* tom. xvi. p. 429, vol. i.) κατὰ τὸ δύναιον. And so on the Parable concerning the husbandmen (*Ibid.* tom. xvii. p. 463), κατὰ δύναιον; and on the marriage of the king's son (*Ibid.* tom. xvii. p. 474),

κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν δύναμιν; and that he would search out the sense of the Gospel of St. John (*Com. in Johan.* tom. i. p. 5, vol. ii.), κατὰ δύναμιν. Now what doth Origen intend by his searching out the sense and expounding the meaning of the Scriptures to the utmost of his power and ability? Is it a bare reading and transcribing of other men's works, or an employment of his own abilities and studies, to find out the sense and meaning of them? Certainly every one will think the latter to be most probable.

So as to the argumentative defence of the truth, Origen promises he would answer the calumnies of Celsus, *according to his power*, κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν δύναμιν (*Contra Celsum*, lib. i. p. 2); and that he would defend and confirm his arguments against Celsus, *according to his power*, ὡς δύναμις (*Ibid.* lib. i. p. 36), and demonstrate the reasonableness of the Christian religion, *according to his power*, ὡς δύναμις (*Ibid.* lib. vi. p. 265), and dispute against Celsus, *according to his power*, ὡς δύναμις (*Ibid.* lib. vii. p. 332). Now, whether Origen's defending the truth, and disputing against Celsus, according to his utmost ability and power, consisted in a reading, or in a bare transcribing out of a book, the written arguments of other men, or in an employment of his own abilities, inventions, and expressions, is no difficult matter to determine.

I have not found one place, wherein this phrase of ὡς δύναμις doth not comprehend personal abilities; and several scores more might I cite, where it is so to be understood, which I shall omit, and mention only one more, spoken by Origen with respect to this duty of prayer, where it must of necessity imply personal abilities, and that is in his book *De Oratione* (§ 2, p. 134), where he prescribes the method and parts of prayer, the first whereof was doxology; wherein, says he, he that prays must bless God *according to his power*, κατὰ δύναμιν; where κατὰ δύναμιν must signify the performer's abilities of judgment and expression, because it is not spoken of prescribed words, but of a prescribed method of prayer; as if any one should desire me to inform him how, or in what method, he must pray; I tell him, as Origen doth in this place, that first he must begin with an invocation of God by his titles and attributes; then he must proceed to praise God for his mercies and benefits, confessing withal his ingratitude and unfruitfulness; then beg pardon for past sins, strength against future, and conclude all, with praising God through Christ, and that he must do all this according to the utmost of his ability. What could any one imagine that I should intend by this advice of following this method to the utmost of his power, but the exerting of his own abilities, understanding, memory, invention, expression, and the like, since I direct him not to any prescribed words, but only to the observation of those general heads and parts of prayer?

So that the minister's praying ὡς δύναμις, or according to the utmost

of his ability, imports the exerting his gifts and parts in suitable matter and apt expressions; and that the primitive prayers were so, appears yet further from a passage in Origen, who thus explains that verse in Matthew vi.: *But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions as the heathens do:*—‘But when we pray, let us not battologise, that is, use not vain repetitions, but theologise: but we battologise, when we do not strictly observe ourselves, or the words of prayer, which we express, when we utter those things which are filthy, either to do, speak, or think, which are vile, worthily reproveable, and alienated from the purity of the Lord.’ (Ἄλλὰ προσευχόμενοι, μὴ βαττολογήσωμεν, ἀλλὰ θεολογήσωμεν· βαττολογοῦμεν δὲ ὅτε μὴ μωμοσκοποῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἢ τοὺς ἀναπεμπομένους τῆς εὐχῆς λόγους λέγομεν τὰ διεφθαρμένα ἔργα, ἢ λόγους, ἢ νοήματα ταπεινὰ τυγχάνοντα καὶ ἐπίληπτα, τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἀλλότρια τοῦ κυρίου. *De Oratione*, § 10.) Surely this caution had been needless, of strictly observing the words that they uttered; and this fear had been groundless, of expressing themselves undecently, or sinfully, if they had a prayer-book to recur to; but that they had no such prayer-book appears yet more evidently from Tertullian, who, describing their public prayers, says that, looking up to heaven, they spread abroad their hands because innocent; uncovered their heads because not ashamed; and without a monitor, because they prayed from the heart. (Illuc suspicientes Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubescimus, denique sine monitore, quia de pectore oramus. *Apolog.* c. 30, p. 703). Now, what is to be understood by praying from the heart will best appear from inquiring into what is opposed to it, viz., the praying by a monitor. Now, the praying by a monitor, as is acknowledged by all, was praying by a book; but thus Tertullian affirms the primitive Christians prayed not: We do not pray, saith he, with a monitor, reading our prayers out of a book. No, but on the contrary, we pray *de pectore*, *from the heart*, our own heart and soul dictating to us what is most proper and suitable to be asked, having no need of any other monitor besides.

Hence their prayers were suited to their emergencies, and present circumstances, as Tertullian writes, that ‘having premised the Lord’s Prayer, we may offer up accidental requests and petitions’ (præmissa legitima et ordinaria oratione, accidentium jus est desideriorum. *De Orat.* p. 659), of which occasional requests we find some instances, as in the 16th Epistle of Cyprian, where that father assures Moses and Maximus, two Roman confessors, that he remembered them in his public prayers with his congregation (Et quando in sacrificiis precem cum plurimis facimus. *Epist.* 16, § 1, p. 44). And in another epistle, when he congratulates Pope Lucius upon his return from banishment, he assures him ‘That he did not cease in his public prayers to bless God for so great a mercy, and to pray Him that was perfect to keep

and perfect in him the glorious crown of his confession.' (Hic quoque in sacrificiis atque in orationibus nostris non cessantes Deo—gratias agere, et orare pariter, ac petere, ut qui perfectus est atque perficiens, custodiat et perficiat in vobis confessionis vestrae gloriosam coronam. *Epist. lviii.* § 2, p. 163.) And so, when the Church of Carthage sent a sum of money to the bishops of Numidia, for the redemption of some Christian captives, they desired those bishops to 'remember them in their public prayers.' (In mentem habeatis in orationibus vestris et eis vicem boni operis in sacrificiis et precibus representetis. *Epist. lx.* § 4, p. 167.) So that their prayers could not be stinted, invariable forms, because they could add new petitions, as their occasions and circumstances did require."—KING, *Second Part of the Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship, of the Primitive Church*, chap. 2, § 7.

## B.

## ON TURNING TOWARD THE EAST IN PRAYER.

"THE original of this custom seems to be derived from the ceremonies of baptism, in which it was usual to renounce the devil with their faces to the west, and then turn about to the east, and make their covenant with Christ: from whence, I conceive, it became their common custom to worship God after the same way that they had first entered into covenant with him. The ancients give several reasons for this custom, but they all seem to glance at this one.

I. Some say, the east was the symbol of Christ, who was called the Orient, and Light, and Sun of Righteousness, in Scripture: and therefore, since they must worship toward some quarter of the world, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation. As Tertullian tells us in one place, 'that in fact they worshipped toward the east, which made the heathen suspect that they worshipped the rising sun.' (TERTUL. *Apol.* cap. xvi. *Inde suspicio quod innotuerit nos ad Orientis regionem precari*); so in another place he says 'the east was the figure of Christ, and therefore both their churches and their prayers were directed that way.' (*Ibid. Cont. Valentin.* cap. iii. *Nostræ columbæ domus simplex, etiam in editis semper et apertis et ad lucem; amat figuram Spiritus Sancti, Orientem Christi figuram.*) Clemens Alexandrinus says, 'they worshipped toward the east, because the east is the image of our spiritual nativity, and from thence the light first arises and shines out of darkness, and the day of true knowledge, after the manner of the sun, arises upon those who lie buried in ignorance.' (CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* vii. p. 356.) And St. Austin:—

‘When we stand at our prayers, we turn to the east, whence the heavens or the light of heaven arises; not as if God was only there, and had forsaken all other parts of the world, but to put ourselves in mind of turning to a more excellent nature, that is, to the Lord.’ (AUG. *de Serm. Dom. in Monte*. lib. ii. cap. 5. Cum ad orationes stamus ad Orientem convertimur, unde cælum surgit etc. ut admoveatur animus ad naturam excellentiorem se convertere, id est, ad Dominum.) This reason exactly falls in with that which is given for turning to the east when they covenanted with Christ in the solemnities of baptism.

II. Another reason given for it by some is, that the east was the place of Paradise, our ancient habitation and country, which we lost in the first Adam by the fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Saviour. This reason is given by Gregory Nyssen (NYSS. *Hom. v. de Orat. Dom.* tom. p. 755), and St. Basil (BASIL. *de Spir. Sanct.* cap. 27), and by the author of the *Constitutions* (*Constitut.* lib. ii. cap. 57), and the author of the *Questions and Answers to Antiochus*, among the works of Athanasius (ATHAN. *Quæst. ad Antioch.* q. 37), together with Chrysostom, as he is cited by Cotelerius (COTELER. *Not. in Constitut.* lib. ii. cap. 57: *Ex. CHRYS. in Dan.* vi. 10), and Gregentius (GREGENT. *Disput. cum Herbano Judæo. Bibl. Patr.* tom. i. p. 217, *Gr. Lat.*), and many others. Now this is the very reason assigned by St. Cyril for turning to the east when they covenanted with Christ, and celebrated the mysteries of baptism. So that hitherto we find a clear relation of these ceremonies one to the other, and a perfect agreement between them.

III. Another reason assigned for this custom was, that the east was the most honourable part of the creation, as being the seat of light and brightness. The author of the *Questions and Answers to the Orthodox* gives this reason for it: ‘We set apart,’ says he, ‘the most honourable things to the honour of God; and the east, in the opinion of men, is the most honourable part of creation: we therefore, in time of prayer, turn our faces to the east; as we sign those in the name of Christ, that need consignation, with the right hand, because it is deemed more honourable than the left, though it differ only in position, not in nature.’ (JUSTIN. *Quæst. ad Orthodox.* q. 118.) And Lactantius, without taking any particular notice of this custom, makes this general observation, ‘that the east was more peculiarly ascribed to God, because he was the fountain of light, and illuminator of all things, and because he makes us rise to eternal life. But the west was ascribed to that wicked and depraved spirit, the devil, because he hides the light, and induces darkness always upon men, and makes them fall and perish in their sins.’ (LACT. lib. ii. cap. 10. Oriens



Deo accensetur, quia ipse luminis fons et illustrator est rerum, et quod oriri nos faciat ad vitam æternam. Occidens autem conturbatæ illi pravæque menti ascribitur, quod lumen abscondat, quod tenebras semper inducat, et quod homines faciat occidere ac interire peccatis.) Now this is a reason that equally holds good for turning to the east in baptism, as well as in their daily devotion.

IV. There is one reason more assigned for it, which is, that Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and there ascended into heaven, and there will appear again at the last day. This is one of the three answers which the author of the *Questions to Antiochus*, under the name of Athanasius, orders to be given to this question:—‘If a Christian asks the question, he is to be told, they looked towards paradise, beseeching God to restore them to their ancient country and region, from whence they were expelled. If an heathen put the question, the answer should be, because God is the true light; for which reason, when they looked upon the created light, they did not worship it, but the Creator of it. If the question was proposed by a Jew, he should be told they did it, because the Holy Ghost had said by David, “We will worship toward the place where thy feet stood, O Lord,” Psalm LXXXiii. 7 (ATHAN. *Quest. ad Antioch.* q. 37), meaning the place where Christ was born, and lived, and was crucified and rose again, and ascended into heaven. Which seems also to be intimated by St. Hilary on those words of the LXvii<sup>th</sup> Psalm, according to the translation of the Septuagint, ‘Sing unto God, who ascended above the heaven of heavens in the east.’ ‘The honour of God,’ says he ‘who ascended above the heaven of heavens in the east, is now reasonably required: and for that reason toward the east, because he, according to the prophet, is the “East,” or “morning from on high;” that he, returning to the place whence he descended, might be known to be the Orient light, who shall hereafter be the author of men’s rising to the same ascent of a celestial habitation.’ (HILAR. *in Psal.* LXvii. p. 242. Competenter nunc ascendentes super cœlum cœli ad orientem Dei honor poscitur. Ad Orientem verò idcirco quia ipse secundum prophetam Oriens ex alto sit; ut regressus eò unde descenderat, Oriens nosceretur, ipseque sit hominibus in hunc cœlestis sedis ascensum rursus auriundi.)—These several reasons have all a peculiar reference to Christ: and therefore as Christians first used the ceremony of turning to the east, when they entered into covenant with Christ in baptism, so it is probable that from thence they derived this custom of turning to the east, in all their solemn adorations. But whether this were so, or not, we are sure there was such a general custom among them, and that it was founded upon some or all the reasons that have been mentioned; which is as much as is necessary to be said here for the illustration of it.”—BINGHAM, *Antiquities*, book xiii. chap. 8, sect. 15.

## C.

GREGORII M. LIBER SACRAMENTORUM: QUALITER MISSA  
ROMANA CELEBRATUR.

Hoc est: in primis *Introitus*, qualis fuerit statutis temporibus seu diebus festis, sive quotidianis.

Deinde *Kyrie eleison*.

Item dicitur *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, si episcopus fuerit, tantummodo die Dominico, sive diebus festis. A presbyteris autem minime dicitur, nisi solo in Pascha. Quando vero Litaniam agitur, neque *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, neque *Alleluja* canitur.

Postmodum dicitur oratio: deinde sequitur Apostolus.

Item Graduale, seu *Alleluja*.

Postmodum legitur Evangelium et dicitur Oratio super oblata.

Qua completa, dicit sacerdos excelsa voce:

*Per omnia sæcula sæculorum, Amen.*

*Dominus robiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo.*

*Sursum corda. Habemus ad Dominum.*

*Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro. Dignum et justum est.*

Vere dignum et justum est, æquum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, per Christum Dominum nostrum. Per quem majestatem tuam laudant angeli, adorant dominationes, tremunt potestates, cœli, cœlorumque virtutes, ac beati seraphim socia exultatione concelebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces, ut admitti jubeas, deprecamur, supplici confessione dicentes *Sanctus! sanctus! sanctus!*

*Oratio ante quam sacramenta incipiant.*

Facturus memoriam salutaris hostiæ totius mundi, cum illius dignitatem, et meam intueor fœditatem, conscientia torqueor peccatorum. Verum, quia tu Deus multum misericors es, imploro, ut digneris mihi dare spiritum contribulatum, quod tibi gratum sacrificium revelasti, ut eo purificatus, vitali hostiæ piæ manus admoveam, quæ omnia mea peccata aboleat, et eâ deinceps in perpetuum mihi vitandi cautelam infundat, omnibusque pro quibus tibi offertur præsentis et futuræ salutis commercia largiaris. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium tecum, qui tecum vivit et regnat Deus in unitate Spiritus Sancti. Per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen!

---

Te igitur, elementissime Pater per Jesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum supplices rogamus et petimus, uti accepta habeas

et benedicas hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata: in primis, quæ tibi offerimus pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica, quam pacificare, custodire, adunare at regere digneris toto orbe terrarum, una cum famulo tuo Papa III. et rege nostro III. et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus.

Memento, Domine, famulorum, famularumque tuum III. et III. et omnium circum adstantium, quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio: qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus, pro spe salutis, pro redemptione animarum suarum, et incolunitatis suæ, tibi reddunt vota sua, æterno Deo, vivo et vero.

Communicantes et memoriam venerantes, inprimis gloriosæ semper Virginis Mariæ genitricis Dei et Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Sed et beatorum apostolorum et martyrum tuorum Petri, Pauli, Andreae, Jacobi, Joannis, Thomæ, Jacobi, Philippi, Bartholomæi, Matthæi, Simonis et Thathæi (Thaddei), Lini, Cleti, Clementis, Xysti, Cornelii, Cypriani, Laurentii, Chrysogoni, Joannis et Pauli, Cosmæ et Damiani; et omnium sanctorum tuorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ, sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ, quæsumus Domine, ut placatus accipias; diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab æterna damnatione nos eripi, et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus, quæsumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis cor-✠pus et san-✠guis fiat delectissimi filii tui Domini Dei nostri Jesu Christi.

Qui pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manes suas, elevatis oculis in cælum, ad te Deum patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens, bene✠dixit, fregit, dedit discipulis suis dicens: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes. Hoc est enim corpus meum.* Simili modo, postea quam cœnatum est, accipiens et hunc præclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manes suas, item tibi gratias agens, bene✠dixit dedit, discipulis suis, dicens: *Accipite, et bibite ex eo omnes: hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et æterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*

*Hæc quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis.*

Unde et nemores, Domine, nos tui servi, sed et plebs tua sancta, Christi Filii Domini Dei nostri, tam beatæ passionis, nec non ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in cælos gloriôsæ adscensionis, offerimus præclare majesti tuæ de tuis donis ac datis. Hostiam ✠ puram, hostiam ✠ sanctam, hostiam ✠ immaculatam, panem ✠ sanctum vitæ æternæ, et calicem ✠ salutis perpetuæ.

Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu recipere digneris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri justî Abel, et sacrificium patriarchæ nostræ Abrahæ, et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech sanctum sacrificium, immaculatum hostiam.

Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube hæc perferri, per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectum divinæ majestatis tuæ, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui ✠ corpus, et ✠ sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cœlesti et gratia repleamur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

*Super Diptycha.*

Memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum Ill., qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis. Ipsîs, Domine, et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum refrigerii, lucis, et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur. Per eundem.

Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem aliquam et societatem donare digneris, cum tuis sanctis apostolis et martyribus, cum Joanne, Stephano, Matthia, Barnaba, Ignatio, Alexandro, Marcellino, Petro, Felicitate, Perpetua, Agathe, Lucia, Agne, Cæcilia, Anastasia, et cum omnibus sanctis tuis, intra quorum nos consortium, non æstimator meriti, sed veniæ, quæsumus, largitor admitte. Per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, semper bona, creas, sancti✠ficas, vivi✠ficas, bene✠dicis et præstas nobis. Per ip✠sum, et cum ip✠so, et in ip✠so, est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti in unitate Spiritus Sancti, omnis honor et gloria.

Per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen!

*Oremus.*

Præceptis salutaribus moniti, et divina institutione formati, audemus dicere:—

*Pater noster, qui es in cœlis; sanctificetur nomen tuum; adæcniat regnum tuum; fiat voluntas tua, sicut in cœlo, et in terra; panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie; et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris; et ne nos inducas in tentationem.*

Libera nos, quæsumus Domine, ab omnibus malis, præteritis, præsentibus, et futuris, et intercedente beata et gloriosa semper Virgine Dei genitrice Maria, et beatis apostolis tuis, Petro et Paulo, atque Andrea, et omnibus sanctis, da propitius pacem in diebus nostris, ut ope misericordiæ tuæ adjuti, et a peccato simus semper liberi, et ab omni perturbatione securi.

Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium tuum, qui tecum vivit, et regnat Deus in unitate Spiritus Sancti, etc.

*Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum.*

*Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.*

N.B. *Diptycha*.—From the fourth century downwards we find frequent mention of church registers; these are usually called diptycha ecclesiastica, or simply diptycha, diptychs, from the circumstance of their being *folded together*. They were entitled also κατάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί, tabulae sacrae, ecclesiae matriculae, libri viventium et mortuorum; and πτυχαὶ, πτυχαὶ ἱερῶν, δελτοὶ, δελτοὶ ἱερῶν—*μυστικά*.

These registers contained the names of the living members of the church,—of those who had died in full communion with the Christian body,—and of eminent bishops, martyrs, confessors, and benefactors; in short, of all those who were assembled together, or whom the assembled church especially commemorated, at the celebration of the Lord's supper. Some suppose that there were three distinct diptychs, or a separate register for each of the classes above named, but others reckon only two kinds of diptychs, namely, one register of the living and another of the dead, and they suppose that the names of bishops, &c. were included in either one or the other, according to the circumstance of their being still alive or not.

When a member of the church was excommunicated, whether before or after death, his name was erased from the diptychs; and it was again inserted if he was afterwards restored to communion, or recognised as a member of the Christian body.

It was the office of the deacon to read the names contained in the diptychs at the celebration of the Lord's supper. In course of time, when the names of the deceased members of the church became too numerous for recital, a general mention of all those who had died in Christ was substituted for the more particular enumeration. AUGUSTIN *De Cura pro Mortuis*, c. 4.

## D.

### DAILY TEMPLE-SERVICE, AND SYNAGOGUE-WORSHIP OF THE JEWS, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

ACCORDING TO LIGHTFOOT AND PRIDEAUX.

THERE seems to be nothing more uncontested among learned men than that the Jews had set forms of worship in all parts of divine service, and that the apostles freely used these in all instances, in which they thought it necessary or becoming to join with them. Their ordinary

service was of two sorts, the service of the temple, and the service of the synagogue. These differed in many respects, but both agreed in this, that the public prayers in both were offered up in a certain constant form of words. For their private prayers, which every man made particularly by himself, Prideaux tells us, they had no public forms to pray by, nor any public ministers to officiate to them herein; but all prayed in private conceptions;—but their public prayers were directed by public forms, both in the service of the temple and the synagogue.

### 1.—*Daily Temple-Service.*

THE TEMPLE-SERVICE is very accurately described by Dr. Lightfoot as it stood in the time of our Saviour: the sum of his description is this. First, before the offering of the sacrifice, the president called upon them to go to prayers, which they began with this form: “Thou hast loved us, O Lord our God, with an everlasting love, with great and abundant compassion hast thou had mercy on us, O our Father, our King, for our fathers’ sakes, who trusted in thee, and thou taughtest them statutes of life. So be gracious to us also, O our Father, O most merciful Father. O thou compassionate One, pity us. And put into our hearts to know, understand, obey, learn, teach, observe, do, and perform, all the words of the doctrine of thy law in love, and enlighten our eyes by thy law, and cause our hearts to cleave to thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and to fear thy name,” &c. After this prayer they rehearsed the Ten Commandments, and after the Ten Commandments they said over their phylacteries, in Hebrew, called *Tephillin*, which contained four portions of the law written in four parchments. The first out of Exodus xiii., from verse 3 to 10. The second out of Exodus xiii., from verse 11 to 16. The third out of Deut. vi., from verse 4 to verse 9. The fourth out of Deut. xi., from verse 13 to 21. After this prayer and rehearsal of the decalogue, and of their phylacteries at the time of offering incense, they had three or four prayers more; the first of which was in this form, referring to their phylacteries: “Truth and stability, and sure and firm, and upright and faithful, and beloved, and lovely, and delightful, and fair, and terrible, and glorious, and ordered, and acceptable, and good, and beautiful, is this word for us, for ever and ever. The truth of the everlasting God our King, the rock of Jacob, the shield of our salvation for ever and ever. He is sure, and his name is sure, and his throne settled, and his kingdom and truth established for evermore,” &c.

The second prayer was in this form: “Be pleased, O Lord our God, with thy people Israel, and with their prayer, and restore the service to the oracle of thy house, and accept the burnt-offering of Israel, and their prayer in love and complacency; and let the service

of thy people Israel be continually pleasing unto thee." And they concluded thus: "We praise thee, who art the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, the God of all flesh, our Creator, and the God of all creatures: glory and praise be to thy great and holy name, because thou hast preserved and kept us; so preserve and keep us, and bring back our captivity to the courts of thy holiness," &c.

A third prayer ran thus: "Appoint peace, goodness, and blessing, grace, mercy, and compassion for us, and for all Israel thy people. Bless us, O our Father, even all of us as one man, with the light of thy countenance: for in the light of thy countenance thou, O Lord our God, hast given us the law of life, and loving mercy and righteousness, and blessing and compassion, and life and peace: let it please thee to bless thy people Israel at all times. Let us and all thy people the house of Israel be remembered and written before thee in the book of life with blessing and peace," &c.

A fourth prayer was used on the Sabbath as a blessing, by the course that went out of their service, upon those that came in to do the service of the following week, in these words: "He that caused his name to dwell in this house, cause love and brotherhood, and peace, and friendship, to dwell among you."

After these things the priests lifted up their hands and blessed the people in that form of words, which is in Numbers vi. 24: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee, the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace." To which the people answered, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting."

After this blessing, the meat-offering and the drink-offering were offered, and then began the singing of psalms and the music.

The constant and ordinary psalms which they sung were these:

On the first day of the week, Psalm xxvi., "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," &c.

On the second day, Psalm xlviii., "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of God," &c.

On the third day, Psalm lxxxii., "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, and judgeth among gods," &c.

On the fourth day, Psalm xciv., "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth," &c.

On the fifth day, Psalm lxxxvi., "Sing aloud unto God our strength, make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob," &c.

On the sixth day, Psalm xciii., "The Lord reigneth, he is clothed with majesty," &c.

On the Sabbath day they sang Psalm xcii., which bears the title of "A Psalm or song for the Sabbath day," both in the Hebrew Bibles and the translation of the Septuagint.

These were the known, and constant, and fixed psalms for the several days of the week throughout the year. But upon certain days they had additional psalms and hymns. For on the Sabbath day, as there was an additional sacrifice appointed, Numb. xxviii. 9, so at the time of this additional sacrifice the Levites sang the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii., "Hear O heavens, and I will speak," which they divided into six Sabbaths for the morning service; and at the evening service they sang that other song of Moses, Exod. xv., "I will sing unto the Lord, for he triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea," &c. By which custom of singing the songs of Moses upon the Sabbath, Dr. Lightfoot observes, that that passage in Rev. xv. 3, may be illustrated, where the saints are said to "sing the song of Moses, the servant of God:" because they were now come to their everlasting Sabbath, having gotten the victory over the beast and his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and having the harps of God in their hands; which allusion to the Sabbath-service in the time of St. John is a good argument for the antiquity of the practice.

Besides this, there was an additional sacrifice appointed on the first day of the year, called the Feast of Trumpets, Numb. xxix. 1, and at this time they sang Psalm lxxxii., "Sing aloud unto God our strength," &c. And at the evening service of this day, Psalm xxix. "The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness," &c.

Also at the Passover, besides many other forms, they were used to sing the hymn called the Egyptian Hallel, because it was sung in remembrance of their delivery out of Egypt: which consisted of the cxiii., cxiv., cxv., cxvi., cxvii., and cxviii. Psalms. And this, as some observe, was sung also at the beginning of every month, and on the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of the Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. And the latter part of it is generally supposed to be the hymn which our Saviour sung with his disciples at the conclusion of his last supper.

This is the sum of the Jewish temple-service as it stood in our Saviour's time, with which, notwithstanding its stated forms, both He and his disciples complied, whenever they had occasion upon any such solemnities to frequent the temple.

## 2.—*Synagogue Worship.*

THE SERVICE OF THE SYNAGOGUE was something different from that of the Temple. For here were no sacrifices, but only these three things: I. *Prayers.* II. *Reading of the Scriptures.* III. *Preaching and expounding upon them.*

I. Their *public prayers*, like those of the temple, were all by stated forms. Among these the most ancient and solemn were those which



are called *Shemoneh Eshreh*, that is, *the eighteen prayers*, which are said to have been appointed by Ezra and the great synagogue from the time of the captivity. Another prayer was afterwards added, against the Christians. So that the whole amounted to *nineteen*.

They were the following:—

1. Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, powerful and tremendous, the High God, bountifully dispensing benefits, the creator and possessor of the universe, who rememberest the good deeds of our fathers, and in thy love sendest a redeemer to those who descended from them, for thy name's sake, O King, our helper, our Saviour and our shield. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who art the shield of Abraham.

2. Thou, O Lord, art powerful for ever. Thou raisest the dead to life, and art mighty to save; thou sendest down the dew, stillest the winds, and makest the rain to come down upon the earth, and sustainest with thy beneficence all that live therein; and of thy abundant mercy makest the dead again to live. Thou helpst up those that fall; thou curest the sick; thou loosest them that are bound, and makest good thy word of truth to those that sleep in the dust. Who is to be compared to thee, O thou Lord of might? and who is like unto thee, O our King, who killest and makest alive, and makest salvation to spring up as the herb out of the field? Thou art faithful, to make the dead rise again to life. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who raisest the dead again to life.

3. Thou art holy, and thy name is holy, and the saints do praise thee every day. *Selah*. For a great king, and an holy one art thou, O God. Blessed art thou, O God most holy.

4. Thou of thy mercy givest knowledge unto men, and teachest them understanding; give graciously unto us knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who graciously givest knowledge unto men.

5. Bring us back, O our Father, to the observance of thy law, and make us to adhere to thy precepts; and do thou, O our King, draw us near to thy worship, and convert us unto thee by perfect repentance in thy presence. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who vouchsafest to receive us by repentance.

6. Be thou merciful unto us, O our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, O our King, for we have transgressed against thee. For thou art a God, good and ready to pardon. Blessed art thou, O Lord, most gracious, who multipliest thy mercies in the forgiveness of sins.

7. Look, we beseech thee, upon our afflictions. Be thou on our side in all our contentions, and plead thou our cause in all our litiga-

tions, and make haste to redeem us with a perfect redemption for thy name's sake. For thou art our God, our King, and a strong redeemer. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel.

8. Heal us, O Lord our God, and we shall be healed. Save us, and we shall be saved. For thou art our praise. Bring unto us sound health, and a perfect remedy for all our infirmities, and for all our griefs, and for all our wounds. For thou art a god who healest, and art merciful. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who curest the diseases of thy people Israel.

9. Bless us, O Lord our God, in every work of our hands, and bless unto us the seasons of the year, and give us the dew and the rain to be a blessing unto us upon the face of all our land, and satiate the world with thy blessings, and send down moisture upon every part of the earth that is habitable. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who givest thy blessing to the years.

10. Convocate us together by the sound of the great trumpet to the enjoyment of our liberty, and lift up thy ensign to call together all of the captivity, from the four quarters of the earth into our own land. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest together the exiles of the people of Israel.

11. Restore unto us our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as at the beginning, and remove far from us affliction and trouble; and do thou only reign over us in benignity, and in mercy, and in righteousness, and in justice. Blessed art thou, O Lord our King, who lovest righteousness and justice.

12. Let there be no hope to them who apostatize from the true religion; and let heretics, how many soever they be, all perish as in a moment. And let the kingdom of pride be speedily rooted out, and broken in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroyest the wicked, and bringest down the proud. (This is the prayer which was added against the Christians. "The kingdom of pride," is the Roman empire.)

13. Upon the pious and the just, and upon the proselytes of justice, and upon the remnant of thy people of the house of Israel, let thy mercies be moved, O Lord our God, and give a good reward unto all who faithfully put their trust in thy name, and grant us our portion with them, and for ever let us not be ashamed; for we put our trust in thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who art the support and confidence of the just.

14. Dwell thou in the midst of Jerusalem thy city, as thou hast promised, build it with a building to last for ever; and do this speedily, even in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who buildest Jerusalem.

15. Make the offspring of David, thy servant, speedily to grow up

and flourish, and let our horn be exalted in thy salvation. For we hope for thy salvation every day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest the horn of our salvation to flourish.

16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, most merciful Father, pardon and have mercy upon us, and accept of our prayers with mercy and favour, and send us not away empty from thy presence, O our King. For thou hearest with mercy the prayer of thy people Israel. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.

17. Be thou well pleased, O Lord our God, with thy people Israel, and have regard unto their prayers. Restore thy worship to the inner part of thy house, and make haste with favour and love to accept of the burnt sacrifices of Israel, and their prayers; and let the worship of Israel thy people be continually well pleasing unto thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who restorest thy divine presence to Zion.

18. We will give thanks unto thee with praise. For thou art the Lord our God, the God of our fathers, for ever and ever. Thou art our rock, and the rock of our life, the shield of our salvation. To all generations will we give thanks unto thee, and declare thy praise, because of our life which is always in thy hands, and because of our souls which are always depending upon thee, and because of thy signs which are every day with us, and because of thy wonders and marvellous loving-kindnesses which are, morning, and evening, and night, continually before us. Thou art good, for thy mercies are not consumed; thou art merciful, for thy loving-kindnesses fail not. For ever we hope in thee; and for all these mercies be thy name, O King, blessed and exalted, and lifted up on high, for ever and ever; and let all that live give thanks unto thee. Selah. And let them in truth and sincerity praise thy name, O God of our salvation and our help. Selah. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whose name is good, and whom it is fitting always to give thanks unto.

19. Give peace, beneficence, and benediction, grace, benignity, and mercy unto us, and to Israel thy people. Bless us, O our Father, even all of us together as one man, with the light of thy countenance. For in the light of thy countenance hast thou given unto us, O Lord our God, the law of life, and love, and benignity, and righteousness, and blessing, and mercy, and life, and peace. And let it seem good in thine eyes to bless thy people Israel with thy peace at all times, and in every moment. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest thy people Israel with peace. Amen.

Whereas Prideaux observes rightly, that another prayer, called *the nineteenth*, was added a little before the destruction of Jerusalem, against the Christians, who are therein meant under the names of apostates and heretics: I shall confirm his observation from a passage in Epiphanius (EPIPHAN. *Hæres* 29 *Nazaræor. in fine*), who tells us,

that the Jews in their synagogues were used to pray against the Christians in this form,—καταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζαραίους, “O God, curse the Nazarenes.” And the same thing is intimated by Justin Martyr, who says, “immediately after our Saviour’s resurrection, the Jews sent forth their chosen emissaries, to all the synagogues in the world, to tell them that there was a certain impious, lawless sect risen up under one Jesus, a Galilean impostor, whom they had crucified; but his disciples came by night and stole him away out of the grave, and deceived men, by saying he was risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven.” (JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 335. Also HIERON. *ad Esa.* v. 18. Ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazæorum anathematizant Judæi nomen Christianum.) And he adds, “That after their city was demolished, they repented not, but even dared, καταράσθαι αὐτοῦ, to curse him, and all that believed on them;” which plainly refers to this additional prayer, which was of later date, and all the others seem to have been in use in the time of our Saviour and his apostles. And as we are sure they frequented the synagogues, so there is no doubt to be made but that they joined in these usual forms of prayer, which were one part of the synagogue-service.

II. The *reading of the Scriptures* is of three sorts. 1. The Kiriath Shema. 2. The reading of the law. 3. The reading of the prophets.

1. The Kiriath Shema consists in the reading of three portions of Scripture. The first is from the beginning of verse 4, chap. vi., of Deuteronomy, to the end of verse 9; the second from the beginning of verse 13, chap. xi., of Deuteronomy, to the end of verse 21; and the third from the beginning of verse 37, chap. xv., of Numbers, to the end of the chapter. And because the first of these portions in the Hebrew Bible begins with the word *Shema*, i. e., *hear*, they call all these three together the *Shema*, and the reading of them *Kiriath Shema*, that is, the *reading of the Shema*. This reading of the Shema is accompanied with several prayers and benedictions, both before and after it, and is, next the saying of the nineteen prayers, the solemnest part of their religious service, and is in the same manner as that to be performed according to their ritual every day, (that is, either publicly in their synagogue-assemblies, or else privately out of them, on those days when there are no such assemblies, or when they cannot be present at them,) only with this difference, that whereas the nineteen prayers are to be said thrice every day, and by every person of age, without any exception, the reading or repeating of the Shema is only to be twice a day, that is, morning and evening; and the males only, which are of free condition, are obliged to it, all women and servants being excused from the duty. They think they are bound to the repeating of this Shema every morning and evening, because of the words of the law, Deut. vi. 7,—“And thou shalt talk of them—when thou liest down,

and when thou risest up;" and also because of the like words, Dent. xi. 19. The reading or repeating of this Shema, in the manner as is here related, they think is of great moment for the preserving of religion among them, as most certainly it must be, because thereby they do twice every day make confession of the unity of God, and of the duties which they owe unto him.

2, 3. The reading of the law and of the prophets.—The five books of the law are divided into fifty-four sections. This division, many of the Jews hold to be one of the constitutions of Moses, from Mount Sinai. But others with more likelihood of truth attribute it to Ezra. It was made for the use of their synagogues, and the better instructing of the people there in the law of God. For every Sabbath day, one of these sections was read in their synagogues. And this we are assured in the Acts of the Apostles, was done amongst them of old time (Acts xv. 21), which may well be interpreted from the time of Ezra. They ended the last section with the last words of Deuteronomy on the Sabbath of the Feast of Tabernacles, and then began anew with the first section from the beginning of Genesis the next Sabbath after, and so went round in this circle every year. The number of these sections was fifty-four, because in their intercalated years (a month being then added) there were fifty-four Sabbaths. On other years they reduced them to the number of the Sabbaths which were in these years, by joining two short ones several times into one. For they held themselves obliged to have the whole law thus read over in their synagogues every year. Till the time of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, they read only the law. But then being forbid to read it any more, in the room of the fifty-four sections of the law, they substituted fifty-four sections out of the prophets, the reading of which they ever after continued. So that when the reading of the law was again restored by the Maccabees, the section which was read every Sabbath out of the law served for their first lesson, and the section out of the prophets for their second lesson; and so it was practised in the time of the apostles. And, therefore, when Paul entered into the synagogue at Antiochia in Pisidia, it is said, that "he stood up to preach, after the reading of the law and the prophets" (Acts xiii. 15), that is, after the reading of the first lesson out of the law, and the second lesson out of the prophets. And in that very sermon which he then preached, he tells them, "that the prophets were read at Jerusalem every Sabbath-day" (Acts xiii. 27), that is, in those lessons which were taken out of the prophets.

III. The third part of the synagogue-service is *the expounding of the Scriptures, and preaching to the people from them*. The first was performed at the time of the reading of them, and the other after the reading both of the law and the prophets was over. It is plain

Christ taught the Jews in their synagogues both these ways; when he came to Nazareth, his own city, he was called out, as a member of the synagogue, to read the Haphterah, that is, the section or lesson out of the prophets, which was to be read that day. And when he had stood up and read it, he sat down and expounded it, as was the usage of the Jews in both these cases. For out of reverence to the law and the prophets they stood up, when they did read any portion out of either; and in regard to themselves, as teachers, they sat when they expounded. But in all other synagogues, of which he was not a member, when he entered into them (as he always did every Sabbath-day wherever he was, Luke iv. 16), he taught the people in sermons, after the reading of the law and the prophets was over. And so St. Paul taught the Jews in their synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 15). For there it is expressly said in the sacred text, that his preaching was after the reading of the law and the prophets was ended.

---

THE TIMES of their synagogue-service were three days a week, besides their holidays, whether fasts or festivals, and thrice on every one of those days; that is, in the morning, and in the afternoon, and at night. Their ordinary synagogue-days in every week, were Monday, Thursday, and Saturday; Saturday was their Sabbath, the day set apart among them for religious exercises by divine appointment, and the other two by the appointment of the elders, that so three days might not pass without the public reading of the law among them. The reason which they gave for this, is taken from their mystical interpretation of the law. For, whereas we find it said (Exodus xv. 22) that the Israelites were in great distress on their travelling three days in the wilderness without water, by water, they tell us, is there mystically meant the law, and therefore say, that for this reason, they ought not to be three days together without the hearing of it, and consequently for the avoiding hereof they have ordained, that it be publicly read in their synagogues thrice every week. And their manner of doing it, is as followeth:—The whole law, or five books of Moses, being divided into as many sections or lessons, as there are weeks in their year (as hath been before shown), on Monday they began with that which was proper for that week, and read it half way through, and on Thursday proceeded to read the remainder; and on Saturday, which was their solemn Sabbath, they did read all over again, from the beginning to the end of the said lesson or section; and this both morning and evening. On the week days they did read it only in the morning, but on the Sabbath they did read it in the evening, as well as in the morning, for the sake of labourers and artificers, who could not leave their work to attend the

synagogues on the week days, that so all might hear twice every week the whole section or lesson of that week read unto them. And when the reading of the prophets was added to that of the law, they observed the same order in it. As the synagogue-service was to be on three days every week for the sake of their hearing the law; so it was to be thrice on those days for the sake of their prayers. For it was a constant rule among them, that all were to pray unto God three times every day, that is, in the morning at the time of the morning sacrifice, and in the evening at the time of the evening sacrifice, and at the beginning of the night, because till then the evening sacrifice was still left burning upon the altar.—LIGHTFOOT, *Temple-Service*, chap. 9, sect. 4; PRIDEAUX, *Connexion of Scripture History*, part i. chap. 6; as abridged by BINGHAM, *Antiquities*, book xiii. chap. 5, sect. 4, with additions.

---

## E.

### ORNAMENTS OF CHURCHES.

AMBROSE, Jerome, and other early ecclesiastical writers, frequently advert to the introduction of luxury and display in the adorning of churches in their time, and warn men against the abuses likely to arise from the increasing splendour of religious edifices.—Augusti quotes the following passage to this effect; from which we may gather many particulars relating to the nature of the ornaments employed during the fourth and fifth centuries.

Quidquid ex affectu puro et sincero promitur, hoc est decorum; non superfluas ædificationes aggredi, nec prætermittere necessarias. Et maxime hæc sacerdoti convenit, ornare Dei templum decore congruo, ut etiam hoc cultu aula Domini resplendeat, impensas misericordie convenientes frequentare, quantum oporteat largiri peregrinis, non superflua, sed competentia, non redundantia, sed congrua humanitati, ne sumtu pauperum alienam sibi quærat gratiam, ne restrictionem erga clericos aut indulgentiorem se præbeat. AMBROS. *De Offic.* lib. ii., c. 21.

Præcepit autem Deus et tunc populo Judæorum et hodie nobis, qui videmur in ecclesia constitui, ne fiduciam habeamus in ædificiorum splendore, aureatisque laquearibus, et vestitis parietibus marmorum crustis, et dicamus Templum Domini. Illud enim templum est in quo habitat vera fides, sancta conversatio, omniumque virtutum chorus. HIERON. *Comm. in Jerem.* c. 7.—Multi ædificant parietes et columnas ecclesie, substruunt marmora, nitent auro laquearia, gemmis altare

distinguitur. *Id. Ep. 2 ad Nepotian.*—Alii ædificent ecclesias, vestiant parietes marmorum crustis, columnarum moles advchant, earumque dearent capita, pretiosum ornatum non sententia, ebore argentoque valvas, et gemmis aurata distinguant altaria, non reprehendo, non abnuo, unusquisque in suo sensu abundet, meliusque est hoc facere, quam repositis opibus incubare. Sed tibi aliud propositum est: Christum vestire in pauperibus, visitare in languentibus, pascere in esurientibus. *Id. Ep. 8 ad Demetr.*—Auro parietes, auro laquearia, auro fulgent capita columnarum; et nudus atque esuriens ante fores nostras Christus in paupere moritur. *Id. Ep. 12 ad Gaudent.*—Conf. *HIERON. Comment. in Zachar. 7*; *CHRYSOST. Hom. 51, 81, in Matth.; Hom. 60 ad Pop. Antioch.*

## F.

## USE OF PICTURES, &amp;c., IN CHURCHES.

THE following decisions of Gregory the Great respecting the use pictures in churches,—which, it will be observed, was no new custom in his day,—are worthy of remark on several accounts. The first extract is from an epistle addressed by Gregory to Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, who had attempted to remove pictures from churches in his diocese, in consequence of the abuses to which they had given rise.

Perlatum siquidem ad nos fuerat quod, inconsiderato zelo succensus, sanctorum imagines sub hac quasi excusatione, ne adorari debuissent, confregeris. Et quidem quia eas adorari vetuisses omnino laudavimus, fregisse vero reprehendimus. Dic frater, a quo factum sacerdote aliquando auditum est, quod fecisti? Si non aliud, vel illud te non debuit revocare, ne despectis aliis fratribus, solum te sanctum et esse crederes sapientem? *Aliud enim est picturam adorare, aliud per picturæ historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiolis præstat pictura cernentibus: quia in ipsa etiam ignorantes vident quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt, qui literas nesciunt. Unde et præcipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est. Quod magnopere a te, qui inter gentes habitas, attendi debuerat: ne dum recto zelo incaute succenderis, ferocibus animis scandalum generares. Frangi vero non debuit, quod non ad adorandum in ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas solummodo mentes fuit nescientium collocatum. Et quia in locis venerabilibus sanctorum depingi historias non sine ratione vetustas admisit, si zelum discretionem condidisses, sine dubio et ea, quæ intendebas salubriter obtinere, et collectum gregem non dispergere, sed potius dispersum poteris congregare: ut pastoris in te meritum nomen*



excelleret, non culpa dispersoris incumberet. Hæc autem dum in hoc animi tui incaute nimis motu exsequeris, ita tuos scandalizasse filios perhiberis, ut maxima eorum pars a tua se communione suspenderet. Quando ergo ad ovile Dominicum errantes oves adduces, qui quas habes retinere non prævalet? Proinde hortamur, ut vel nunc studeas esse sollicitus, atque ab hac te præsumptione compescas, ut eorum animos, quos a tua disjunctos unitate cognoscis, paterna ad te dulcedine, omni adnisi omnique studio revocare festines. Convocandi enim sunt dispersi ecclesie filii, eisque scripturæ sacræ est testimoniis ostendendum, quia omne manufactum adorari non licet, quoniam scriptum est, "Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli servies." Ac deinde subjungendum est: quia picturas imaginum, quæ ad ædificationem imperiti populi fuerant factæ, ut nescientes literas, ipsam historiam intendentes, quid actum sit discerent, quia transisse in adorationem ideoque commotus es, ut eas imagines frangi præciperes. Atque eis dicendum: Si ad hanc instructionem, ad quam imagines antiquitus factæ sunt, habere vultis in ecclesia, eas modis omnibus et fieri et haberi permitto. Atque indica, quod non tibi ipsa visio historię, quæ pictura teste pandebatur, displicuerit, sed illa adoratio, quæ picturis fuerat incompetenter exhibita. Atque in his verbis eorum mentes demulcens, eos ad concordiam tuam revoca. Et si quis imagines facere voluerit, minime prohibe; adorare vero imagines modis omnibus devita. Sed hoc sollicite fraternitas tua admoneat, ut ex visione rei gestæ ardorem compunctionis perecipiant, et in adoratione solius omnipotentis sanctę Trinitatis humiliter prosternantur. Cuncta vero hæc ex amore sanctę ecclesie tuę fraternitati loquimur. Non ergo ex mea correptione frangatur a zelo rectitudinis, sed magis adjuvetur in studio pię dispensationis. GREG. M. *Epist.* lib. ix. ind. 4, ep. 9.

Ideoque enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut ii, qui literas nesciunt, saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quæ legere in codicibus non valent. Tua ergo fraternitas et illis servare, et ab eorum adoratione populum prohibere debuit: quatenus et literarum nescii haberent unde scientiam historię colligerent, et populus in picturæ adoratione minime peccaret. Id. *Epist.* lib. vii. ind. 2, ep. 3.

Imagines, quas tibi dirigendas per Dulcidum diaconum rogasti, misimus. Unde valde nobis tua postulatio placuit: quia illum toto corde, tota intentione quæris, ejus imaginem præ oculis habere desideras, ut te visio corporalis quotidiana reddat exercitatum: ut dum picturam illius vides, ad illum animo inardescas ejus imaginem videre desideras. Ab re non facimus, si per visibilia invisibilia demonstramus. Sic homo, qui alium ardentem videre desiderat, aut sponsam amans videre conatur, si contigerit eam ad balneam aut ad ecclesiam ire, statim per viam incedenti se præparat, ut de visione ejus hilaris recedat. Scio quidem, quod imaginem Salvatoris nostri non ideo petis, ut quasi

Deum colas, sed ob recordationem filii Dei in ejus amore recalesceas, ejus te imaginem videre desideras. Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam prosternimur, sed illum adoramus quem per imaginem aut natum, aut passum, sed et in throno sedentem recordamur. Et dum nobis ipsa pictura quasi scriptura ad memoriam filii Dei reducit, animum nostrum aut de resurrectione lætificat, aut de passione demulcet. Ideoque direximus tibi surtarias\* duas, imaginem Dei Salvatoris, et sanctæ Dei genitricis Mariæ, beatorumque apostolorum Petri et Pauli continentes, per supradictum filium nostrum diaconum, et unam crucem, clavem etiam pro benedictione a sanctissimo corpore Petri, apostolorum principis, ut per ipsum a maligno defensus permaneas, ejus signo te esse munitum credis, et ex eo te protegat, qui juvenilia semper suggerit recordari, ut in bonis tuis actibus perseveres, ut in ejus amore usque ad finem permaneas, pro ejus amore solitarius desideras habitare, ut alios in ejus amore accendas, propter quem te fecisti haberi, ut vitæ hujus mala quæque inimicus suggerit retro actu mentis proventibus quasi facibus inardescas, pro cuius amore vitam etiam velis finire, ipse quoque te protegat usque in finem, qui cunctum mundum dignatus est redimere Jesus Christus Dominus noster, qui vivit et regnat in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. *Id. Epist. lib. vii. ind. 2. ep. 54.*

---

## G.

### ASCETICS AND MONKS.

MONACHOS et Ascetas primorum temporum differre, nostrorum plerique statuunt: nec temere. Interest sane multum inter nos et illos. At ex ascetis monachos factos esse, non minus certum est. Quamdiu vita Christianorum ascetica in continentia et abstinencia a commoditatibus et deliciis posita erat, nec philosophiæ, quam diximus, præceptis regebatur, nihil obstabat, ne ascetæ inter homines et in familiis suis manerent. Eadem vero vita quum ad rationem revocaretur, atque philosophicis perceptis de animæ corporumque natura inneceteretur, quum ascetæ scintillam divinam mole corporis oppressam eliciendam, sensuum vim frangendam, mentem a sensu revocandam et ad principium suum reducendam, rerum in sensus incurrentium imagines in anima delendas, motus omnes animi sistendos, supremum bonum in quiete positum esse, quum hæc et similia docerentur illis, qui simpliciter antea vixerant, consentaneum erat, ut illi hominum cætus relinquerent atque vitam solitariam sectarentur. Difficillime enim inter homines, inter occupa-

\* Surtaria (Surtarium),—Scutum ubi sunt pictæ imagines. *BARON. Annal. a. 754, n. 4.*

tionum variarum strepitus, inter crebras interpellationes sociorum et amicorum, hæc officia servari, id est, mens purgari, sensus compesci, tranquillitas omnis cogitationis et motus expers obtineri poterat. Discabant vero hæc primum ascetæ in Ægypto ex ore scriptisque doctorum suorum sæculo secundo ad occasum declinante: sequenti vero sæculo dogmata hæc, crescente inter Christianos Africanos et Asiaticos philosophiæ Ægyptiacæ, seu, si mavis, Alexandrinæ et Ammonianæ amore, multo latius diffundebantur. Quare hoc circa tempus ascetæ urbibus et conciliis hominum sese subducere atque in solitudines migrare incipiebant: ex quo monachorum, id est, solitariorum appellatio illis imposita est. Vid. CASSIAN. *Collatione XVIII.* c. v. p. 517, Opp. Nolim ego diffiteri, ante hoc tempus jam paucos majoris sanctimoniam acquirendæ causa consuetudinem hominum reliquisse, atque semotos a turba vixisse; multa enim sunt, quæ suadent, ut id factum esse credamus. Hoc vero certissimum est, ante quam Christiani philosophiæ, quam sæpius jam nominavimus, operam darent, vivendi hoc genus parum necessarium ad supremum sanctitatis gradum obtinendum visum fuisse. Ascetarumque partem longe maximam familiis, quibus adscripti erant, haud excessisse. Segregati ab hominum commercio Ascetæ, quo commodius et facilius laborantem animam ex servitute corporis et sensuum extraherent, aptamque ad Deum videndum redderent, in societates et collegia paulatim primum in Ægypto, deinde in Syria, coibant, vivendique lege sibi præscripta, ducem, patrem, seniore sibi eligebant, ejus exemplo, auspiciis, et hortatu militarent. Hinc monasteria et cœnobita. Verum alii ne hanc quidem socialem, solitariam licet, vitam putabant satis convenire magno illi consilio, quod ceperant, animam componendi atque liberandi: timebant enim, ne ipse fratrum adspectus, ne colloquia, ne laborum et precum communitas, animam ad cogitationes, variosque motus retraheret, quietique ejus impedimento foret. Itaque in deserta plane loca et ferarum recessus sese recipiebant, in quibus sine sodalibus duram, tristem, omnisque solatii humani nesciam vitam agebant: unde Anachoretæ seu Eremitæ dicebantur. Firmabo hæc, quæ de causis, propter quas ascetæ solitudinem quæsierunt, et Monachi facti sunt, dixi, testimonio Cassiani, quo finem vitæ monachorum apte complexus est: quod quidem in hac causa gravissimum et maximum est, quoniam sententiam posterorum primorum inter Christianos monachorum declarat; notum enim est, Cassianum ex Ægyptiorum monachorum, cum quibus versatus erat, ore, quæ de monachorum rebus, consiliis et institutis tradit excepisse. Sic igitur ille, *Collatione Nonâ*, cap. ii., p. 360, illustrem Ægyptiorum abbatem Isaacum loquentem inducit. "Omnis monachi finis, cordisque perfectio ad jugem atque indisruptam orationis perseverantiam tendit, et quantum humanæ fragilitati conceditur, ad immobilem tranquillitatem mentis ac perpetuam nititur puritatem. Ob

quam possidendam omnem tam laborem corporis, quam contritionem spiritus indefesse quærimus et jugiter exercemus, et est inter alterutrum reciproca quædam inseparabilisque conjunctio." *Idem*, cap. iii. "Ab omni discursu atque evagatione lubrica animus inhibendus, ut ita paulatim ad contemplationem Dei ac spiritualis intuitus incipiat sublimari." Pluribus hæc de re disserit Collatione prima, quæ De monachi intentione inscripta est, alius abbas Ægyptius, Moses, qui cap. iv. p. 219, inter alia finem quidem docet professionis monachorum esse regnum Dei, sed destinationem eorum esse illam cordis puritatem, quæ ad visionem Dei ducat. Quod, cap. viii. p. 221, exemplo Marthæ ac Mariæ ita illustrat, ut affirmet, "monachum a contemplatione descendere debere ad illud, quod dicitur unum, id est, Dei solius intuitum, ut etiam sanctorum actus et ministeria mirifica supergressus, solius Dei jam pulchritudine scientiaque pascatur." Secretioris igitur disciplinæ moralis Christianorum, quæ philosophicis de Deo, mundo, anima et homine sententiis nititur, filii sunt monachi, id est, mystici: quales et antea Esseni et Therapeutæ inter Judæos erant. Manet hujus rei recordatio quædam in animis et institutis monachorum Syrorum, Ægyptiorum, Græcorum; quod quidem, si locus hic permetteret, plurimis demonstrare possem. Nostri vero, qui Europam incolunt, monachi nesciunt hodie prorsus, quibus de causis vitæ ratio; quam profitentur, instituta sit, veterumque morum et præceptorum vix speciem et umbram qualemcunque retinent. In quo nihil est, quod valde miremur. Ardentis solis, sicique cæli fructus est theologia mystica, ejusque filia, vita monastica: quocirca nostris in terris nunquam ad maturitatem pervenire potuit, omnesque monachorum sectæ inter nos natæ brevi tempore a primo fervore suo, legibusque conditorum, defecerunt. MOSHEIM, *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum*, sæc. ii. § 35.

---

## II.

### THE LITERATURE OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES;

OR,

A CLASSIFIED CATALOGUE OF THE PRINCIPAL WORKS RELATING TO  
THE SEVERAL SUBJECTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHEOLOGY.

AUGUSTI and Siegel have each given a copious account of the literature of Christian Antiquities, or the works which treat of the different subjects of Ecclesiastical Archæology. The following list is an abridgment of their catalogues. It contains the titles of the leading or most

important books, and such as are at the same time generally accessible to scholars in our own country. Such a catalogue may perhaps be useful, partly as affording means of reference to materials employed in constructing the works from which the foregoing Manual has been chiefly compiled, and partly as exhibiting an extensive copia librorum for the use of those persons who may wish to bestow a more close attention upon subjects connected with the customs and observances of the ancient church.

This list is classified, as nearly as possible, in accordance with the arrangement of the Manual.

#### Names of Christians.

- J. F. Buddei Exercit. de Origine, Dignitate et Usu Nominis Christiani.  
*Conf. Ejusdem Synt. Dissert. Theolog.*
- J. F. Hebenstreit de Variis Christianorum Nominibus.
- C. A. Heumann de Ortu Nominis Christiani.
- J. C. Burgmann de Nomine Christiani ejusque origine et notione.
- Christ. Kortholt, Paganus Obtrectator, s. de Calumniis Gentilium in Vet. Christ.
- C. F. Gudii Paganus Christianor. Laudator et Fautor.
- J. F. Gruner Exercit. III. de Odio Humani Generis Christianis olim a Romanis objecto.

#### Divisions or Classes of Christians.

- Phil. Rovenii Reipublicæ Christianæ libri duo, tractantes de variis hominum statibus, gradibus, officiis et functionibus in Ecclesia Christi.
- J. H. Boehmer Dissertationes XII. Juris Ecclesiasticæ Antiquæ.
- Planck, Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung der Christ-kirchlichen Gesellschafts-Verfassung.
- Morinus de Pœnitentia, lib. vi. c. 7.
- Bath. Cellarius de Catechumenis.
- Tob. Pfanner de Catechumenis Antiquæ Ecclesiæ.
- Duguet (Conférences Eccl.) de la durée du Catéchuménat, ses degrés, ses ordres, et ses âges différens.
- Strauch, *κατηχούμενος*, historice descriptus.

#### THE CLERGY.

- Marc. Ant. de Dominis de Republ. Eccles. libri x.
- N. Coifféteau pro Sacra Monarchia Eccl. Cath. adv. rempubl. M. A. de Dominis libri iv. apologet.
- Phil. Rovenii Reipublicæ Christianæ libri duo, tractantes de variis hominum statibus, gradibus, officiis et functionibus in Ecclesia Christi.

- Pagan. Gaudentius de Vita Christianor. ante tempora Constantini.  
 Jo. Frontonis de Moribus et Vita Christianorum in primis Ecclesie  
 sæculis.  
 Du Pin de Antiqua Ecclesie Disciplina.  
 Bened. Bachini de Ecclesiasticæ hierarchiæ originibus.  
 L. Thomassin, Vetus et Nova Ecclesie Disciplina.  
 C. M. Pfaff, de Originib. Juris Eccles.  
 Herm. Scholliner de Magistratum Ecclesie origine et creatione.—  
 Ejusdem Dissertatio de Hierarchia Ecclesie Catholica.  
 C. G. Keuffel, Institutio vet. et mediæ Eccles. Politia, s. Disciplina  
 Eccles.  
 Pelliccia, Politia Chr. Eccl. primæ, mediæ, et novæ ætatis.

## BISHOPS.

- J. Fr. Buddeus Exercit. de origine et potestate Episcoporum.—*Conf.*  
 Dissertat. Theol. syntagma i.  
 L. Schroeder de Episcopis Veteris Ecclesie.  
 J. F. Gruner de Origine Episcoporum, eorumque in Ecclesia primitiva  
 jure.  
 E. J. Danovii Dissert. de Episc. ætate Apostolor.  
 J. P. Gabler de Episc. primæ Eccles. eorumque origine.  
 Forbiger de Muneribus Ecclesiasticis ætate Apostolorum (Gabler  
 Progr. II. examinatur Forbigeri sententia de Presbyt. ætate  
 Apostolorum).  
 Hammond, de Episcopis et Presbyteris.  
 Dodwell, Dissert. de origine et potestate Episcoporum et Pres-  
 byterorum.  
 J. Pearson Vindicæ Ignatiana.  
 D. Blondell de Episcopis et Presbyteris.  
 Wallonis Messalini (Claudii Salmasii) Dissert. de Episcopis et Pres-  
 byteris.  
 J. Hildebrand, Exercitatio de Episcopis.  
 Caspar Ziegler, de Episcopis.  
 Planck, Geschichte der Christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverf, 1 bd.  
 Eisenschmid, Geschichte der Kirchendiener, 1 abth.

## CHOREPISCOPI.

- Rabani Mauri Opusculum de Chorepiscopis.  
 Pomp. Sarnelli, de Chorepiscopi della dignità vescovile et de suoi titoli.  
*Conf.* Sarnelli Lettere Eccles. Lett. v.  
 Casp. Ziegler de Episcopis, lib. i. c. 13.  
 Hammond de Episcopis, &c. Dissert. iii.  
 J. H. Boehmeri Dissertat. Jur. Eccles. Antiq. Dissert. v. de Christian.  
 Cætib. in vicis et agris.  
 Suicer, Du Fresne, s. v. Χορεπίσκοποι, Chorepiscopi.

## METROPOLITANS AND PATRIARCHS.

- Eman. a Schelstrate de auctoritate Patriarchali et Metropolitana (written in answer to Stillingfleet).
- Jacobi Usseri Opuscula duo de Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum origine.
- De Antiqua Ecclesie Disciplina dissertationes historice excerptæ ex conciliis œcumenicis et sanctorum patrum ac auctorum ecclesiasticorum scriptis. Auctore Ludovico Elies du Pin.
- Jos. Mottæ Dissertatio de Jure Metropolitico.
- J. Morini Exercitatio. Eccl. et Bibl. (Diss. I. De Patriarch. et Primat. Origine.)
- Thomassin, Vetus et Nova Disciplina.
- J. G. Janus de originibus Patriarcharum Christianorum dissertatio.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES AND DIOCESES.

- Theatrum conversionis gentium totius orbis, sive chronologia de vocatione omnium populorum et propagatæ per universum orbem fidei Christianæ relig. Descriptio. Auctore F. Arnoldo Mermannio.
- Parœcia, sive de Parœciar. et Parœcor. origine, necnon de Missa Parœciali. Auctore Jo. Filesaco theol. Paris.
- Jac. Gaultier Tabula chronographica status Ecclesie Catholice a Chr. n. ad. a. 1614.
- K. a S. Paulo Geographia Sacra, s. Notitia antiqua dicecesium omnium patriarchal. metropoliticar. et episcopalium veteris ecclesie, ex conciliis et patribus, his. ecclesiast. et geographis antiquis collecta: —accesserunt notæ et animadvers. de Holstenii et parergon notitias aliquot ecclesiast. et civil. divers. temporibus editas complectens. Amsterd. 1704.
- Em. a Schelstrate Antiquitas Ecclesie, dissertationib. monumentis ac notis illustrata, tom. ii.
- J. Alb. Fabricius Salutaris lux Evangelii, toti orbi per divinam gratiam exoricens, s. Notitia hist.—chronol., literaria, et geograph. propagatorum per orbem totum Christianorum sacrorum. Conf. Ejusd. Bibliothec. Græc. tom. xii. ed. 2.
- Fr. Jac. de Digne Historiographie générale des provinces Ecclesiast. de l'Eglise Latine.
- Biachinii Libr. III. de origine Hierarchie Ecclesiasticæ.

## PRESBYTERS.

- J. Morini (Commentar. de Sac. Eccl. Ordin. p. 3) Exercitatio de Presbyteratus materia et forma; Exere. de Episcopis et Presbyteris multis simul sacrificantibus, et Eucharistia post ordinationem presbyteratus data.

- Jac. Boileau de antiquo Presbyterorum jure in regim. Ecclesiast.  
 M. Zimmermann de Presbyteris veteris Ecclesie commentariolus — de Presbyterissis veteris Ecclesie commentariolus.  
 M. Hentschen de Presbyterorum Clericorum dignitate et potestate ordinandi ex jure divino et Antiquitate Ecclesie, et hac occasione de Episcopis, presbyteris, et Chorepiscopis.  
 H. Dodwell (Dissert. Cyprian.) Dissert. de Presbyteris Doctoribus, Doctore Audientium, et Legationibus Ecclesiasticis. Diss. de potestate Presbyterii sede Episcopali vacante.  
 Matt. Laroquanus (Advers. sacr.) de Sacerdotibus secundi ordinis.  
 J. S. Zschoerner Schediasma philol.-theol. de Presbyteris politicis.  
 Camp. Vitringa de Synagog. Vetere, lib. iii. p. 1, c. 1.  
 J. Bened. Carpzov. Exercitt. in Ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone.  
 J. F. Buddeus Eccles. Apostol. c. 6.  
 C. M. Pfaff de origine Jur. Eccles.  
 J. H. Böhmer Jus. Ecclesias. lib. ii. tit. 24, § 28.

## DEACONS AND DEACONESSES.

- Casp. Ziegler de Diaconis et Diaconissis vet. Eccl.  
 D. C. Molleri Dissert. de Septem Diac. Eccles. Rom.  
 Odelon. Dissert. de Diaconissis Primitivæ Ecclesie.  
 Thomassin. de Vet. et Nova Eccles. Disciplina, p. 1, lib. ii. c. 29, seq.

## ARCHDEACONS.

- G. H. Götze Tractatus de Archidiaconor. in veteri Ecclesia officiis et auctoritate.  
 Sarnelli, Lettere Eccles.; Lett. xxv. Della origine dignità Archidiaconale.  
 J. P. Kress, Erläuterung der Archidiaconalwesens und der geistlichen Sendgerichte.  
 J. G. Pertzsch, Vom Ursprunge der Archidiaconal-Gerichte, Bischöflichen Officialen und Vicarien.  
 Schmidt, de Synodis Archidiaconalibus in Germania; in Thesaur. Eccles. T. 3.  
 Thomassin, de Vet. et Nov. Disciplin. Eccles., p. 1, lib. ii. c. 17, 18.

## SUBDEACONS.

- Mth. Laroquanus (Adversaria Sacra), de Sacerdotibus secundi ordinis.  
 J. Morinus Commentar. de Sac. Eccles. Ordinationibus, p. 3.  
 Thomassin, de Vet. et Nov. Ecclesie Disciplina, tom. i. c. 20.  
 Bona Rer. Liturgicar., lib. i. c. 25, § 14, seq.  
 Cotelerius ad Patres Apostol. tom. i. p. 239, seq.; ad Constitut. Apostol. ii. 25.



## READERS.

- J. A. Schmidt, de Primitivæ Ecclesiæ Lectoribus illustrib.  
 Paul Paulsen, de Lectoribus veteris Ecclesiæ Judaicæ et Christianæ.

## ACOLYTHS.

- G. G. Grabner de Acolythis Progr. 1, 3.

## SINGERS.

- J. A. Schmidt Dissertat. de Cantoribus Ecclesiæ V. et N. Test.  
 Mat. Bloch, de Psalterum seu Cantorum origine in Ecclesiis.

## ORDINATION.

- Jo. Morini Commentarius historic. ac dogmatic. de Sacris Ecclesiæ  
 Ordinationibus secundum antiq. et recent. Latinos, Græcos,  
 Syros, &c.  
 Hallier, de Sacris Electionibus et Ordinationibus ex antiquo et novo  
 Ecclesiæ usu.  
 Natalis Alexander Dissert. 6 de Septem Diaconor. electione (Hist.  
 Ecclesiast. tom. i.)

- 
- Antonii v. Dale Dissertationes ix. Antiquitatib., quin et marmorib.  
 cum Romanis tum potissimum Græcis illustrandis inservientes.  
 Ziegler de inauguratione et consecratione Sacerdotum Hebr.  
 Chr. Zoega de unctione Sacerdotis summi.  
 J. Hülsemann de Ministro Consecrationis Sacerdotalis.  
 G. C. Götze Diss. de conformitate Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ et Evangelico-  
 Lutheranae in constituendis ministris.  
 H. Schollner de Magistratum Ecclesiæ origine et creatione.  
 Forbiger de Muneribus Ecclesiast. ætate Apostolorum.

## REVENUES OF THE CLERGY.

- Paul Sarpi (Fulgentius) de Materiis Beneficiariis s. Beneficiis Eccle-  
 siasticis.  
 Hieron. a Costa (Richard Simon) Histoire de l'origine et du progrès  
 des Revenues Ecclésiastiques.  
 L. Thomassin de Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis.  
 Mich. Pastor, de Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis, et de bonis Ecclesiæ tem-  
 poralibus acquirendis et conservandis.  
 Casp. Ziegler de Dote Ecclesiæ, ejusque juribus et privilegiis.  
 J. Selden, History of Tithes.  
 H. Spelman, Tracts on Tithes.  
 Historia Patrum Sportulantium ex antiquis idoneis documentis, &c.  
 Lips. 1722.  
 G. P. Stelzer de Jurib. Stolaæ.

## HABIT AND VESTMENTS OF THE CLERGY.

- J. G. Heineccius de Habitu et Insignibus Sacerdotalibus Apostolorum.  
 J. Andr. Schmidt, Dissertatio de Habitu et Insignibus Apostolorum Sacerdotalibus.  
 J. F. Cotta Dissertat. de Lamina Pontific. App. Joannis, Jacobi, et Marci.  
 And. du Saussay Panoplia Sacerdotalis, seu libri xiv. de venerando Sacerdotum habitu.  
 (Jac. Boileau) Hist. disquisitio de re vestiaria Hominis Sacri, vitam communem more civili traducentis.  
 Joan. du Tour liber singularis de Amictu, Veste Sacerdotali, de origine, antiquitate, et sanetitate Vestium Sacerdotalium legis naturæ, Mosaicæ, et Evangelicæ; et de præcepto hominibus dato orandi in Ecclesia nudo capite.  
 Calvoer Rituale Ecclesiast. P. 2, sect. iii. cap. 25, de Vestimentis Sacerdotalibus antiquæ Ecclesiæ, et cap. 23 de Vestimentis Sacerdotum Evangelicæ Ecclesiæ in genere.  
 Octav. Ferrarius de Re Vestiaria Libri VII. ed. 3.

## PUBLIC PRAYER.

- J. Hildebrand de Precibus vet. Christianor. libri iii. (a) Sacrar. Antiquitt. de Precibus veter. Christianor. libellus. (b) Rituale Orantium, &c. (c) De invocatione Sanctorum et Precibus pro defunctis.  
 J. Hoornbeek Miscellanea Sacra (de Precibus Ecclesiæ).  
 A. H. Deutschmann, Ritus Antiqui Precum.  
 Jac. Thomasii Dissert. de ritu vet. Christianorum Precandi versus orientem.  
 A. Rechenberg de *Χειραρσία* Orantium.  
 C. C. Sturm de ritu veterum sublatis manibus Precandi.  
 J. Bürger de gestibus Precantium vet. Christianorum.

## USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

- Herm. Witsii Exercitationes Sacræ in Symbol. Apost. et Orationem Dominicam.  
 J. A. Schmidii Oratio Dominica historice et dogmaticæ proposita.  
 J. G. Walch de usu Orationis Dominicæ apud veteres Christianos.  
 J. E. Ostermann Comment. de communi Christianorum Precatione.  
 A. R. Gebser de Oratione Dominica Comment.

## LITURGIES AND RITUAL.

I. *Works of earlier Writers of the Western Church on Liturgies and Ritual.*

- Isidorus Hispalensis (Isidore of Seville), ob. 636, de Ecclesiasticis Officiis, libri duo.
- Alcuinus, ob. 804, de Divinis Officiis liber.
- Amalarius (Amalhard), ob. 837, de Ecclesiastico Officio, libri quatuor.
- Walafred Strabo, de Exordiis et Incrementis Rerum Ecclesiasticarum, A D. 840.
- Rabanus Maurus, ob. 856, de Institutione Clericorum et Cæremoniis Ecclesiæ libri tres.
- Berno, fl. 1014, de quibusdam rebus ad Missæ Officium pertinentibus.
- Micrologus de Ecclesiasticis Observationibus. (A work of the twelfth century—written, as some suppose, by Ivo, bishop of Chartres).
- Honorius Augustodunensis, Sacramentarium, seu de causis et significatione mystico Rituum Divini in Ecclesia Officii (beginning of the twelfth century).
- Rupertus, de Divinis Officiis libri xii. (middle of the twelfth century).
- Beleth, Brevis Explicatio Divinorum Officiorum ac eorundem rationum (latter end of the twelfth century.)
- Innocentius III. (ob. 1203) de Mysteriis Missæ libri sex.
- Gulielmus Durandus (Duranti), ob. 1296, Rationale Divinorum Officiorum.
- J. Steph. Duranti (ob. 1589) de Ritibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ libri tres.

For a more copious list of these writers, see Hittorp, de Divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Officiis et Ministeriis, varii veterum aliquot Ecclesiæ Patrum ac Scriptorum libri.—Zaccaria Bibliotheca Ritualis.—Gerbert, Theolog. Liturgic.—C. M. Pfaff, de Liturgiis.

2. *Works of earlier Writers of the Greek Church.*

- Germani II. Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Theoria in Auctuario Ducaeano Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. (thirteenth century.)
- Typicum Sabæ Monachi, seu Ordo Recitandi Officium Ecclesiasticum per totum annum. Venet. 1615.
- Leo Allatius de Libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum, Dissert. II. (Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca.)

See Heineccii Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer Historie, Glaubenslehren, und Kirchengebräuchen.

3. *Works of modern Roman Catholic Writers.*

De Antiquitate, Veritate, ac Cæremoniis Missæ opuscul. e S. Patribus summis depromptum per Nicolaum Aurificum. Venet. 1572.

Speculum Missæ ex Antiquis quibusdam Ecclesiæ Patribus. Venet. 1572.

Missæ Apostolica sive ἡ Θεία λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου, Divinum Sacrificium Sancti Apostoli Petri, cum Wilhelmi Lindani Episcopi Guadavensis Apologia pro eadem D. Petri Apostoli Liturgia. Antwerpia, 1589.

Antiquitatum Liturgicarum Arcana. Duaci, 1605.

Jac. Pamellii Missale, S. S. Patrum Latinos, sive Liturgicum Latinum. Colon. 1676.

Joannes Bona, Presbyt. Cardinal. Ordin. Cister., Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo. Romæ, 1671.

Edmund Martène de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus. Rotomagi, 1700.

Petrus Sibbern de libris Latinorum Ecclesiasticis Schediasma. Vitebergæ, 1706.

Prosper Lambertini, sive Benedicti xiv., de Sacrificio Missæ. Paduæ, 1745.

Claude de Vert, Explication, simple, littérale, et historique, des Cérémonies de l'Eglise. Paris, 1720—1723.

Pierre le Brun, Explication littérale, historique, et dogmatique des Prières et des Cérémonies de la Messe. Paris, 1726.

Liturgia Romana Vetus, tria Sacramentaria complectens, Leoninum scilicet Gelasianum et antiquum Gregorianum, edente Ludovico Antonio Muratorio. Venet. 1748.

(Answered by J. Aug. Ernesti, in a treatise entitled Anti-Muratorius, sive Confutatio Muratoricæ disputationis de rebus Liturgicis. Lipsiæ, 1755.)

Bartholin. Gavanti, Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum cum novis observationibus et additionibus. Aug. Vindel. 1763.

Gabr. Aubespine, L'Ancienne Police de l'Eglise sur l'administration de l'Eucharistic. Opp. Albaspanæi, ed. 1770.

Bibliotheca Ritualis, concinnatum opus a Francesco Antonio Zaccaria. Romæ, 1778.

Aug. Krazer de Apostolicis necnon Antiquis Ecclesiæ occident. Liturgiis, illarum origine, progressu, ordine, die, hora, ac lingua, cæterisque rebus ad Liturgiam Antiquam pertinentibus liber singularis. Aug. Vindel. 1756.

4. *Works of modern Writers of the Greek Church.*

Is. Habert. Ἀρχιερατικόν, s. liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Græcæ ex Euchologiis collegit, Latine vert. et observat. illustr. Paris, 1643.

- Procli (Patriarch. Constantinop.) de Traditionibus Missæ, cum notis Ricoardi. Romæ, 1630.
- Jac. Goar. Ἐυχολόγιον, s. Rituale Græcorum cum interpretat. Lat., glossario, et observat. Paris, 1647.
- Leonis Allatii de libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum. Dissert. II. cura J. A. Fabricii. Hamb. 1712.—De Liturgia S. Jacobi. Symmieta s. opuseula. Græc. et Lat. Ed. Bart. Nitrusio. Colon. 1653.
- Guil. Cave Dissert. de libris et Officiis Eccles. Græcorum. (Histor. Liter. Scriptorum Eccles. tom. ii.)
- Eusebius Renaudot Liturgiæ Orientalium collectio. Paris, 1716.
- Jo. Guil. Jani de Liturgiis Orientalibus in doctrina de S. Eucharistia antiquæ veritati evangel. suffragantibus. Viteberg. 1724.
- Jos. Sim. Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino Vaticana, tom. i. iii. 1719—24.
- Jo. Michaelis Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche, 1711.

5. *Works of Protestant Writers.*

- J. A. Schmidt de Insignioribus Veterum Christianorum formulis. Helmst. 1696.
- Jo. Friderici Liturgia Vetus et Nova, sive collatio rituum liturgicorum Ecclesiæ Christ. prisæ et hodiernæ, cum præfat. Jo. Phil. Slevogtii. Jenæ, 1705.
- Joachimi Hildebrandi Rituale Eucharisticum Veteris Ecclesiæ publicis Lectionibus olim dicatum, et nunc iisdem denuo destinatum, a J. Andrea Schmidio. Helmst. 1717.
- Chr. Matt. Pfaffii Institut. Histor. Eccles. juxta ordinem seculor. brevissimo penicillo delineatæ. Tuling. 1721.

PSALMODY.

- J. Filesæus de Cantu Ecclesiastico. Select. lib. ii.
- J. Bona de Divina Psalmodia ejusque causis, mysteriis, et disciplinis, deque variis ritibus omnium Ecclesiarum in psallendis divinis officiis, Tractatus histor. symbol., asceticus.
- C. S. Schurtzfleisch Diss. de Hymnis Ecclesiæ Veteris.
- J. Hoornbeck, Miscellanæ Sacra, (de Psalmodia.)
- J. Z. Hilliger Diss. philol. de Psalmorum, Hymnorum, atque Odarum Sacrarum discrimine.
- J. G. Walch de Hymnis Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ. Ejusdem Miscellanæ Sacra, p. 34, seq.
- Mart. Gerbert de Cantu et Musica Sacra.

READING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

- G. E. Tentzel de ritu Lectionum Sacrarum.

- J. A. Schmidt de Primit. Eccl. Lectionibus.—Ejusdem Libellus de Lectionariis utriusque Ecclesie.  
 P. J. Hartmann de rebus gestis Christian. sub Apostolis.  
 J. F. Buddei Ecclesia Apostolica s. de statu Ecclesie sub Apostolis.

## PREACHING.

- Ferrarii Bernhardini Mediolanensis de ritu Sacrar. Ecclesie veteris Concionum, cum præfatione Joannis Georg. Grævii.  
 Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria, h. e., Totius anni evangelia, festa dominica, sanctissimæ Deiparæ illustriorumque sanctorum solemnia, patrum symbolis, tractatibus, panegyricis illustrata. Opera et Studio Franc. Combefisii.  
 Joach. Hildebrand Dissert. de veterum Concionibus.  
 H. G. Tzschirner de claris veteris Ecclesie Oratoribus.

## CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

- Mich. Waleker de Catechisatione Veterum.  
 J. G. Walch de Apostolor. Institutione Catechetica. *Conf.* Ejusdem Miscellanea Sacra.  
 G. T. Zachariæ de Methodo Catechetica.  
 G. Langemack Historia Catechetica.  
 J. G. Walch Einleitung in die Catechetische Historie älterer, mittlerer, und neuerer Zeiten.  
 J. G. Köcher Einleitung in die Catechetische Theologie.

## DISCIPLINA ARCANI.

- G. T. Meier de Recondita Vet. Eccles. Theologia.  
 Em. a Schelstrate de Disciplina Arcani.  
 W. E. Tenzel Dissertat. de Disciplina Arcani adversus Em. a Schelstrate (Antiquitas Illustrata; Exercit. Select.)  
 J. L. Schedius de Sacris Opertis Christian.  
 Hartmann Commentar. de rebus gestis sub Apostolis.  
 Mosheim de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantin. M. Sec. ii. § 34.

## BAPTISM.

- Josephi Vicecomitis Observationum Ecclesiasticarum vol. i., in quo de antiquis Baptismi ritibus ac cæremoniis agitur.  
 Jac. Canisii Fons Salutis, s. primum Sacramentorum omnium Baptismus.  
 F. U. Calixt. de antiquis circa Baptismum ritibus.  
 J. Daleus (de cultib. relig. Latinor. l. ix.) de Baptismi Cæremoniis.  
 A. C. Schubert (pr. J. Musæus) de ritib. Ecclesie primitivæ Baptismalibus.

- J. Cabassutius (Notitia Ecclesiastica) Dissertatio de ritibus olim Baptismo adhiberi solitis.
- J. Hoorubeck (Miscellanea Sacra) de Baptismo veterum.
- J. Hildebrand Rituale Baptismi veteris.
- Ant. van Dale (Diss. super Aristeæ) Historia Baptismorum cum Hebraicorum tum Christianorum.
- C. G. Schwartze Dissertatio de ritibus quibusdam formulisque a manu-missione ad s. Baptismum translatis.
- J. G. Walch Ritus Baptismales sæculi ii.—Historia Pædobaptismi quatuor priorum sæculorum.
- J. A. Stark, Geschichte der Taufe und der Taufgesinnten.
- Marc. Gudii de Clinicis seu Grabatariis vet. eccl.
- Mich. Schreiber de dilatione Baptismi.
- A. F. Büsching de procrastinatione Baptismi apud vet. ejusque causis.
- J. F. T. Zimmermann Comment. de Baptismi origine ejusque usu hodierno.
- J. G. Reiche de Baptismi origine et necessitudine, necnon de formulis baptism.
- Fr. Brenner, Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verrichtung der Taufe von Christus bis auf unsere Zeiten.
- Al. Pirie, Dissertation on Baptism, intended to illustrate the origin, history, design, mode, and subject of that sacred Institution. London, 1790.
- R. Robinson, History of Baptism.
- W. Wall, the History of Infant-Baptism,—and Defence of the History of Infant-Baptism, against the reflections of Gale and others.

## CONFIRMATION.

1. *Roman Catholic Writers.*

- Natalis Alexander, Dissert. ad sec. 2, de Sacramento Confirmationis.
- J. A. Orsi, de Chrismate Confirmatorio.
- Ziegler, Die Feier der heiligen Firmung in der Catholischen Kirche.

2. *Protestant Writers.*

- J. Dallai de duobus Latinor. ex unctione Sacramentis, Confirmatione et Extrema ut vocant unctione, Disputatio.
- C. M. Pfaff Dissert. de Confirmatione Catechumenor.
- C. T. Seidelii Dissert. qua ostenditur Pontificios in ritu Confirmationis a praxi Eccles. Apostol. plane aberrare.
- E. Ehrhardt de Confirmatione Catechumen. Evangelica.

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. *History of the celebration of this Sacrament in the Early Ages.*
- Laroque, Histoire mémorable et intéressant de l'Eucharistie.

Rud. Hospiniani, *Historiæ Sacramentariæ*, vol. i. ii.

Henr. Rixner de *Institutis et Ritibus vet. Christianor. circa Eucharistiam*.

J. A. Quenstedt de *S. Eucharistiæ ritib. Antiquis*.

Ed. Martène de *Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus*, lib. i.

Joach. Hildebrand, *Rituale Eucharistiæ vet. Eccl.*

### 2. *Concerning the Sacred Elements.*

J. Fr. Budens de *Symbolis Eucharisticis*.—*Parerga Hist. Theol.*

J. G. Hermann, *Historia concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato in Cœna Domini*.

Kortholt C. *Dissertat. de Hostiis s. placentulis orbicularibus, num verus sit Panis?*

J. A. Schmidt de *Oblatis Eucharisticis quæ Hostiæ vocari solent*.

J. A. Schmidt *Dissert. de fatis calicis Eucharistici in Ecclesia Romana a Concilio Constantiensi ad nostra usque Tempora*.

L. T. Spittler, *Geschichte des Kelche in Abendmahle*.

### CHURCH-REGISTERS, OR DIPTYCHS.

J. Cabassutius de *Diptychis Ecclesiæ* (in *Notit. Concilior. Notit. Eccles.*)

Chr. Aug. Salig de *Diptychis veterum tam profanis quam sacris*.

H. Dodwell de *nominum e Diptychis Ecclesiæ recitatione in Eucharistia* (*Dissert. Cyprian.*)

J. Andr. Schmid. de *Diptychis veterum*.

Petr. Zorn de *Notariorum in prima Ecclesia singulari usu et origine, quod ad acta martyr. et sanctor. consignata attinet.* (*Opusc. Sacr.*)

J. H. Leich de *Diptychis veterum et de Diptycho Quirini*.

Seb. Donati de *Dittichi antichi profani e sacri*.

A. F. Gori *Thesaurus veterum Diptychorum consularium et ecclesiasticorum.* Access. J. B. Passerii *additamenta et præfati.*

J. Bona de *Rebus Liturgicis*, l. ii. c. 12.

### THE KISS OF PEACE.

T. Pfanneri de *Osculis Christianor. Vet. in Observat. Eccl.*

Mart. Kempii *Opus de Osculis*.

J. Herrenschildii *Oscnologia*.

Ritterhusii de *Osculis Dissertatio*.

P. Mulleri de *Osculo Sancto*.

A. Pettyen de *Osculo Sancto et Judæ*.

### PUBLIC PENANCE.

Jo. Morini *Commentar. Histor. de Disciplina in Administratione Pœnitentiæ xiii. primis sæculis in ecclesia observata*.



Melch. Cani Relatio de Sacramento Pœnitentiæ.

J. Filesaci Syntagma de Pœnitentiâ.

FESTIVALS.

Durandi Rationale Divin. Off.; lib. iv.

Martène de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus; tom. iii. (ed. 2.)

Rudolphi Hospiniani de Festis Judæorum et Ethnicorum, *h.e.* de origine, progressu, ceremoniis, et ritibus festorum apud Judæos, Græcos, Romanos, Turcas, et Indianos. Ed. tertia.

Mt. Dresseri de Festis Diebus Christianorum, Judæorum, et Ethnicorum liber, quo origo, causa, ritus, et usus eorum exponitur.

Theod. Thummii Tradat. Historic. Theol. de Festis Judæorum et Christianorum.

Andr. Wilkii *Ἐοπρογραφή*: Pars I. Festa Christianorum Œcumenica continens; Pars II. Festa xii Apostolorum continens.

Joachim Hildebrand de Diebus Festis libellus. Ejusdem de Priscæ et Primitivæ Ecclesiæ sacris publicis, templis, et diebus festis Enchiridion collectum.

Jo. Andr. Schmidt Historia Festorum et Dominicarum.

Leo Allatius de Dominicis et Hebdomadibus Græcorum.

Jacob Gretser de Festis Christianorum libri duo adversus Danæum, Dresserum, et Hospinianum aliosque sectarios. Ejusdem Auctarium de Festis nuper vulgatis.

Carol. Guyeti Heortologia, seu liber de Festis Propriis locorum, &c.

Henr. Engelgrave, Cœleste Pantheon, seu cœlum novum in festa et gesta sanctorum totius anni morali doctrina varie illustratum.

Louis Thomassin Traité des Fêtes.

Andr. Baillet Histoire des Fêtes Mobiles, (Vies des Saints. Paris, 1701.)

Prosper Lambertini Commentarii duo de Jesu Matrisque ejus Festis et de Missæ Sacrificio. Ex Ital. in Lat. Serm. vertit. M. Aug. de Giacomellis.

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY.

De Sabbato et Die Dominico. Auctore Guil. Anesio.

Dies Dominicus, s. Succincta narratio ex S. Scripturarum et Antiquitatis Patrum testimoniis concinnita, et duobus libris distincta. Lond. 1639.

J. S. Stryk de Jure Sabbati.

J. G. Abicht de Sabbato Christian. ex histor. N. T.

J. Meibius, Diss. a quibusnam Dies Solis sit consecratus divino cultui.

Gf. Wegner, Deductio et Declaratio Sententiæ Aug. Confessionis de

Die Dominico, originem ejusdem, non institutioni divinae, sed ecclesiae Christianae, vindicantis.

Franeke de Diei Dominici apud veteres Christianos celebratione.

See also the works of Hospinian, Hildebrand, and Schmidt, on Festivals.

#### FASTS.

F. U. Calixtus de Jejunio.

J. Dallaens de Jejunii et Quadragesima.

Thomassin, Traité de Jeunes de l'Eglise.

A. Halesii de Praesenti Statu Ecclesiae Graecae; c. 9.

Leo Allatius de Consensu Eccles. Gr. et Latin.

Valfredi de Usu et Institutione Jejunii quatuor temporum.

J. A. Muratori de quatuor temporum Jejunii, eorum origine et usu.

Ejusdem Anecdota; tom. ii.

Suiceri Thesaurus s. v. *Νηστεία*.

Du Fresne Glossarium s. v. *Jejunium*.

#### ROGATIONS.

C. G. Wolf Tract. de dieb. Pœnitentialib. et Supplicationum.

Du Fresne Glossar. Med. et Infim. Latinit. s. v. *Rogationes*.

#### CHURCHES.

G. Rossteucher de Templis.

J. Fabricii Oratio de Templis Vet. Christianorum.

J. G. Walch de Ecclesiis domesticis Christianor. Apostolic.

J. M. Faber de Templor. ap. Christianos antiquitate dubia.

Pott Sylloge Commentat. Theol.; vol. iii.

J. G. Siber Templor. condendor. et dedicandor. ritus.

Leo Allatius de Templis Graecor. recentior. et de Narthece Vet. Eccles.

Procopii de Aedificiis lib. i. c. 1—3.

Du Fresne Constantinopolis Christiana. De Sacris Aedificiis a Const. M. constructis Synopsis historica.

#### CHURCH-BELLS.

Hieron. Magius de Tintinnabulis; c. i.

A. Stockflet de Campanarum usu.

J. C. Reimanni Dissert. de Campanis.

Nicol. Eggers Dissert. de origine et nomine Campanarum. Ejusdem  
Dissert. de Campanarum materia et forma.

J. B. Pacichelli de Tintinnabulo Nolano lucubratio.

H. Walleri Dissert. de Campanis et Praecipuis earum usibus.

P. C. Hilscher de Campanis Templorum.

- J. B. Thiers *Traité des Cloches.*  
 S. A. Mitzler de Campanis.  
 Eschenwecker de eo quod justum est circa Campanus.

## ORGANS.

- Gerbert de Cantu et Musica Sacra. Especially tom. ii. l. 3, c. 3, de  
 Organis aliisque instrumentis musicis in Ecclesiam inductis.  
 Fr. Blanchini *Dissert. de tribus generib. Instrumentor. Musicæ veterum  
 Organicæ.*  
 Hospinian. de origine et progressu Templorum; lib. i. c. 11, de origine  
 Organorum Musicorum in Templis.  
 F. G. Walchii *Compendium Antiquit. Ecclesiast. c. 19, de Instru-  
 mento Musico, speciatim de Organis Musicis.*

## RIGHTS OF ASYLUM IN CHURCHES.

- Mœbii *Ἀσυλολογία* seu de Hebræor., Gentilium, et Christianorum  
 Asylis.  
 Gust. Carlholm de Asylis.  
 G. Ritterhusius de Asylis.  
 Engelbrecht de injusta Asylorum extensione.

## ORNAMENTS OF CHURCHES, &amp;c.

- L. A. Muratori de Templorum apud Veteres Christianos ornatu.  
 Ejusdem *Anecdota*; tom. i. p. 178, seq.  
 G. Chladni *Inventarium Templorum.*  
 M. A. Goldasti *Decreta de Cultu Imaginum in utroque imperio.*  
 Petav. *Theol. Dogm.*; tom. iv. p. 2, lib. xv. c. 10.  
 J. Dallæi *Liber de Imaginibus.*  
 F. Spanhemii *Historia Imaginum Restituta.*  
 Basnage *Histoire des Images depuis Jesus Christ jusqu'à l'onzième  
 siècle, in l. xxii. et xxiii. de son Histoire de l'Eglise.*  
 Münter, *Simbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen.*

## USE OF THE CROSS AND CRUCIFIX.

- Justi Lipsii de Cruce libri tres ad sacram et profanam historiam perti-  
 nentes.  
 Jacobi Gretseri *soc. Jes. theol. opera omnia de Sancta Cruce*; 3 tomi.  
 Alphonsi Ciaconii de signis sanctissimæ Crucis.  
 Andreas Baudis *Cruce Christianorum ex historiar. monumentis con-  
 structa.*  
 Christ. Wildvogel de venerabili signo Crucis.  
 C. L. Schlichter de Cruce aq. ud Judæos, Christianos, et Gentiles signo  
 salutis.

## MARRIAGE.

- T. Sanchez de Sacramento Matrimonie.  
 Histoire de l'Eglise sur le Sacrement du Mariage depuis Jesus Christ  
 jusqu'à nous, par Gisbert.  
 J. Gerhard de Conjugio. Ejusdem Loci Theolog. ed. Cotta; t. xv. xvi.  
 Joachim Hildebrand de Nuptiis Vet. Christ.

## FUNERAL RITES AND CEREMONIES.

- On. Panvini de ritu Sepeliendi Mortuos apud Veteres Christianos et  
 eorundem Cœmeteriis Liber.  
 Jac. Grotser de Funere Christianorum Libri Tres.  
 J. A. Quenstedt Sepultura veterum, s. de antiquis ritibus Sepuleralibus  
 Græcor., Romanor., Judæor., Christianor.  
 J. H. Heidegger de Sepultura mortuorum.  
 L. G. Gyraldi de Sepultura ac vario Sepeliendi rita Libellus.  
 Mth. Larroquanus (Adv. sacr.) de Cæremoniis usurpatis a prioribus  
 Christianis, dum terræ mandabantur mortuorum corpora.  
 C. S. Schurtzfleisch (Controvers. xxxiv.) Qualis Christianorum  
 Funerum Ritus fuerit?  
 J. E. Franzen Antiquitatum circa Funera et ritus vet. Christianor.  
 quovis tempore in Ecclesia observat. libri vi., cum præfatione Jo.  
 Fabricii et J. Andr. Schmidii.  
 Joach. Hildebrand de veteris Ecclesiæ Martyrum imprimis et S. S.  
 Patrum, ars bene moriendi, sive praxis circa moribundos, et de  
 morientium virtutibus.  
 Jo. Nicolai de luctu Christianor. seu de ritibus ad Sepulturam perti-  
 nentibus.

## AGAPE.

- Jo. Hilberti Disput. de Agapis.  
 C. S. Schurtzfleisch (J. F. Creitlov.) de veter. Agaparum ritu.  
 J. A. Muratori de Agapis sublatis, in Anecd. Græc.  
 J. H. Beelmeri de Coitionib. Christianorum ad capiendum cibum, in  
 Dissertatt. Juris Ecclesiast. Antiquiss.  
 Quistorp de Agapis nascentis Ecclesiæ.  
 J. Mœrlin de Agapis vett. Christian.  
 G. Schlegel de Agapis ætate Apostolorum.  
 J. Th. Fr. Drescher de veter. Christ. Agapis Comment.

## STATIONS.

- Im. Petitus (Var. Lect.) de veterum Christianorum Stationibus, semi-  
 jejuniis, et jejniis.  
 J. M. Chalden Comm. de Stationibus veterum Christianorum.  
 Du Fresne Glossar. ad Scriptores Med. et. infim. Latinit. s. v. Statio.

## PROCESSIONS.

- Nic. Serarii Sacri Peripatetici, seu libri ii. de Sacris Ecclesie Catholice Processionibus.
- J. Gretseri Libri ii. de Eccles. Rom. Processionibus seu Supplicationibus.
- Nicolai Sanderi Auctariolum ad Serarium Gretserumque de ritu Catholicar. Processionum.
- Jac. Eveillon de Processionibus Ecclesiasticis.
- Christ. Lupi Dissert. de Sacris Processionibus.
- Jo. Franci Diatribe duplex de ritibus Ecclesie Latine Judaicis, in Parergis Theologicis.
- J. C. Kregelii Exerc. de Processionibus sacris et civilibus Hebræorum.
- J. A. Hartmann Dissert. de Ambarvalib. Pontificior.
- Paul Antonii Dissert. de sacris Gentilium Processionibus.

## PILGRIMAGES.

*Works of Roman Catholic Writers.*

- Jonæ Aurelianens. de usu Imaginum et Peregrinationum contra Claudium Taurin. lib. iii. (In Bibliotheca Patrum, ed. Colon. t. ix.)
- Bellarmin de Cultu Sanctorum; tom. iii. oper.
- J. Gretseri de sacris et religiosis Peregrinationibus Libr. iv. (Oper. tom. iv. p. 2, p. 1—180. Regensb. 1734 fol.)
- N. Serarii Sacri Peripatetici, s. Libri Duo de Sacris Eccles. Cathol. Processionibus.
- N. Sanderi Auctariolum ad Serarium Gretserumque de ritu Cathol. Processionum.
- Jo. Stalenii Peregrinus ad loca sancta ortholoxus et pius demonstratus, sive Vindicie Sacrarum Peregrinationum.
- T. M. Mamachi Antiquitt. Christian. tom. ii. de Peregrinatione veterum Christianorum in Palæstinam.
- Pet. Lazeri Disq. de sacra veterum Christianorum Romana Peregrinatione.

*Works of Protestant Writers.*

- Pt. Molinei Traet. de Peregrinationibus Superstitiosis. (Attached to his edition of Gregor. Nyss. Epist. de Euntibus Ierosolym.)
- J. H. Heidegger Dissertatio de Peregrinatt. Relig. in specie Hierosolymitana, Romana, Compostellensi, Laurentana, et Eremitana.
- Meh. Förtsch Exerc. hist.-theol. de Peregrinat. religiosis Judaico-ethnico pontificiis.
- H. Benzeli Exerc. de Peregrinationibus Religiosis, scripta a. 1724 (Syntagma Dissertatt. p. i. p. 51—83).

## MONACHISM.

Pt. Calzolari *Historia Monastica.*

M Galeni *Origines Monasticæ.*

Hospinian. de *Monachis, h. e. de origine et progressu Monachatus et ordinum Monasticorum equitumque militarium libri sex.*

Crececlii *Collectanea de origine et fundatione omnium fere Monasticorum ordinum.*

Prosp. Stellartii *Annales Monastici.*

J. Mabillon de *Monachorum origine, statu, et regulis in Occidente ante Benedictum.* (Præf. ad Act. Sanctor.)

A. D. Alteserra *Asceticon, s. Originum rei Monasticæ libri x.*

J. Hildebrand de *Religiosis eorumque variis Ordinibus.*

Helyot, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques.*

L. A. Muratori *Diss. de Monasterior. erectione et Monachorum institutione* (*Antiq. Ital. med. ævi tom. v.*)

Weber, *Die Möncherei, oder geschichtl. Darstell. der Klosterwelt.*

Roderique, de *Abbatibus eorumque Origine Primæva.*

Samburinus, de *Jurib. et Privilegiis Abbatum.*

Casp. Barthel, *Dissert. de Jure et Jurisdictione Abbatum.*

Van Espen, *Jus Eccles. Univ. p. i. tit. xxxi. c. 6, § 10.*

## INDEX.

- ΑΒΒΟΤΣ (Abbates), 781  
 Absolutio, baptism so called, 485  
 Absolution of penitents, 633—636,  
 641—644  
 Accipere pœnitentiam, 629  
 Acclamation in the election of minis-  
 ters by the people, 330  
 Acclamation in divine worship, 454,  
 455  
 Ascetarium, &c., *i. q.* asceterium, 783  
 Acolyths, 304, 305  
 Acta Sanctorum, 441  
 Address to the Gentiles, a work of  
 Tatian, 76, 78  
 Ἀδελφοί, a title of Christians, 181; of  
 the baptized, as distinguished from  
 catechumens, 195  
 Administration of baptism, 509—522;  
 of confirmation, 539—542; of the  
 Lord's supper, 552—568  
 Ἄδυστον, ἄβυστον, *i. q.* βῆμα, 720  
 Advent, 665  
 Advocates, not permitted to receive  
 ordination, 314  
 Aërius, his opinion concerning episco-  
 pacy, 241, 251; his objection against  
 the use of prayers for the dead, 427  
 African liturgy, 417  
 Agape, feasts of charity; origin of the  
 name and of the custom, 764; mode  
 of celebration, 765; time and place  
 of celebration, 766; abolition of the  
 custom, 767; agape natalitiæ,—con-  
 nubiales,—funerales, 767  
 — celebration of, in connexion with  
 the Lord's supper, 600, 601  
 Ἀγάπη, 545  
 Ἀγαπητοί, a title of baptized Chris-  
 tians, 195  
 Age required as a qualification for  
 ordination, 317, 318  
 Ἄγιοι, a title of Christians, 181; of the  
 baptized as distinguished from ca-  
 techumens, 195  
 Ἄγιοι, ἀγιώτατοι, epithets applied to  
 bishops, 214  
 Ἄγιον, ἀγίασμα, ἄγιον ἀγίων, *i. q.* βῆμα,  
 719  
 Agnus Dei, 598  
 Ἀθήριον, the open space round a church,  
 or churchyard, 725  
 Ἀκέφαλοι, αὐτοκέφαλοι, independent  
 bishops, 221, 233  
 Ἀκοίμητοι, a class of monks, 779  
 Ἀκροωμένοι, a class of penitents,  
 629  
 Albis, 521  
 Album, 202  
 Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, 132  
 Alexandrian Christians, their system  
 of allegorizing Scripture, 134, 135  
 — liturgy, 416, 420  
 All-Saints' day, 696  
 Alms, distribution of, at marriages,  
 752; at funerals, 760  
 Almsdeeds, supposed to be meritorious  
 in the eye of God, by Cyprian, 150;  
 by Lactantius, 161  
 Altar, use of the word, 704  
 — high, 721  
 Ama, amula, 586  
 Ambo, ἄμβων, the reader's desk, 444,  
 722  
 Ambrose, his testimony concerning the  
 use of prayers for the dead, 426  
 Amen, use of this word in the ancient  
 church, 379; by communicants in  
 the Lord's supper, 587, 595  
 Ἀμύητοι, ἄμυστοι, ἀμυσταγώγητοι, titles  
 of catechumens, their origin and  
 date, 195  
 Ἀμυλητον, 551  
 Anachoretae, anchorites, 778  
 Ἀνάδοχοι, deaconesses so called, 300  
 Ἀνάδοχοι, sponsors so called, 523  
 Ἀναγνώστης, reader, 303  
 Ἀνακαμπτήρια, connected with churches,  
 728  
 Ἀνάκτορον, *i. q.* basilica, 720  
 Ἀνάκτορον, *i. q.* βῆμα, 720  
 Ἀναφορά, 546  
 Anathema maranatha, 619

- Anthemata, ornaments of churches, 741
- <sup>Ἀνάξιος</sup>, note of disapprobation or rejection at the election of ministers, 330
- Ancille, 296
- Ancille Dei, 781
- Andrew's, St., day, 697
- Angel of Penitence, mention of, in the Shepherd of Hermas, 620, 621
- Angeli ecclesie, a title of bishops, 212
- Angels, their supposed interference in the government of the world, taught by Athenagoras, 80; by Eusebius, 163
- fallen, regarded as the originators of idolatry, 80
- Anglo-Saxon liturgy, 418
- Annual fast, 660
- festivals, 654—657
- Annulus, a ring, one of the episcopal insignia, 217
- Annunciation, feast of the, 689—691
- Anointing, baptism why so called, 484
- of the sick, 752, 753
- Antelmy, Joseph, his opinion concerning the author of the Athanasian creed, 482
- Antichrist, opinion of Irenæus concerning, 91
- Antioch, creed of, 476; liturgy of, 414
- <sup>Ἀντίπασχα</sup>, Sunday after Easter, 677
- Antistites, antistites sacrorum, *i. q.* *episcopi*, 211
- <sup>Ἀφεσις</sup>, absolution, 641—644
- <sup>Ἀφορισμός</sup>, ordination, 312
- <sup>Ἀφορισμός</sup>, *i. q.* <sup>ἔξορκισμός</sup>, 515
- Apocalypse, 440, 442
- Apoerisarii, 310
- Apoeryphal books, use of, in the ancient church, 440
- Apologies of Justin Martyr, First and Second, 71, 72
- Apology of Claudius Apollinaris, 79
- of Melito, 79
- of Miltiades, 79
- of Minucius Felix, 129
- Apostles' creed, 463, 464, 477
- their office and employment, 204, 205
- <sup>Ἀποστολεῖον</sup>, 704
- Apostolical Canons, so called; their probable date and origin, 174
- Constitutions, so called; their author, contents, and date considered, 171—173; real value of the work, 173, 174; their testimony concerning the use of prayers for the dead in the early church, 431; concerning the public use of Holy Scripture, 438; and concerning the practice of preaching, 451; creed of, 473, 474; their testimony concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 555, 556, 566
- Apostolici, a title of metropolitans, 224
- , apostolicals, certain monks so called, 780
- <sup>Ἀπόστολοι</sup>, *i. q.* <sup>ἐπίσκοποι</sup>, 211
- <sup>Ἀπόστολος</sup>, meaning and application of the term, 204
- <sup>Ἀπόστολος</sup>, *i. e.* the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, 442
- Apotactites, 79
- <sup>Ἀποταγή</sup>, abrenuntiatio, 512
- <sup>Ἀποταξάμενοι</sup>, certain monks so called, 780
- Applauses, popular, during the delivery of sermons, 454, 455
- Appointment of ministers, extraordinary modes of, 335
- Apsis, or absis, 720
- Aquarii, 79
- Aquileia, creed of, 477
- Archbishop, date and use of the title, 219
- Archdeacons, origin and history of their office, 292—295; their functions, 295
- <sup>Ἀρχὴ ἐτέρου βίου</sup>, baptism so called, 486
- Archimandrites, 781
- Architecture, ecclesiastical, history of, 707—713
- Architerium, &c., *i. q.* *asceterium*, 783
- <sup>Ἀρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν</sup>, *i. q.* <sup>ἐπίσκοποι</sup>, 213
- Archpresbyters, their influence and duties; their gradual subjection to archdeacons, 283, 284
- Area, or open space round a church, 726
- martyrum, *area sepulcrarum*, 706
- Arius, creed presented by him to Constantine, 476
- Arms extended in prayer, 393
- , &c., laid aside upon entering a church, 739
- Arnobius, his Disputation against the Heathen, 159; his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 425, 426
- <sup>Ἀρράβων</sup>, 551
- Arrhæ and Arrhabones, the earnest of marriage, 749
- <sup>Ἀρτομαχία</sup>, 588
- Ascension-day, 678, 679
- Asceterium, &c., (<sup>ἀσκήτηριον</sup>), a monastery, why so called, 783
- Ascetics (<sup>Ἀσκηταί</sup>) in the early church,



- who, 193, 775, 777; difference between them and monks, 199, 314—316
- Ash-Wednesday, 666—668
- Asinarii, as a term of reproach, 133
- Aspect of churches, 717, 718
- Aspersion or sprinkling, a mode of baptism, 504
- Asyla, or places of sanctuary, 740, 741
- Ἀτελέστεροι, a class of catechumens, 193
- Athanasian creed, 480—433
- Athenagoras, his history, 79; analysis of his Embassy in behalf of the Christians, 80, 81; of his Treatise on the Resurrection, 81
- Ἀθεοί, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 167
- Attendere ad preces, 333
- Audientes, a class of catechumens, 192
- , a class of penitents, 629
- Augustin, his testimony concerning the use of prayers for the dead, 429, 430
- Aula baptismatis, *i. q.* baptisterium, 501
- Aurum trionicum, exemption of the clergy from that tax, 339
- Authors, Jewish and profane, their testimony concerning the rites and practices of the early church, 175—180
- Autolycus, treatise to, by Theophilus of Antioch, analysis of, 82—84
- Ἀξία, ἀξίωμα, *i. q.* τάξις, 203
- Ἀξίως, note of approbation at the election of ministers, 330
- BANNS of marriage, 717
- Baptism, names or appellations of, 483—486; to whom administered, 486—492; ministers of, 492—496; times of, 496—499; place of, 499—502; mode and form of, 502—509; observances and ceremonies connected with it, 509—522; baptismal sponsors and names, 522—531
- by heretics, 496
- by laymen, 495
- classes of persons excluded from, 490—492
- connexion of confirmation with, 534—538
- Lord's supper administered immediately after, 572
- of church bells, question concerning, 731, 732
- of infants, 486
- opinion of Tertullian concerning this sacrament in his treatise *De Baptismo*, 115, 116
- Baptism, sometimes made compulsory, 489, 490
- vicarious, of the living for the dead, 487, 488
- Βαπτισμός (*βάπτισμα*, *βάπτω*, *βαπτίζω*) 484
- Baptisteries, 500, 726
- Barnabas, Epistle of; general character of its contents; question of its genuineness, 65
- Barnabas, St., the apostle, 692, 693
- Bartholomew, St., the apostle, 694
- Basil, liturgy of, 413
- Basilica, a church, 704
- Βαθμός, *i. q.* τάξις, 203
- Baths, sometimes attached to churches, 728
- Beati, beatissimi, epithets applied to bishops, 214
- Βήλα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 723
- Belfries, 729
- Bells, when first attached to churches, 729, 730; their uses, 730, 731; consecration and baptism of, 731, 732; when introduced into England, 731
- Bema, or sanctuary in churches, 719—721; οἱ τοῦ Βήματος, τάξις τοῦ Βήματος, a title of the clergy, 202
- Βήμα τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν, *i. q.* ἄμβων, 722
- Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, 132
- Bethphania, Epiphany why so called, 636
- Biathanati, or biathanati, as a term of reproach, 87
- Βιωτικοί, a term applied to the laity, 189
- Bishops, their names and titles, 210—214; office and duties, 214—217; insignia or emblems of their office, 217—219; orders or classes, 219—233; difference between bishops and presbyters, 233—262
- ministers of ordination in the ancient church, 320, 321
- required to preach, 451
- profane homage paid to them, in the Apostolical Constitutions, 171
- Βωμός, altar, 704
- Βοσκολί, a class of monks, why so called, 730
- Bowing of the head, or of the body, 393
- Bread, breaking of bread, &c., the Lord's supper so called, 544
- used in the celebration of the Lord's supper, 587—589
- British liturgy, 418
- Burial grounds, among the Jews and Romans; among Christians, 754, 755

- Burying of the dead in churchyards, when first practised, 726  
 — of the dead in the naves and choirs of churches, when introduced, 737  
 — of the dead; this practice preferred by Christians to that of burning the corpse, 753, 754
- CESAREA in Cappadocia, liturgy of, 413  
 — in Palestine, creed of, 475
- Caligæ, 218
- Calix Stationarius, 771
- Calumnies of the heathen against the Christians, 80, 81, 111, 112
- Campana, a church bell, why so called, 730
- Campanarium, campanile, 729
- Cancellarii, chancellors, 311
- Cancelli, a partition between the choir of a church and the nave, 720
- Cancellus, a pulpit for preaching from, why so called, 722
- Candidates for holy orders, their examination, 318, 319
- Candlemas Day, the feast of the Purification, why so called, 689
- Canon of Scripture; views of Origen, 137, 138; of Eusebius, 169, 170; in the (so-called) Apostolical Canons, 174
- Canonical virgins, 776
- Canonici regulares seculares, 777
- Canons, apostolical. See Apostolical Canons
- Cantate, fourth Sunday after Easter, why so called, 678
- Cantharus, a water-vessel before a church, 725
- Cantor, 307
- Caput jejunii, 666  
 — totius ecclesie, 232
- Carceres ecclesie, *i. q.* decanica, prisons or houses of correction belonging to the church, 727
- Cardinal, a modern title, 221
- Carissimi in Jesu Christi filii, a title of baptized Christians, 195
- Carnis privium, 666
- Casa, casa Dei, *i. q.* tabernaculum, 706
- Cassian, a follower of Tatian, 79
- Catechete, deacons, so called on account of their share in catechetical instruction, 291
- Catechetica, 460
- Catechetical instruction, 460—463; a preliminary of baptism, 509, 510
- Catechismus, 460
- Catechumens, who, 192; their teachers and schools, 192; their term of probation and instruction, 192; their classes or orders, 193; not allowed to receive ordination, 313; prayer for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 337—339
- Cathedral churches, 706
- Catholici, a title of Christians, 184
- Ceimeliarchæ, 310
- Celebration of divine worship, an act of the bishop, 214  
 — — the Lord's supper, weekly, daily, 571
- Celibacy of the clergy, 744, 745
- Census capitis, exemption of the clergy from that tax, 338
- Centenarius, an officer in a monastery, 781
- Ceremonies connected with public prayer and psalmody, 391—396  
 — at baptism, 509—522  
 — at confirmation, 539—542  
 — at the administration of the Lord's supper, 592—602  
 — of marriage, 748—752  
 — at funerals, 753—763
- Cereus paschalis, 674
- Chancel, 720
- Chapters of clergy, date of their origin, 217
- Χάρις, χάρισμα, baptism so called, 485
- Charis y, kiss of. See Kiss.
- Charity schools, 728
- Charlemagne first establishes tithes by civil law, 350
- Χειμάζοντες, χειμαζόμενοι, 198
- Χειροθεσία, 322
- Χειροτονία, 313, 322
- Χήραι, widows, 297
- Choir (chorus), 720
- Χώρα, *i. q.* ταξίς, 203
- Chorepiscopi, rural bishops, their date and origin; their office, rights, and privileges; abolition of the order, 222, 223
- Chrestiani, for Christiani, 83
- Χρισμα, 518, 533
- Christ, his divine nature as the Son or Word of God; doctrine of Theophilus of Antioch, 82, 83; Irenæus, 86, 90; Clement of Alexandria, 95, 102—104; Dionysius of Alexandria, 153, 154; Gregory of Neocæsarea, 156, 157; Lactantius, 160, 161; Eusebius, 163
- Χριστευτορεία, simony, 316
- Christian hope and character, described by Clement of Rome, 62; Christian perfection, according to

- Clement of Alexandria, 101, 102, 103, 104
- Christians, origin and adoption of the title, 182
- their divisions or classes, as enumerated in the New Testament, 183, 189; by Eusebius, 190; by Jerome, 190
- Christmas, 656; Christmas-Day, 697, 698
- Christophori, an epithet of Christians, 184
- Chrysargyrum, exemption of the clergy from that tax, 339
- Chrysostom, liturgy of, 413, 414; his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 423, 429; and concerning the public reading of holy Scripture, 439
- Church, derivation and meaning of the word, 702, 703
- the meaning of this term in the New Testament, and in the works of early ecclesiastical writers, 190
- built by Gregory of Neocesarea, 156; consecration of a church at Tyre by Paulinus, 164
- Churches, names or appellations of, 702—707; history of, 707—713; forms of, 714—716; site and position of, 716—718; structure and parts of, 718—738; respect shown to, 738—741; ornaments of, 741, 742
- celebration of the Agapæ in them, when forbidden, 767
- Church bells, 729, 734
- doors, 736, 737
- government and discipline, entrusted to the bishop, 215—217
- organs, 734—736
- ornaments, 811, 812
- pavements, 737
- pictures, 742, 812—814
- property, 348—351
- registers, 801
- towers, 729
- windows, 737
- yards, 725, 726; the dead, when first buried in them, 726; consecration of, 754
- Ciborium, 705
- Cibus Dei, &c., 550
- Circumcision, or the great circumcision, baptism so called, 486
- Circumcision, feast of the, 683—685
- Civil officers, not permitted to receive ordination, 314
- Classes of Christians in the New Testament, 183, 189
- Classes or degrees (stations) of penitents, 628—631
- or orders of bishops, 219—233; of presbyters, 233, 234; of deacons, 238; of monks, 775—781
- Claudius Apollinaris, a Christian apologist, 79
- Clastrum, cloister, 782
- Clement of Alexandria, his history and writings, 94, 95; analysis of his Exhortation to the Heathen, 95; of his *Pædagogus*, 96, 97; of his *Stromata*, 97—107; his character as a Christian writer, 107—109; his testimony concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 563
- of Rome, whether or not the companion of St. Paul; probable date of his death; character of his epistle to the Corinthians; present state of the copy; spurious writings under the name of Clement; analysis of the epistle to the Corinthians, 58—64; this epistle publicly read in the ancient churches, 441
- Clementines, 59
- Clergy, their rank, rights, and privileges, 337—341; punishment of delinquents, 342—345; their revenues, 345—351
- election of the. See Election
- habit and vestments of the, 351—354
- celibacy of the, 744, 745
- remarks of Chrysostom, Jerome, and Gregory Nazianzen, concerning their character and duties, 354—371
- Clerici, regulares, sæculares, 777
- Clerus, clerici, the clergy, meaning and origin of the term, 190, 191, 201, 202
- Clinici, not allowed to receive ordination, 315
- Cloister, a monastery, why so called, 782
- Cloisters attached to churches, 725
- Cœlestis regni comparatio, baptism so called, 465
- Cœlicolæ, (probably) a term of reproach applied to Christians, 183
- Cœmeteria, *κοιμήτηρια*, burial-grounds why so called, 754
- Cœmeterium, a house of worship erected at the burial-place of a martyr, 706
- Cœna Domini, the Lord's supper, 543
- pura, Good Friday, why so called, 671, 672
- Cœnæ, cœnula, the feasts of charity so called, 767

- Cenobite, 778  
 Cenobium, a monastery, why so called, 782  
 Coffins, use of, by Christians, 756  
 Collationes superindictæ et extraordinariæ, exemption of the clergy from such tribute, 339  
 Collegiati, *i. q.* copiate, 309  
 Colorbasus, a follower of Valentinus, 87  
 Commendatory prayer for the dead, 759  
 Commistri, 281  
 Communicants in the Lord's supper; persons admitted to communicate, 577—580; their preparation, 580—586; their acts and conduct, 586, 587  
 Communicatio, communio, the Lord's supper so called, 544, 545  
 Communio laica, 344  
 — peregrina, 343  
 — servorum, 670  
 Communion, different senses of the word, doctrinal, historical, or ecclesiastical and liturgical, 544, 545  
 — in both kinds, 593, 594  
 — table, how covered at the administration of the Lord's supper, 574, 575  
 Compatries, commatres, *i. q.* sponsore, 523  
 Competentes, a class of catechumens, 193; prayer for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 400, 401  
 Concha, conchula hematis, 720  
 Concilia, conciliabula, *i. q.* ecclesiæ, 705  
 — plenaria, 273  
 Concio, *i. q.* sermo, homilia, 448  
 Confession, auricular or private, 639, 640  
 Confession of sin required of penitents, 631, 632  
 Confirmation, derivation of this rite from the practice of the apostles, 531—534; in connexion with baptism, 534—538; by whom administered, 215, 538—548; mode of its administration, 540—542  
 Consacerdotes, 281  
 Consanguinity or affinity, degrees of, 744  
 Consecration and benediction, acts of the bishop, 215  
 — of churches, 739, 740; of churchyards, 754; of church-bells, 731—734  
 Consent of parties necessary in order to marriage, 749  
 Consistentes, a class of penitents, 630  
 Constantinople, liturgy of, 413  
 Constitutions, Apostolical. See Apostolical Constitutions  
 Contract of marriage, 749  
 Contributions for the support of public worship, 346, 347  
 Conventiculum, *i. q.* ecclesia, 705, 706  
 Conventus, convent, a monastery, why so called, 783  
 Conversi, in monasteries, 777  
 Conversion of St. Paul, feast of the, 687, 688  
 Convivia baptismalia, 522  
 Copiate, 308  
 Corinthians, Epistle to, by Clement of Rome, analysis of, 58—64  
 Cornu evangelii, cornu epistolæ, 722  
 Corona, 217  
 Corporal punishment, inflicted on delinquent clergymen, 344, 345  
 Corpus Christi, *i. q.* ecclesia, 706  
 — — the bread in the Lord's supper, 550  
 Councils, ecclesiastical, their origin, 270—272; extent, 272, 273; form or constitution, 273—275; œcumenical, or general, 275, 276  
 Couriers or messengers, employed in giving notice of the celebration of divine worship, 730  
 Cramer, on episcopacy, 240, 243  
 Creed, apostles', 463, 464  
 — trace of, in the writings of Ignatius, 465  
 — of Irenæus, 466  
 — — Tertullian, 467  
 — — Origen, 469, 470  
 — — Cyprian, 470  
 — — Gregory of Neocæsarea, 471  
 — — Lucian the Martyr, 472, 473  
 — — the Apostolical Constitutions, 473, 474  
 — — Jerusalem, 474, 475  
 — — Cæsarea in Palestine, 475  
 — presented by Arius to Constantine, 476  
 — of Antioch, 476  
 — Roman, 477  
 — of Aquileia, 477  
 — Nicene, as first published, 478  
 — Nicene, as completed by the second general council of Constantinople, 478  
 — Athanasian, 480—483  
 — a, use of, in catechetical instruction, 461, 462; subscribed before baptism, 510  
 Cross, the, as a badge of the episcopal office, 218, 219

- Cross, or crucifix, custom of carrying it in funeral processions, 757, 758  
 — sign of the, mentioned by Tertullian, 119; a preliminary of baptism, 517; made at confirmation, 541; at the administration of the Lord's supper, 599
- Cruz collaria, a cross suspended from the neck, 218  
 — gestatoria, a cross carried in procession, 219  
 — stationalis, 771
- Cryptæ (*κρυπταί*), 717
- Culdei, certain monks so called, 780
- Curie tradi, 344
- Curiales not to be ordained, 314
- Curtains, in churches, 723
- Custodes, 310
- Cypress, why not used at Christian funerals, 758
- Cyprian, his history, 144—146; his treatise to Donatus, 146; on the vanity of idols, 147; proofs against the Jews, on the dress of virgins, 147; on the unity of the church, 147; on the lapsed, 148; on the Lord's Prayer, 148, 149; on mortality, 149; exhortation to the suffering of martyrdom, 149; address to Demetrian, 149; on good works and alms-deeds, 149, 150; on patience, 150; on envy and ill-will, 159; epistles, 150, 151  
 — creed of, 470  
 — his proceedings with regard to the lapsed, 624—627  
 — his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 425; concerning the public reading of holy Scripture, 438; concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 564—566
- Cyril of Alexandria, liturgy of, 416  
 — of Jerusalem, his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 426
- DAILY celebration of the Lord's supper, 571
- Δαιμονιζόμενοι, who, meaning of the term, 197, 198
- Dairo, 783
- Dare orationem, 382, 383  
 — pacem, 634  
 — penitentiam, 629
- Day-time chosen by Christians for the celebration of funerals, 755
- Deacons, their name, origin, and rank, 284—288; their offices and duties, 288—292; their classes or orders, 292—303; their presence in councils, 274
- Deaconesses, their names, functions, and ordination, 298—300; extinction of the office, 300, 301
- Dead, prayer for the, in the ancient church, 421—437; protested against in the book of Homilies, 436, 437; form of prayer for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 431, 432  
 — practice of baptizing them, 467, 468  
 — administration of the Eucharist to them, 580  
 — when first buried in church-yards, 726  
 — custom of burying them in the naves and choirs of churches, 737
- Decani, *i. q.* copiatæ, 309
- Decanica, decaneta, or decanica, prisons or houses of correction belonging to churches, 727
- Decanus, dean, 263, 284  
 — an officer in a monastery, 781
- Decime, tithes, 349—351
- Decimatio anni, 657
- Δεηθῶμεν, Let us pray, use of this formula in the ancient church, 362, 363
- Defensores, or syndici, 311
- Degradation, a punishment of offending clergymen, 343
- δέσπνα κοινά, *i. q.* agapæ, 764
- δέσπνον κυριακόν, the Lord's supper, 543
- δέλτοι, δέλτοι ἱερά, or μυστικά, diptychs, 801
- Delubrum, use of the word by the early Christians, 705
- Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, 131, 132
- Demons, their history, according to Athenagoras, 80; influence of, Tertullian, 121; Eusebius, 163  
 — supposed to be put to flight by the ringing of church-bells, 734
- Deo carissimi, an epithet applied to bishops, 214
- Deprivation (*privatio communionis*), a punishment inflicted on delinquent clergymen, 343, 344
- Desperati, as a term of reproach, 167
- Diaconicum bematis, or minus; diaconicum majus, 721  
 — magnum, 726
- Diadema, 217
- Διάδοχοι τῶν ἀποστόλων, a title of bishops, 212

- Διακαινισμός**, first week after Easter, why so called, 679  
**Διάκονος**, *διακονία*, *διακονεῖν*, 284  
**Διακόνισσα**, ἡ *διάκονος*, deaconess, 293  
 Dialogue with Trypho, by Justin Martyr, notice of that work, 73  
**Διδάσκαλος**, doctor, 208  
**Διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων**, 440  
**Dies absolutiois**, 671  
 — cinerum, 666—668  
 — cenæ Dominicæ, 670  
 — Dominicus, the Lord's day, 651  
 — lucis, 670  
 — luminum, 666  
 — mandati, 670  
 — natalis eucharistæ, 670  
 — Neophytorum, 677  
 — panis, 670  
 — — the Lord's day why so called, 571  
 — — Maunday Thursday, or the Thursday before Easter, 669—671  
 — salutaris, 671  
 — solis, Sunday, 651  
 — viridinum, 671  
**Δικανίκιον**, a pastoral staff, 217  
 Dioceses metropolitica and patriarchal at the end of the fourth century, 262—270  
 Dionysius of Alexandria, his history, 151, 152, 154, 155; his opinions, and treatise entitled A Refutation and Defence, 153, 154  
 — — Corinth, 79  
 Diptycha, diptychs or church-registers, 891  
 Disciplina, *i. q.* pœnitentia, 616  
 — arcana, system of secret instruction, 376, 462, 463  
 Disputatio, disputare, of lectures on Scripture, 448  
 Distribution of the elements of the Lord's supper, 593—599  
 Divina indulgentia, baptism so called, 485  
 Divine worship, by whom celebrated in the earliest ages of the church, 214, 280  
 Divinity of Christ. See Christ.  
 Divorce, 746  
**Δόγμα**, 157  
**Δογματιεὶ**, or *οἱ τοῦ δόγματος*, a title of Christians in general, 184; *οἱ τοῦ δόγματος*, afterwards restricted to the clergy, 202  
 Dominica, Dominicus dies, the Lord's day, 651  
 Dominica in Albis, 656, 677  
 — Palmarum, or in Palmis, 659  
 Dominicalia, veils worn by women at the time of receiving the eucharist, 581  
 Dominus vobiscum, use of this salutation in the ancient church, 382  
 Domus Dei.—ecclesiæ,—divina, the Lord's house, *i. e.*, a church, 702  
 Donum, donum gratiæ, *δῶρον*, baptism so called, 485  
 Doors of churches, their number, construction, and use, 736, 737  
 Door keepers, 308  
 Dowry, settling of, at espousals, 749  
 Dress of the clergy, ordinary, 351—354  
 Dumb, baptism of the, 489  
 EARLY Christians, their agreement in matters of faith, 86, 87  
 Ears, touching of, a ceremony sometimes used as a preliminary of baptism, 515  
 East, praying towards the, 394, 395, 795—797; turning towards the East, a ceremony observed at baptism, 517; churches built with the altar towards the East, 717, 718  
 Easter, 656, 657; Easter-day, 674—677; Sundays before, 668; Sundays after, 677, 678; disputes concerning the time of its celebration, 655, 656, 675, 676  
 — a baptismal season, 497  
 Easter-Eve, 672—674  
 Ecclesia, a church, *i. e.*, place of Christian worship, 703; the nave of a church, 721  
 Ecclesiæ matriculæ, church-registers, 801  
 Ἐκκλησιαστήριον, a church, *i. e.*, place of Christian worship, 703  
 Ecclesiastical History of Hegesippus, 75, 76  
 — — — Eusebius, 169, 170  
 — institutions, origin of, 189, 190  
 Ecclesiastici, a title of Christians, 184  
 Ἐκκλησιαστικοί, a term appropriated to the clergy, 202  
 Eclectics, 133  
 Ἐκλεκτοί, a title of Christians, 181; of the baptized as distinguished from catechumens, 195  
 — ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, certain ancient ascetics or monks, 200, 779  
 Ἐκτεπώματα, what, 741  
 Εγκόλπιον, a cross suspended from the neck, 218  
 Ἐγουμενείον, 783

- Ἐσθδος τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου, baptism so called, 435
- Ἐλαιον, 518
- Electi, a class of catechumens, 193
- Election of ministers, by the votes of the whole church, 327—330; by visitors, &c., 331—335; election by the whole church, abuses of, 331; such election forbidden, 334; rights of the people in this respect lost, 332, 333
- Elements of the Lord's supper, 537—592, consecration of, 592; distribution of, 593—599; correctly described by Tertullian, as a figure or emblem of our Saviour's body and blood, 125; false doctrines in the early church concerning them, 541, 584
- Elevation of the host, 593
- Ἡλιολάτραι, (probably) a term of reproach applied to Christians, 183
- Ἐλπίς, applied to the Lord's supper, 551
- Ἡμέρα ἀσπασμοῦ, the feast of the Annunciation, why so called, 690
- ἐπισωζομένης or σωζομένης, Ascension-day, 679
- ἐνσαρκώσεως, the festival of the Annunciation so called, 691
- τῶν φώτων, *i. q.* Ἐπιφάνια, 636
- Eucenia (ἐγκαίνια), 710
- Eueratites, 76, 530
- Ἐνδυμα ἀβρααρσίας, baptism so called, 496
- Energumens (ἐνεργούμενοι or δαμονιζόμενοι), who, 197, 198; regulations of the early church concerning them, 196; not allowed to receive ordination, 314; prayer for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 399, 400; sometimes baptized, 439
- Ephesus, liturgy of, 418
- Ἐφῶδιον, viaticum, baptism so called, 435; and the Lord's supper, 551
- Ἐφθοροι, *i. q.* ἐπίσκοποι, 212
- Ἐπίκλησις τῶν πιστῶν, 403
- Epiphanes, a follower of Valentinus, 87
- Epiphanius, his arguments and testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 427, 428
- Epiphany, feast of the, 685—687; a baptismal season, 493
- Episcopary, its origin explained according to the theory of a human or ecclesiastical institution, 234—249; according to the doctrine of a divine or apostolical ordinance, 249—262
- Episcopal order, profane homage paid to it in the Apostolical Constitutions, 179
- Episcopa, episcopissa, 296
- Episcopi rurales or villani, *i. q.* chorepiscopi, 222
- sedis apostolicæ, primæ sedis, primæ cathedræ, titles of metropolitans, 223
- Ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες, 221
- Ἐπίσκοπος, meaning and use of the word, 210
- Episcopus episcoporum, *i. q.* archiepiscopus, 214
- Ἐπισωζομένη, Ascension-day, 679
- Epistola Canonica, of Gregory of Neocesarea, 626
- Epistle of Clement, 53—64
- Epistles and Gospels, 445, 446
- of Ignatius, 66—68
- Ἐπιτάφια, funeral orations, 753, 759
- Equus canonicus, exemption of the clergy from that tax, 339
- Eremitæ, hermits, 778
- Ἐρμηνευταί, interpreters, 310
- Espousals, 749
- Esto Mihi, Quinquagesima Sunday, why so called, 666
- Ἐσυχασταί, monks so called, 739
- Ἐσυχαστήριον, a monastery, why so called, 733
- Ἐγγέλιον, the four gospels, 442
- Ἐγγελισμός, the feast of the Annunciation, why so called, 690
- Eucharist (εὐχαριστία), the Lord's supper, so called, 545. See Lord's supper
- Eucharistia, Maunday Thursday, why so called, 670
- Ἐὐχὴ τῶν πιστῶν, the Lord's prayer, why so called, 196
- προσφωνήσεως, 382, 383
- Ἐὐλογία, *i. q.* εὐχαριστία, 515
- Eulogia, administered to persons not present at the celebration of the Lord's supper, 576, 579
- Eunuchs, maimed and deformed persons, not permitted to receive ordination, 314
- Eusebius of Cesarea, his history, 164, 165; his Chronicon, 165; analysis of his Evangelical Preparation, 166, 167; of his Demonstration of the truth of the Gospel, 167—169; his Treatise against Hierocles, 169; his Ecclesiastical History, 169; other writings, 179, 171
- Evangelists, their office in the early church, 205, 206

- Eve and the Virgin Mary, contrasted by Irenæus, 91
- Evening prayers, 410, 411
- Evil spirits. See Demons
- Examination of candidates for holy orders, 318, 319
- \**Ἐξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας*, *ἑξαρχοι*, Exarchs, 220, 224
- Exaudi, sixth Sunday after Easter, or Sunday after Ascension-day, why so called, 678
- Exceptrices, deaconesses so called, 360
- Excommunication, 345, 618—621
- \**Ἐξέδραι*, *exedrae*, 725
- \**Ἐξηγήσεις*, *ἐξηγήματα*, *ἐξηγητικά*, *ἔκθεσις*, 448
- Exercises, penitential, 631—633
- Exhortation to the Heathen, by Clement of Alexandria, analysis of, 55
- \**Ἐξομολόγησις*, 621, 633, 637
- Exorcism, a preliminary of Baptism, 510—515
- Exorcists, 305, 306
- Expositiones, explanationes, *i. e.*, lectures on Scripture, 448
- Extemporaneous preaching, 458
- Extreme unction, not an ancient ceremony, 752, 753
- FAGO, 586
- Faithful, the, or baptized members of the church,—their names or titles, 194, 195; their rights and privileges, 195—197; prayers for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 403—497; admitted and required to partake of the Lord's supper, 577
- Fanum, use of the word by the early Christians, 705
- Fasting, a preparation for celebrating the Lord's supper, 580
- Fasts, practice of the early church, 657—659; practice of later times, 659—662
- Fathers, or early ecclesiastical authors, use made of their writings; how far respect is due to them, 55—57
- Feasts of Charity. See Agapæ
- Festivals of the ancient church, Origen's enumeration of them, 139
- Festivals, Christian, origin of, 645—647; celebration of, 647, 648; multiplication of, 648, 649; festivals, weekly, 649—654; annual, 654—657; moveable, 663; immoveable, 663, 664
- Festum Candelarum, or Luminum, the feast of the Presentation, why so called, 688
- Festum Trium Regum, Epiphany, why so called, 686
- Fidejussores, sureties, sponsors so called, 523
- First-fruits, 349—351
- Fistuke eucharisticæ, 596
- Flentes, a class of penitents, 629
- Flowers, and branches of trees, churches adorned with, 742  
— strewed by Christians upon the graves of their friends, 760
- Fons, *i. q.* baptisterium, 500
- Fonts, when placed within the walls of churches, 725
- Forgeries in the name of Clement of Rome, 59; in the name of Ignatius, 68
- Forms of absolution, 642, 643  
— — churches, 714—716
- Formulae solennes, in divine worship, 290
- Formulary, baptismal, 505—509
- Fossarii, fossores, *i. q.* copiatæ, 309
- Fountain, or well, baptism so called, 484
- Fratres sportulantes, 347
- Freedmen and slaves not allowed to receive ordination, 314
- Freedom of the human will, asserted by Irenæus, 90, 91; by Tertullian, 124; by Eusebius, 166
- Funeral rites and ceremonies, 753—763
- GALLIANS, Christians so called by the Jews, 182
- Galleries in churches, 722
- Gallican liturgy, 417, 418, 420
- Garlands used at marriages, 751; why Christians did not crown the dead with them, 758
- Γαζοφυλάκιον*, the diaconicum magnum, why so called, 726
- General or Œcumenical Councils, 275, 276
- Γενέθλια*, *γενέθλιος*, *ἡμέρα*, Christmas-day, 697, 698
- Genuflectentes or Substrati, a class of catechumens, 194; a class of penitents, 629
- Gifts at espousals, 749
- Gloria in excelsis, use of this doxology in the ancient church, 381, 382
- Gloves, one of the episcopal insignia, 217
- Gnostici, a term applied to Christians in general, 184; to the clergy in particular, 202
- Gnostics, confutation of, by Irenæus, 85—92



- Godfathers and godmothers, 523  
*Γουδαίνουρες*, a class of penitents, 629  
*Γουδαρία*, 332  
 Good Friday, 671, 672  
 Gratia, baptism so called, 485  
 Great Week, 677  
 Grecian impostors, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 183  
 Gregorii M. Liber sacramentorum, 793—801  
 Gregory Nazianzen, his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 426  
 Gregory of Neocesarea, his history, 155, 156, 153; his opinions, 157; his writings, 153; creed of, 471; his *Epistola Canonica*, 628  
 Gyrovagi, wandering monks, 779
- HAIR and vestments of the clergy, 351—354  
 Hagiographa, 437  
 Hall, Bishop, on the Divine right of Episcopacy, quoted, 249, 250, 251  
 Hallelujah, use of this doxology in the ancient church, 379  
 Hands, folding of, in prayer, 394  
 — imposition of, in confirmation, 510; in ordination,—see Ordination  
 — joining of, at espousals, 751  
 Harmony of the Gospels, by Tatian, 76  
 Heathen worship, its origin and use, according to Origen, 133, 139  
 Hebdomas indulgentiæ, passion-week, why so called, 634  
 — Magna, 656, 676  
 Hegesippus, author of an Ecclesiastical History, 75, 76  
 Hegumeni, abbots, 781  
 Hermas, Shepherd of, 64, 65  
 Hermias, his probable date; analysis of his Satire on the Heathen Philosophers, 74, 75  
 Hermits, 778  
 Hexapla of Origen, 136  
 Holy days. See Festivals  
 — water, use of, an imitation of the lustral sprinklings of the heathen, 725  
 Honey, use of, at baptism, 519, 520  
 Hosannah, use of this doxology in the ancient church, 380  
 Hospitals connected with churches, 728  
 Hydroparastate, 79, 591  
 Hymns, primitive, supposed traces of in the New Testament, 336, 337  
 — use of, in the ancient church, 387—394
- ΙΕΡΕΙΥΣ, a symbolic term, 184  
 Ἰερωδοται, a term applied to the laity, 189, 191  
 Ἰεροστολαί, 213  
 Ἰεραρεῖον, *i. q.* βήμα, 729  
 Ἰεροκήρυκες, deacons, why so called, 299  
 Ἰερουμέναι, the superior class of Christian ministers, 293  
 Ἰερουργία, applied to the celebration of the Lord's supper, 517  
 Ignatius, his history, date of his death; his Epistles, questions concerning their genuineness, 65—68; trace of a creed in his writings, 463; his testimony concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 557—559  
 Illuminatio, baptism so called, 484  
 Images in churches, 742  
 Immersion, a mode of baptism, 592—594  
 Immoveable feasts and holy days, 663, 654  
 Impluvium, 725  
 Imposition of hands at ordination, 322  
 Incense, use of, at the celebration of the Lord's supper, 599, 600  
 Incineratio, 667  
 Indictio festorum mobilium, 687  
 Indulgences, origin of, 631  
 Indulgentia, baptism so called, 485  
 — paschalis, 631  
 Indulgentie stationariæ, 771  
 Infant-baptism, 487  
 Infants, the Lord's supper administered to them, 579, 580  
 Infula, 217  
 Innocentiæ, portus, baptism so called, 486  
 Innocents' day, 700  
 Inspector, *i. q.* episcopus, 210  
 Institutio, 469  
 Insulae, churches, why so called, 706  
 Intercession of saints and angels, taught by Origen, 140  
 Intercessores or interventores, 223  
 Interpretation of Scripture, doctrine concerning, or specimens of, by Theophilus, 83; by Irenæus, 89, 91; Clement of Alexandria, 95, 96, 101, 105, 106, 108; Tertullian, 115, 116, 121, 123; Origen, and other Alexandrians, 134; Origen, 140, 141; Cyprian, 147; Eusebius, 167, 169; in the Apostolical Constitutions, 174  
 Interventores, visitors, 334  
 Investiture, 322

- Invocation of the Holy Spirit at the Lord's supper, 592, 593
- Invocavit, the first Sunday in Lent, why so called, 668
- Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, his history, 84; his writings, 85; analysis of his Refutation of Knowledge falsely so called, or Treatise against Heresies, 85—92; his character as a Christian writer, 92, 93; his testimony concerning episcopacy, 256, 257; creed of, 466; his testimony concerning the administration of the Lord's supper, 562, 563
- Irenicon, Stillingfleet's, design of that treatise, 244, note; quoted, 241, 244, 245
- JAMES, ST., liturgy ascribed to, 414  
— the apostle, festival of, 694
- Janitores, *i. q.* ostiarii, 309
- Jejunium, jejunium perfectum, 662  
— rogationum, or litaniarum, 661
- Jejunia quatuor temporum, 660
- Jerome, his views concerning the origin of episcopacy, 235—240, 252, 253, 257—259; his testimony concerning the use of prayer for the dead, 429
- Jerusalem, creed of, 474, 475
- Jessæans, a name given to Christians, 181
- Jewel, Bishop, on episcopacy, 240, 241
- Jews, Christians, so called by the heathen, 185
- John Baptist's, St., day, 693  
— St., the evangelist's day, 700
- Jubilate, third Sunday after Easter, why so called, 678
- Judica, fifth Sunday in Lent, why so called, 668
- Julian the apostate, amount of his testimony concerning the early church, 178
- Jus asyli, 740, 741
- Justin Martyr, his life, 70; analysis of his First Apology, 71, 72; of his Second Apology, 72; of his Dialogue with Trypho, 73; his other works, 73; his testimony concerning the public use of holy Scripture, 438; concerning preaching, 449; concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 559—561
- Juvenius, a Christian poet, 163
- KANŌN, regula fidei, 463
- Κανὼν, ἅγιος κανὼν, register, sacred register, 202
- Κανονικοὶ, canonici, (*οἱ τοῦ κανόνος, οἱ ἐν τῷ κανόνι,*) a title of the clergy, its meaning and application, 202
- Καταγώγια, connected with churches, 728
- Κατάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί, church registers, 801
- Καταπέτασμα, καταπέτασμα μυστικὸν, 723
- Κατήχησις, (catechesis,) instruction given to catechumens, 192
- Κατηχητής, κατηχιστής, catechist, a teacher of catechumens, 192
- Κατηχισμὸς, *i. q.* κατήχησις, 192
- Κατηχομεῖον (pl. τὰ κατηχομενεῖα, κατηχομενεῖα, or κατηχομενεα), the place in which catechumens were taught, and prepared for baptism, 192, 722
- Καθαρισμὸς, applied to the Lord's supper, 551
- Καθέδρα, the bishop's chair in churches, 720
- Καθίσματα, 770
- Κειμηλιαρχεῖον, the diaconicum magnum, why so called, 726
- Κεφάλαια, sections of Scripture, 443
- Κεφαλὴ, *i. q.* μητροπολίτης, 223
- Κήρυγμα, *i. q.* sermo, homilia, 448
- Κήρυκες, deacons, why so called, 290
- Κηρύσσειν, liturgical meaning of this word, 290
- Κίδαρις, 217
- Kiss at espousals, 749
- Kiss of peace or charity, after baptism, 521; at the celebration of the Lord's supper, 601, 602; at the interment of the dead, 759; at the Agapæ, 765; omitted on Good Friday, 672
- Kissing of church doors, altars, &c., 739
- Kneeling at prayer, 393; enjoined on penitents, 631
- Κοινὰ τράπεζαι, κοινὰ ἐστιάσεις, *i. q.* agapæ, 764
- Κοινωνία, communio, the Lord's supper, so called, 544, 551
- Κολυμβεῖον, a water-vessel before a church, 725
- Κολυμβήθρα, *i. q.* baptisterium, 501
- Κοπιαταί, copiatæ, 308
- Κράμα, κράσις, 590
- Κρήνη, a water-vessel before a church, 725
- Κυριακὴ, the Lord's day, 651
- Κυριακῆ, κυριακὸν, a church, 702
- Kyrie eleison, use of this formula in the ancient church, 381

- ΛΑΒΙΣ, λαβίδιον, 596**  
 Lactantius, his history, 160; analysis of his Christian Institutions, 160—162; his Latin style, 162; his treatise on the Wrath of God, 162, 163; on the Workmanship of God, 163; on the Deaths of Persecutors, 163  
 Lætare, fourth Sunday in Lent, why so called, 668  
 Laici, laity, 190  
 Laity, their presence in councils, 274, 275  
 — and clergy, distinction between, 190, 191  
 Λαμπαδοῦχον, a lighted candelabrum, carried in procession before patriarchs of the Eastern church, 219  
 Λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, a title of Christians in the New Testament, 181  
 Lapsed, case of the, 624—628  
 Laura, a monastery, why so called, 782  
 Lavaerum natalis novi, baptism so called, 486  
 Laver, laver of regeneration, baptism so called, 484  
 Lay baptism, 495  
 Lay brethren in monasteries, 777  
 Laymen excluded from the office of preaching, 453  
 Lecticarii, *i. q.* copiatæ, 308  
 Lectionaries, 444  
 Lectorium, *i. q.* ambo, 444  
 Lectricium, *i. q.* ambo, 444  
 Legends, 441  
 Λειτουργία, applied to the Lord's supper, 547  
 Lent, 660; Sundays in, 668  
 Λεονάριον, a water-vessel before a church, 725  
 Lessons of Scripture, 441, 442  
 Levites, this term applied to deacons, 268  
 Libellatici, 627  
 Libertas asyli, 740  
 Libraries attached to churches, 727  
 Lindsay's Preface to Mason's Vindication quoted, 260—262  
 Litanies, (λατρεία, λίται,) 661  
 Liturgies, ancient history of, 413—421  
 Liturgy, meaning and use of the term, 396, 397  
 — prescribed in the Apostolical Constitutions, 602—615  
 Locns intra cancellos, the chancel, 720  
 Λόγιον, an episcopal ornament, 213  
 Λόγος, *i. q.* oratio, sermon, 448  
 Λόγος κατηχητικός, catechetical lesson, *i. e.*, instruction given to catechumens, 192  
 Lord's day, observance of the, 649—654; prayer for the, 403, 469  
 — Prayer, use of, in the primitive church, 372—378  
 — Supper, its names or appellations, 542—551; celebration of this sacrament in successive periods of the church, 552—568; times of celebration, 568—573; place of celebration, 574—575; by whom administered, 575—577; partakers of this sacrament, 577—587; the sacred elements, 587—592; observance and ceremonies connected with the administration of this sacrament, 592—602; Liturgy or formularies used at its celebration, 602—615; opinion of Irenæus concerning this ordinance, 90; celebration of it at funerals, 759  
 Λουτρά, baths, 728  
 Low Sunday, 677  
 Lucian the martyr, creed of, 472, 473  
 — of Samosata, his testimony concerning the rules and practices of the early church, 177  
 Luke, St., the evangelist, 695  
 Lux mentis, oculorum, baptism so called, 485  
 MAGICIANS, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 186  
 Majores diœcesium episcopi, 230  
 Μακάριοι, μακαριώτατοι, epithets applied to bishops, 214  
 Mandra (μάνδρα), a monastery, why so called, 783  
 Manna cœlestis, 550  
 Mansionaria, (ecclesia,) 771  
 Mansionarii, *i. q.* ostiarii, 309; *i. q.* παραμονάριοι, 310; *i. q.* stationarii, 771  
 Marcosians, 87  
 Marcus, a follower of Valentinus, 87  
 Mark, St., liturgy ascribed to, 416  
 Mark's, St., day, 691, 692  
 Marriage, laws and customs relating to, in the Christian church, 743—748; marriage rites and ceremonies, 748—752  
 — abstinence from, advocated by Tatian, 78; referred to by Eusebius, 168  
 — lawfulness of, maintained by Clement of Alexandria, 100, 101  
 — second, unlawfulness of, maintained by Athenagoras, 81; by Tertullian, 116, 117, 121; persons who had contracted a second marriage not permitted to receive ordination, 314

- Μάρτυρες*, *i. q.* sponsors, 522  
*Μαρτύριον*, 704  
 Martyrdom, 101, 102, 112, 113, 142, 143  
 Martyrologies, 441  
 Mass, the Lord's supper so called, 548, 549  
 Masses, private, origin of, 573; for the dead, origin of, 759  
*Μαθηταί*, an original title of Christians, 181  
 Matricula, 202  
 Matriculae ecclesiae, church registers, 801  
 Matricularii, 311  
 Matrinxæ, godmothers, 523  
 Matrimony, solemnization of, 751, 752  
*Ματρονίκιον*, 723  
 Matthew, St., the apostle, 695  
 Matthias's, St., day, 639  
 Maunday Thursday, 669—671  
 Medicamentum, medicina corporis et mentis, the Lord's supper so called, 551  
 Meletius, 332  
 Melito, 79  
 Memoria, 704  
*Μεμνημένοι*, a title of baptized Christians, its meaning, origin, and date, 195  
 Mensa, *i. q.* martyrism, 704  
 — Deï, the Lord's table, 543  
 Mensula, side table, 721  
*Μεσίτης*, mediator, a title wrongly applied to presbyters, 282  
*Μεσοπεντεκοστή*, 680  
*Μεταληψις*, *i. q.* *κοινωνία*, 551  
*Μετανοία μικρά, μεγάλη*, 393  
 Metatorium or mutatorium, the diaconicum magnum, why so called, 726  
 Metatum, exemption of the clergy from that tax, 339  
*Μητέρες ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου φωτισματος*, godmothers, 523  
 Metropolitans, their names and titles, 220, 223—225; origin of their office, 225; metropolitans in the East and West, 225, 226; their office, rights, and privileges, 226—228; their elections and ordinations, 228  
 Milanese liturgy, 417  
 Milk, use of, at baptism, 520  
 Millennium, or doctrine of the personal reign of Christ on earth, taught by Irenæus, 92; by Tertullian, 124, 125; its universal acceptance in the early church, 125; when first called in question, 125; opinion of Origen relating to it, 142; doctrine of Lactantius, 161, 162  
 Miltiades, a Christian apologist, 79  
 Ministers, Christian, their names and titles, 201—203; division of them into ordinary and extraordinary, 203, 204; extraordinary ministers, namely, apostles, evangelists, prophets, 204—208; ordinary ministers, namely, bishops or presbyters (afterwards bishops and presbyters), and deacons, 208—210; ministers at first not appointed to their office without the consent and co-operation of the church, 327  
 — of baptism, 492—496; of confirmation, 538, 539; of the Lord's supper, 575—577  
 Ministræ, 296  
 Minucius Felix, his Apology for the Christian Religion, 129  
 Miracles in the early church, 87, 88  
 Misericordias Domini, second Sunday after Easter, why so called, 678  
 Missa, mass, 548  
 — presanctificatorum, 672  
 Mitra, 217  
 Mixed marriages, 745, 746  
 Mode and form of baptism, 502—509  
*Μοναχή*, monacha, 739  
 Monachi sæculares, 780  
 Monachism, origin of, 775—777  
*Μονυχοί, μονάζοντες*, monks, 778  
 Monarchæ, a title of metropolitans, 224  
 Monasteria, large churches so called, 705  
 Monasteries, 781—783  
*Μοναστήριον*, meaning of the term, 782  
*Μόνη*, monialis, 780  
 Monks, orders or classes of, 777—781  
 Montfaucon, his opinion concerning the author of the Athanasian Creed, 482  
 Monthly fasts, 661, 662  
 Monuments in memory of the dead, 755  
 Morning prayers, 409, 412  
 Mors peccatorum, baptism so called, 485  
 Mourning for the dead, 761—763  
 Moveable feasts and holy days, 663, 664  
 Mozarabic liturgy, 418  
*Μύσταις*, baptism so called, 485  
 Muratori, his opinion concerning the author of the Athanasian Creed, 483  
 Murder, crime of, falsely charged upon the early Christians, 81  
*Μύρον*, 518, 521, 510

- Μυσταγωγία**, baptism so called, 485 ; term applied to the Lord's supper, 547  
**Μυσταί**, *μυσταγωγητοί*, 195  
**Μυστήριον**, (arcanum, sacramentum,) baptism so called, 485  
 —, *μυστήριον τῆς εἰρήνης*, the Lord's supper so called, 546, 551
- NAMES** assumed by Christians, 181—185 ; names and epithets applied to them by way of reproach, 185—188  
 — given at baptism, 529—531  
**Ναός**, templum, 704, 705  
**Narthex**, an outer division of the church, 723—725  
**Natarenes**, martyrum, commemorations of martyrs, 648, 655, 656  
**Natalis calicis**, Thursday before Easter, 670  
**Natalitia Christi**, Christmas day, 698  
**Nativitas spiritualis**, baptism, why so called, 485  
**Nativity**, feast of the. See Christmas.  
*Ναυτολόγοι* or *Ναυτολόγοι*, catechists, why so called, 461  
*Ναῦται*, presbyters, why so called, 461  
**Nave**, part of a church, 721—723  
**Nazarenes**, Christians so called by the Jews, 182, 185  
**Νέα**, first week after Easter, why so called, 679  
**Neophytes** not allowed to receive ordination, 314 ; their vestments, 522  
**Νέοτεροι**, novelli, novissimi, nuperrimi, reproachful epithets applied to Christians, 188  
**New-Year's-day**, observance of, 683—685  
**Nicene Creed**, as first published, 478 ; as completed by the second general Council of Constantinople, 478  
**Nocturnal celebration** of funerals, 755  
**Nola**, a church bell, supposed origin of the name, 730  
**Nomination** of the clergy, 335  
**Nonna**, 780  
**Notarii**, notaries, 310 ; notaries at councils, 275 ; notaries or short-hand writers, their practice of recording sermons, 456, 457  
**Notice** of marriage to be given to the bishop, 746  
**Novatus** and Novatian, their proceedings with regard to the lapsed, 624—627  
**Novendiale**, 762  
**Nymphæum**, a water-vessel before a church, 725
- OBULATIONARIUM**, 721  
**Oblations** at the Lord's supper, 586  
*Ὁχημα πρὸς Θεόν*, baptism so called, 486  
**Octava Infantum**, Sunday after Easter, why so called, 677  
**Octave** of Easter, 677 ; of the Nativity, 683  
**Oculi**, third Sunday in Lent, why so called, 668  
**Economi**, assistants of the bishop in distributing the funds of the church, 217, 310, 347  
**Ecumenical**, or general councils, 275, 276  
**Offerentes**, *i. e.* sponsors, 523  
**Offertories** and masses for the dead, origin of, 759  
**Offertorium**, 546  
**Officials**, 295  
*Ὀἶκοι βασιλικοί*, buildings connected with churches, 728  
 — *εὐκτήριοι*, places of Christian worship so called, 703  
*Ὀἰκονομία*, 157  
*Ὀμιλία*, homily, 448  
*Ὁμοφόριον*, 218  
*Ὀνοχορηταί*, a term of reproach, 188  
**Optatus**, his testimony concerning the public use of holy Scripture, 439  
**Orations**, funeral, 758, 759  
**Oratoria**, oratories, places of Christian worship so called, 703  
**Oratorium populi s. laicorum**, the nave of a church, why so called, 721  
**Orders** or classes of Christians, two in the New Testament, 188, 189 ; three reckoned by Eusebius, 190 ; five reckoned by Jerome, 190 ; reducible to two, 190  
**Orders** of bishops, 219—233  
 — — presbyters, 283, 284  
 — — deacons, 296—303  
 — — monks, 777—781  
**Ordination** ; origin and nature of the rite, 311—313 ; disqualifications and qualifications for ordination, 313—320 ; administration of the rite, 320—322 ; form of prayer used at ordination, 323—326  
**Ordines majores**, minores, superior and inferior orders of the clergy, 203  
**Ordo** (order), synonymous with gradus, officium, potestas, dignitas, &c., 203, 312  
*Ὀργάνον λειτουργικόν*, 596  
**Organs**, among the Greeks and Romans, 734, 735 ; introduction of wind-organs into churches, 735 ; use of, 736

- Oriental Liturgy, 413—416, 420  
 Origen, his history, 130—133; his method of interpreting Scripture, 133—136; his Hexapla, 136—138; Commentaries and Homilies, 137, 138; treatise against Celsus, 138—141; on the Principles of the Christian Faith, 141, 142; on Prayer, 142; Exhortation to Endurance of Martyrdom, 142, 143; Stromates, 143; his testimony concerning prayer for the dead, 425; concerning the public reading of holy Scripture, 438, 439; concerning preaching, 450; concerning the celebration of the Lord's supper, 563, 564; creed of, 469, 470  
 Original sin, opinion of Clement of Alexandria concerning, 101  
 Ornaments of churches, 741, 742; opinions of some of the ancients concerning, 811, 812  
 Ὅρος, or ἔκδοσις πίστεως, *i. q.* regula fidei, 463  
 Ostiarii, door-keepers, 308  
 Οὐρανολάτραι, (probably) a term of reproach applied to Christians, 188  
 Outer buildings attached to churches, 725—728  
 PACTUM, *i. e.* baptismal vow or covenant, 516  
 Pædagogus, a treatise by Clement of Alexandria, analyzed, 96, 97  
 Palatini, a class of subdeacons at Rome, 301  
 Παλιγγενεσία, regeneratio, baptism, why so called, 485  
 Pallium, the philosopher's mantle, worn by Christian teachers, 70, 79, 80, 127, 353  
 — the pall, a badge of the episcopal office, 218  
 — jugale, 751  
 Palm Sunday, 668, 669  
 — and olive branches, use of, at funerals, 758  
 Panis Dei, &c., 550  
 Pantænus, 94  
 Papa, original and later use of the title, 212  
 Parabolani, or Parabolarii, as a term of reproach, 187  
 — officers of the church, 310  
 Parafrænarii, 311  
 Παραμονάριοι, 310  
 Paronymphs, 751  
 Παρασκευή, Good-Friday, 672  
 Παραθέσεις, commendatory prayers for the dead, 759  
 Paratorium, 721  
 Παραράπεζον, side-table, 721  
 Parish churches, 707  
 Parish schools, 728  
 Parentes, a term applied by bishops to their constituents, 328, 329  
 Παρθενίκιον, 723  
 Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, 671, 674  
 Pascha clausum, Sunday after Easter, 677  
 Πάσχα στανρώσιμον, 671  
 Pastophoria, chambers connected with a church, 727  
 Πατέρες ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου φωτισμτος, *i. q.* sponsors, 523  
 Patres, patres laicorum, a title of presbyters, 212  
 — *i. q.* abbates, 781  
 — ecclesiae, patres clericorum, patres patrum, titles of bishops, 212  
 Patriarcha œcumenicus, 232  
 Patriarchæ, *i. q.* episcopi, 210  
 Patriarchs, their name or title, 219, 223, 229; origin of their office, rise and establishment of their dignity, 229—231; their office, rights and privileges, 219, 231; division of the patriarchate, 232, 233  
 — of the Jews, 228, 229  
 Patrini, godfathers, 523  
 Patronage, ecclesiastical, 335—337  
 Paul of Samosata, errors of, 154  
 Paulinus, bishop of Nola, probably unacquainted with church-bells, 730  
 Pavements of churches, 737  
 Pax vobiscum, use of this salutation in the ancient church, 382  
 Peace, kiss of. See Kiss.  
 Pectorale, 218  
 Pedilavium, custom of washing the feet at baptism, 522; on the Thursday before Easter, 669  
 Pedom, a pastoral staff, 217  
 Penance, public, 616—636; private, 636—640  
 Penitence, doctrine of Iernas in the Shepherd, and other fathers, concerning, 620—622; angel of, mentioned in the Shepherd, 620, 621  
 Penitentiary presbyters, 636  
 Penitents, 197; different classes of, 628—631; duties and burdens imposed upon them, 631—633; their readmission into the church, 633—636  
 — prayers for them in the Apostolical Constitutions, 401—403  
 — restoration of, an act of the bishop, 215  
 — not allowed to receive ordination, 314

- Πεντεκοστή, Pentecost, 679—682
- Περίαμμα, a cross suspended from the neck, 218
- Περίβολος, the area connected with a church, 725
- Pericopæ, sections of Scripture, epistles and gospels, 443, 445, 446
- Περικοπή τῶν εὐαγγελίων, 439
- Periodeutæ or visitors, 216
- Περιστῶον, the cloister attached to a church, 725
- Persons baptized, 486—492
- Peter and Paul's, Sts., day, 693, 694
- Phagiphania, Epiphany, why so called 687
- Φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, 551
- Φιάλη, a water-vessel before a church, 725
- Philip and James', Sts., day, 692
- Philo Judæus, his method of interpreting Scripture, 134, 135
- Φιλοσοφία, φιλοσόφημα, *i. q.* κήρυγμα, 448
- Philosophy, its use in the Christian system, according to Clement of Alexandria, 98, 99; his opinion concerning its origin and character, 103—106
- Φροντιστήριον, *i. q.* ἀσκήτηριον, a monastery, 783
- Φῶς, applied to the Lord's supper, 551  
—, φῶτισμα, φωτισμός, baptism so called, 484, 485
- Φωτιζόμενοι, a title of baptized Christians, 195
- Φωτιστήριον, *i. q.* baptisterium, 501
- Φυλακτήριον, baptism so called, 485
- Pictures in churches, 742; sentiments of Gregory the Great concerning, 812—814
- Pilgrimages, 774, 775
- Pillarists, 779
- Pisciculi, a figurative term applied to Christians, 185
- Piscina, *i. q.* baptisterium, 501
- Πιστός, *i. q.* regula fidei, 463
- Πιστοὶ (οἱ πιστεύοντες, or πιστεύσαντες), a title of Christians, 181; of the baptized, as distinguished from catechumens, 194
- Place of baptism, 499—502  
— — celebrating the Lord's supper, 574, 575  
— — preparing catechumens, 192, 723
- Platonism, charge of, against Justin Martyr, 72, 73; in the writings of Tatian, 76, 77; alteration and modification of, 83; in the time of Origen, 133—135
- Plautinæ prosupriæ homines et Pistores, a term of reproach, 187
- Pliny the Younger, his epistle concerning the Christians to Trajan, with Melmoth's translation, 176, 177, 178—180
- Pœnitentia, 616; pœnitentia secunda, 620, 621; pœnitentia canonica, 624; pœnitentiam dare, accipere, 629
- Ποιμὴν, pastor, 208
- Polycarp, his life; his Epistle to the Philippians, 68—70
- Pontifex Maximus, a title of Christian emperors, 337
- Pontifices Maximi, *i. q.* episcopi, 212
- Pope, origin of the title, 212
- Pœcones, deacons, why so called, 290
- Predicatio, *i. q.* homilia, sermo, 448  
— or propositio, nomination, 329, 330  
— Petri, 440
- Preposito, *i. q.* episcopi, 211
- Præsanctificatio, 672
- Præsidentes, præsides, *i. q.* episcopi, 212
- Præsules, *i. q.* episcopi, 211
- Prayer, canonical hours of, 395  
— common, ancient forms of, 396—412  
— for the dead, 421—437  
— forms of, at the ordination of a bishop, 323, 324; of a presbyter, 324, 325; of a deacon, 325; of a deaconess, 325, 326; of a subdeacon, 326; of a reader, 326; at confirmation, 541, 542
- Prayer, public, whether precomposed or extempore in the primitive church, 791—795
- Preaching, in the ancient church, 447—460
- Πρεσβυτέρα, or πρεσβυτίς, presbytera, or presbyterissa, 296
- Πρεσβυτέριον, the presbytery, 278
- Πρεσβυτέριον, presbyterium, *i. q.* βῆμα, 720
- Πρεσβύτερος, 277, 278, 280; πρεσβύτεροι προσετώτες, 279; ἐπιχώριοι πρεσβύτεροι, πρεσβύτεροι πολέως, 283
- Presbyters, their name, 277, 278; their quality, office, and duties, 278—282; different orders or classes, 283, 284; admitted to vote in early councils, 274  
— penitentiary, 638, 639
- Presentation of Christ in the Temple, feast of the, 688, 689
- Priests (sacrificing), a character belonging to all Christians; Christian ministers, improperly so called, 122

- Primicerius, or prior, *scholæ cantorum*, 308  
 Primitiæ, first fruits, 349—351  
 Primus, or primicerius, *diaconorum*, 292  
 Princeps provinciæ, *i. q.* metropolitanus, 224  
 — sacerdotum, *i. q.* archiepiscopus, 214  
 Principes, *i. q.* *episcopi*, 213  
 Privatio communions, or deprivation, a punishment inflicted upon delinquent clergymen, 343  
 Privilege of asylum belonging to churches, 740, 741  
 Procedere, *i. q.* *sacris interesse*, 772  
 Processio, a religious assembly, church-going, 771  
 Processions, ecclesiastical, 771—774  
 — ceremonies and order of, 773  
 — funeral, 757, 758  
 Πρόεδροι, *i. q.* *ἐπίσκοποι*, 211  
 Προεστῶτες, προϊστάμενοι, (*πνευματικοί*), *i. q.*, *ἐπίσκοποι*, 211  
 Profession, baptismal, 515—517  
 Προκαθήμενοι, 296  
 Προκριτῶν τοῦ λειπῶν, a title of metropolitans, 224  
 Promissum, *i. e.*, baptismal vow or promise, 516  
 Πρόναος, *i. q.* *narthex*, 721, 724  
 Propatres, promatres, *i. q.* *sponsors*, 523  
 Proper Psalms, use of, in the ancient church, 385, 386  
 Property of the church, 348—351  
 Prophets, in the early church, their gifts and offices, 206—208  
 Προφητεῖον, 704  
 Πρόπυλοι, *i. q.* *narthex*, 721, 724  
 Πρόωρεὺς, a bishop, why so called, 461  
 Προσευκτήρια, 703  
 Προσευχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς, 382  
 Προσευχῆ, οἶκος οὐ τόπος προσευχῆς, 703  
 Προσκαλιόντες, a class of penitents, 629  
 Προσφορά, oblatio, the Lord's supper so called, 546  
 Προσφοραι, oblations at the Lord's supper, 586  
 Προσφώνησις, 382, 612  
 Προσφωνήσεις, in divine worship, 290  
 Prostration on the ground at prayer, 393  
 Πρώτη εἴσοδος, 724  
 Πρωτοπρεσβύτερος, first presbyter, 283  
 Πρώτος, Primas, Primate, 220, 223  
 Πρόθεσις, 721  
 Provinces, ecclesiastical, in the fourth century, 262—270  
 Provincial councils, 273  
 Provost, derivation of the word, 211  
 Psalmi responsorii, 384, 385  
 — *graduales*, 773  
 Psalmista, psalmistanus, 307  
 Psalmody, 384—391  
 Psalms sung during the administration of the Lord's supper, 597—599  
 — at funerals, 756, 757  
 — in religious processions, 773  
 Psalter, use of, in the ancient church, 445, 446  
 Ψάλτης, singer, 306  
 Ptolemy, a follower of Valentinus, 87  
 Πτυχαί, πτυχαί ἱερῶν, diptychs, 831  
 Public prayers in the ancient church, 372—383  
 Πυλωροί, door-keepers, 308  
 Pulpitum, *i. q.* *ambo*, 444, 722  
 Πύλη, πύλη ὡραία, or βασιλική, 724, 736  
 Punishment of delinquent clergymen, 216, 342—345  
 Punishments, future, supposed to be only temporary, by Origen, 138  
 Purgatorium, 551  
 Purification of the soul, as taught by Clement of Alexandria, 105, 106  
 — — St. Mary the Virgin, feast of the, 688, 689  
 Πύργος, turris, original and later acceptance of this word in ecclesiastical antiquities, 444, 729  
 QUADRATUM populi, the nave of a church why so called, 721  
 Quadragesima, 660, 668  
 Quarterly fasts, 660  
 Quartodecimans, 655  
 Quasimodogeniti, Sunday after Easter why so called, 677  
 Quesnel, his conjecture concerning the author of the Athanasian creed, 482  
 Quinquagesima, 666; Quinquagesima penitentia, paschalis or lætitia, 666, 677, 679  
 RATIONALE, an episcopal ornament, 218  
 Rattles, wooden or iron, used for giving notice of the celebration of divine worship, 731  
 Readers, 303, 304  
 Reading-desk, 722  
 Readmission of penitents, 633—636  
 Rebaptization of heretics, 537, 538  
 Receptorium, the diaconicum magnum why so called, 727  
 Recognitions of Clement, 59  
 Reddito symboli, 670



- Regeneratio, baptism why so called, 485  
 Regionarii, a class of subdeacons at Rome, 301  
 Registers, or diptychs, 801  
 Regula fidei, 463  
 Regulares, canonici, 777  
 Religiosi, *i. q.* regulares canonici, 777  
 Reminiscere, second Sunday in Lent, why so called, 662  
 Renunciantes, certain monks so called, 780  
 Renunciation of the devil and his works at baptism, 514  
 Repentance; doctrine of Clement of Alexandria, 100; of Tertullian, 117, 123; Origen, 137; Lactantius, 161  
 Repentance after baptism, doctrine of early ecclesiastical writers concerning, 620—623  
 Reserve in teaching divine truth, opinion of Clement of Alexandria concerning, 103  
 Responsoria, 384, 385  
 Resurrection of the dead, treatise concerning this doctrine by Athenagoras, 81; maintained by Irenæus, 92; by Tertullian, 126, 127  
 Revelatio Petri, 440  
 Revenues of the church, 345—351  
 Rights of the people in elections of the clergy lost, 333, 335  
 Ring, use of, in the marriage ceremony, 749, 750  
 ῥηπίδιον, 603  
 Rites and ceremonies connected with public prayer and psalmody, 391—396  
 — at baptism, 509—522  
 — at confirmation, 540—542  
 — at the celebration of the Lord's supper, 592—602  
 — — — of marriage, 748—752  
 — at funerals, 753—763  
 Robing-room or vestry of a church, 727  
 Rogate, fifth Sunday after Easter, why so called, 678  
 Rogationes, Rogation-days, 661  
 Roman creed, 477  
 — liturgy, 416, 417, 420  
 Rosemary, use of, at funerals, 758  
 Rural deans, 283, 284  
 ΣΑΒΑΝΟΣ, 522  
 Sabbath, the, observance of, in the early church, 652—654  
 Sabbatum, use of the word by the fathers, 652  
 — magnum, 656, 672, 674  
 Sacerdotes secundi vel tertii ordinis, a title of deacons, 289  
 Sacrament, sacrament of the altar, the Lord's supper so called, 549, 550  
 Sacramentum, application of the term to the ordinance of baptism and the Lord's supper, 119, 120  
 — in what sense applied to confirmation by Cyprian, 534, 535  
 — absolutionis et remissionis peccatorum, baptism so called, 485  
 — illuminationis, or illustrationis, baptism so called, 485  
 — indulgentiæ, baptism so called, 485  
 — novæ vitæ, baptism so called, 486  
 Sacrarium, *i. q.* βῆμα, 719; side-table, 721  
 Sacred virgins of the church, 781  
 Sacrificati, 627  
 Sacrificium spirituale, sanctum, mysticum, rationale,—the Lord's supper so called, 546  
 Sacristæ, 311  
 Salt, milk, and honey, use of, at baptism, 519—521  
 Saluatorium, the diaconicum magnum, why so called, 727  
 Sancti, sanctissimi, epithets applied to bishops, 214  
 Sanctimonialia, 781  
 Sanctuarium, sauctum, *i. q.* βῆμα, 719  
 Sandals, 217  
 Sarabaitæ, 779  
 Sarmentitii, Christians reproachfully so called, 187  
 Satisfactio, *i. q.* pœnitentia, 616  
 Saturday. See Sabbath  
 Scenophylaces, 310, 726  
 Schools in connexion with churches, 728  
 — of canonical singers, 307, 308  
 Scripture, Holy, its authority and sufficiency in matters of faith, 89, 90, 107, 111, 123, 124, 147  
 — public use of, in the ancient church, 437—447  
 Scultet, Abraham, his tract on the divine right of episcopacy, from Bishop Hall, 251—260  
 Seal, baptism so called, 484  
 Seasons, baptismal, 497, 498  
 Second marriage, supposed unlawfulness of, 743, 744  
 Secretum, or secretarium, the diaconicum magnum why so called, 727  
 Seculars, a term applied to the laity, 191  
 Secundus, a follower of Valentinus, 87  
 Σηκός, use of the word by the early Christians, 705  
 Semaxii, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 187

- Semijejunia stationum, 662  
 Semnium (*σεμνείον*), a monastery, why so called, 782  
 Senatorium, part of the nave of a church, 723  
 Senes, elders, a title of metropolitans in Africa, 224  
 Septimana in albis, first week after Easter, why so called, 679, 680  
 — major, 676  
 Septuagesima, 665, 666  
 Sermo, sermon, 448  
 Sermons, from what part of the church they were delivered, 453, 454, 722  
 Services, morning and evening, order of, 396  
 Severus, a follower of Tatian, 79  
 Sexagesima, 666  
 Shepherd of Hermas, its contents and character, 64, 65; publicly read in ancient churches, 441; its doctrine concerning penitence, 620, 621  
 Shoes put off on entering a church in some countries, 739  
 Sibylline books, forged, received as genuine by the early fathers, 71, 72; quoted by Theophilus, 83  
 Sibyllists, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 187  
 Sicca, 672  
 Sick, anointing of the, 752, 753  
 Sign of the cross. See Cross.  
 Simon and Jude, Sts., Apostles, 696  
 Simony, a bar to ordination, 315, 316  
 Singers in public worship, 306—308  
 Sites of churches, 717, 718  
 Σκηνή, tabernaculum, 705  
 Σκευοφυλάκιον, 721, 726  
 Slaves and freedmen not allowed to receive ordination, 314  
 Soldiers not allowed to receive ordination, 314  
 Solea, *σωλέα*, part of the nave of a church, 723  
 Solemnization of matrimony, 751, 752  
 Solitaries, religious, 778  
 Sorcerers, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 186  
 Sorores ecclesiae, 781  
 Σωτηρία, baptism so called, 486; applied to the Lord's supper, 551; and to Good Friday, 671  
 Soul, its state after death; Irenæus, 92; Clement of Alexandria, 105; Origen, 140  
 — immortality of; Tatian, 76, 77; Irenæus, 88  
 Spanish liturgy, 418  
 Sponsalia, sponsals, 749, 750  
 Sponsalitiæ donationes, 749  
 Sponsors, their names or appellations, 522—524; origin of their office, 524, 525; their duties, 525—527; persons qualified to act in that capacity, 527, 528; number required at baptism, 528, 529  
 Sportæ, sportellæ, sportulæ, 347  
 Σπουδαῖοι, a set of ascetics, 200, 779  
 Standing, an ancient posture at prayer, 391—393  
 Στάσεις, stationes, select portions of the gospels, why so called, 770  
 Statio (*στάσις*), three several meanings of the word in ecclesiastical antiquities, 769, 770  
 Stationalis (ecclesia, crux), 771  
 Stationarii, a class of subdeacons at Rome, 301  
 — *i. q.* mansionarii, 771  
 Stationes, classes or degrees of penitents, 628—631  
 — weekly fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays, 119, 662  
 — particular places or objects at or near which worship was performed, 771  
 Σταυρολόγραι, a term of reproach applied to Christians, 188  
 Στέφανος, 217  
 Stephen's, St., day, 700  
 Stillingfleet, his earlier and later opinions concerning the origin of episcopacy, 241, 244—249  
 Στοιαι, cloisters attached to a church, 725  
 Stromata, by Clement of Alexandria, analysis of, 97—107  
 Stylitæ, 779  
 Subdeacons, origin and history of their order; their functions, 301—303  
 Subscription to a creed required before baptism, 510  
 Subsella, 720  
 Substrati or genuflectentes, a class of catechumens, 194; a class of penitents, 629  
 Succession of teachers in the church, 123, 124  
 Suffragan bishops, 221  
 Suffrages of the people necessary to the appointment of ministers, 327—330  
 Suggestum or suggestus, *i. q.* bema, 719  
 — or suggestus, lectorum, *i. q.* ambo, 444, 722  
 Συγκατάβασις, 157  
 Σύγκελλοι, syncelli, 311  
 Συλλειτουργοί, 281

- Σύμβολον, σύμβολον σωτηριώδες, &c.**,  
 baptism so called, 212  
**Summi sacerdotes, i. q. episcopi**, 212  
**Συμπόσια, i. q. agapæ**, 764  
**Συναξίς**, applied to the Lord's supper,  
 547  
**Sunday**. See Lord's day  
**Sundays of Advent**, 665  
 — before Easter, 668, 669  
 — after Easter, 677, 678  
**Συνιστάμενοι**, a class of penitents, 630  
**Σύνοδοι, i. q. ecclesie**, 705, 706  
**Superattendens, i. q. episcopus**, 210  
**Superhumeralæ**, 218  
**Superinspector, i. q. episcopus**, 210  
**Superintendens, i. q. episcopus**, 210  
**Superpositio**, 662  
**Supplications**, 661  
**Surplice-fees**, unknown in the ancient  
 church, 347  
**Sursum corda**, Lift up your hearts, use  
 of this formula in the ancient  
 church, 383  
**Susceptores, deaconesses** so called, 300  
 — sponsors so called, 523  
**Suspension (suspensio a beneficio, sus-  
 pensio ab officio)**, a punishment of  
 delinquent clergymen, 342, 343  
**Symbolum, creed, or confession of  
 faith**, 119, 463  
**Synagogue, its presidents and other  
 officers**, 209  
**Synagogue, services of the**, regarded  
 as the original pattern of Christian  
 worship and ecclesiastical institu-  
 tions, 189, 190  
**Synagogue-worship**, 801—811  
**Syndici, or defensores**, 311  
**Synoditæ, i. q. cenobitæ**, 778, 779
- TABERNACULUM, i. e. a place of Christ-  
 ian worship**, 705  
**Tabula clericorum**, 202  
**Tabulæ sacræ, church registers**, 801  
**Tapers lighted, use of, at the reading  
 of the Gospel**, 444, 445; at baptism,  
 522; at the celebration of the Lord's  
 supper, 569, 570; at marriages, 751;  
 at funerals, 755, 758  
**Tatian, his history and probable date**,  
 76; his writings and opinions, 76—  
 78; his followers, 78, 79  
**Tatianists**, 78  
**Τάξις ἱερατικῆ**, order of the priesthood,  
 203  
**Taylor, Jeremy**, on episcopacy, quoted,  
 252, 259; on prayer for the dead and  
 purgatory, 430  
**Τελεῖαι, τελειώμενοι**, titles of baptized  
 Christians, their meaning, origin, and  
 date, 195; application of *τελειοί*, and  
 its cognates, in the New Testament,  
 195  
**Τελειώτεροι**, a class of catechumens,  
 193  
**Τελετή, or τελείωσις**, baptism so called,  
 485  
**Τελετὴ τελετῶν**, the Lord's supper so  
 called, 547  
**Τέμενος**, use of the word by the early  
 Christians, 705  
**Temple-service**, regarded by some as  
 the pattern of Christian worship and  
 institutions, 189, 190; daily, 802—  
 1 804  
**Tertullian, his history, character, and  
 value of his writings**, 109—111; his  
 Apology, and book *Ad Nationes*,  
 111—113; his treatise on the Testi-  
 mony of the Soul, 113; on Prayer,  
 113; to the Confessors, 114; on  
 Public Shows, 114, 115; on Idolatry,  
 115; on Baptism, 115, 116; to  
 his Wife, 116, 117; on Penitence,  
 117; against the Jews, 117, 118; on  
 Patience, 118; on the Soldier's  
 Chaplet, 118—120; on the Veiling  
 of Virgins, 120; on Female Dress,  
 and on Female Ornaments, 120, 121;  
 on Flight in time of Persecution,  
 121; on Chastity, and on Single  
 Marriage, 121, 122; on Fasts, 122;  
 on Modesty, 123; on the Prescrip-  
 tion of Heretics, 123, 124; against  
 Marcion, 124, 125; against the Val-  
 entinians, 125; against Praxeas,  
 125, 126; against Hermogenes, 126;  
 Scorpian, 126; on the Body of  
 Christ, and on the Resurrection of  
 the Body, 126, 127; on the Soul,  
 127; on the Mantle, 127; to Sca-  
 pula, 127, 128  
**Tertullian, his opinion of the grounds  
 of episcopal authority**, 239, 240; his  
 testimony concerning apostolical  
 succession, 257; concerning prayer  
 for the dead, 424, 425; concerning  
 the public use of Holy Scripture,  
 433; concerning preaching, 449,  
 450; concerning the celebration of  
 the Lord's supper, 564; creed of,  
 467  
**Τετραστήλον**, the cloister attached to a  
 church, 725  
**Τετραστῶον**, the cloister attached to a  
 church, 725  
**Theoetistus**, bishop of Caesarea in  
 Palestine, 131  
**Θεοδρόμοι**, in the ancient church, 730  
**Θεοφάνια, i. q. Ἐπιφάνια**, 685

- Θεοφιλέστατοι, an epithet applied to bishops, 214
- Theophilus of Antioch, 82; analysis of his treatise to Autolyceus, 82—84
- Theophori, an epithet of Christians, 184
- Therapeutæ, 181
- Thomas, St., the Apostle, 697
- Θρόνος, the bishop's chair in churches, 720
- Θυμίαμα, incense, 599, 600
- Θυσία ἀναίμακτος, the Lord's supper, so called, 546
- Θυσιαστήριον, *i. q.* βῆμα, 720
- Τιάρα, 217
- Tillemont, his opinion concerning the author of the Athanasian creed, 482
- Times of administering baptism, 496—499; of administering confirmation, 535, 536; of celebrating the Lord's supper, 568—573
- Tithes, payment of, no very ancient institution in the Christian church, 349; at first voluntary, 349; when made compulsory by the church, 350; and by the state, 350; always voluntary in the Greek church, 350, 351
- Titular bishops, 221
- Tituli (τίτλοι), churches so called, 704  
— inscriptions on monuments in memory of the dead, 755
- Τοίχαρχοι, deacons, why so called,
- Tonsure, clerical, 320
- Towers of churches, their date, origin, and use, 729
- Tractatus, tractate, tractator, of lectures on Scripture, 448
- Traditio et redditio symboli, 377
- Tradition, oral, 89, 97, 98, 119, 123, 124
- Traditores, 627
- Trajan, his reply to Pliny's epistle respecting the Christians, with Melmoth's translation, 175, 176, 177, 178
- Τράπεζα κυρίου, the Lord's table, 543, 544
- Tribunal, *i. q.* ambo, 444  
— chori, *i. q.* bema, 722  
— ecclesie, *i. q.* ambo, 722
- Trinity, first use of this term by Theophilus of Antioch, 83  
— in Unity; speculations of Athenagoras, 80; of Irenæus, 91; of Tertullian, 125, 126  
— Sunday, 682, 683
- Τρόπαια, tropæa, churches so called, 704
- Τρουλλὸς, τρουλλωταί, 716
- Trumpets used for giving notice of the celebration of divine worship, 731; of a funeral procession, 757
- Truth, reserve in teaching, 156, 157
- Tubicines sacri, deacons why so called, 290
- ΥἱΟΙ' Θεοῦ, a title of baptized Christians, 195
- Υἱοθεσία, baptism so called, 486
- Unctio infirmorum, anointing of the sick, 752
- Unction, extreme, not an ancient ceremony, 752, 753  
— a preliminary of baptism, 518; at confirmation, 540, 541; at ordination, 322
- Unity of the church, Cyprian's arguments concerning, 147, 148
- Unreasonableness of Separation, Stillfleet's, quoted, 245—249
- Υπαπαντή, the Feast of the Presentation, why so called, 688
- Υπηρέται, the inferior class of Christian ministers, 203; subdeacons, 301
- Υπέρθεσις, superpositio, 662
- Υποβολαίς, 307
- Υποδέκται, deaconesses so called, 300
- Υποδιάκονοι, subdeacons, 301
- Υποπίπτοντες, a class of penitents, 629
- Υπουπόψεις, a lost work of Clement of Alexandria, 109
- Υποθέσις τῆς παρῆρησίς, 551
- VALENTINIANS, confutation of their errors by Irenæus, 87
- Veil, bridal, 751
- Veils worn by women at the time of receiving the Eucharist, 581
- Vestiarium, vestry, the diaconicum magnum, why so called, 727
- Vestments of the clergy, in celebrating divine worship, 351—354
- Viaticum, baptism so called, 485; applied to the Lord's supper, 551
- Vicarii generales, vices gerentes in pontificalibus, 221
- Vicars of Christ, bishops when so called, 213
- Vice-episcopi, *i. e.* suffragans, 221
- Vidua, viduatus, viduitas, 296
- Vigilius, bishop of Thapsus, supposed by some to have composed the Athanasian creed, 482
- Vigils, 662, 673
- Vincentius of Lerins, regarded by some as the author of the Athanasian creed, 482
- Virgines Dei, vel Christi, 781
- Virgins, sacred, of the church, 776
- Virtutum via, baptism so called, 486

- Visitations, episcopal, 216  
 Visiting presbyters, 216  
 Visitors, election of the clergy by, 331  
 Vita, baptism so called, 486  
 Vitta nuptialis, 751  
 Vossius, G. J., concerning the author of the Athanasian creed, 482  
 Voting, in election of ministers, by the people, 327—330  
 Votum, *i. e.* baptismal vow or promise, 516  
  
 WALLS of churches, how adorned, 737, 741  
 Washing of the feet at baptism, 522; on the Thursday before Easter, 669  
 Washing of the hands before entering a church, 738, 739; before receiving the Lord's supper, 587  
 Watchers, a class of monks, 779  
 Watching a corpse, custom of, among the early Christians, 756  
 Water, use of, in baptism, 502—505  
 Water of life, baptism so called, 484  
 Water mixed with wine in the Lord's supper, 590—592  
 Water substituted for wine in the Lord's supper, by Tatian, 78  
 Water-drinkers, 79  
 Waterland, Dr., his opinion concerning the author of the Athanasian creed, 483  
 Wednesday and Friday, fast-days, 659, 662  
  
 Weekly celebration of the Lord's supper, 571, 573  
 Weekly fasts, 662  
 Weekly festivals, 649—654  
 West, turning towards the, a symbolical ceremony at baptism, 513, 517  
 White garments of the newly-baptized, 521, 522  
 White linen cloth, anciently used as a covering of the communion-table at the time of the celebration of the Lord's supper, 574, 575  
 Whitsunday, Whitsuntide, 657, 679—682; a baptismal season, 497, 498  
 Widows in the early church, 296, 298, 299  
 Windows of churches, 737  
 Wine used in the celebration of the Lord's supper, 590—592  
 Witnesses at espousals, 750  
 Women, incapable of being ordained as ministers of the word and sacraments, 313  
 Worship, divine, under the superintendence of the bishop, 215, 216, 280, 281  
 Worship of the heavenly bodies, its origin and use, according to Clement of Alexandria, 106  
  
 ΞΕΝΟΔΟΧΕΙΑ, connected with churches, 728  
 Ξηροφαγία, 662  
  
 ΖΩΗ, applied to the Lord's supper, 551

LONDON :  
HARRISON AND CO., PRINTERS,  
ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

# NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS,

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

---

THE BIBLE CYCLOPÆDIA, a Comprehensive Digest of the Civil and Natural History, Geography, Statistics, and General Literary Information, connected with the Sacred Writings; illustrated by Several Hundred Wood Cuts.

Complete in Thirty Parts, at 1s. 6d. each, forming two Volumes, price 25s. each.

---

BIBLE MAPS; a Series of New and Accurate Maps, constructed on the best Authorities, and verified by collation with the Discoveries of Modern Travellers; forming a complete HISTORICAL and DESCRIPTIVE ATLAS of SCRIPTURE GEOGRAPHY. By WILLIAM HUGHES, F.R.G.S. Uniformly with the Bible Cyclo-pædia, 7s. 6d., coloured.

---

HISTORY of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, from the Ascension of Jesus Christ to the Conversion of Constantine. By the late EDWARD BURTON, D.D., Regius Professor, Oxford. The Fourth Edition. 6s. 6d.

---

HISTORY of the CHURCH of IRELAND. By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. Two large Volumes.  
Vol. I. From the Reformation to the Revolution.  
Vol. II. From the Revolution to the Union. 34s.

By the same Author, Octavo, 12s.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY, Exemplified and Illustrated by the Acts of PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS.

---

HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND; embracing Copious Histories of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Translation of the Bible, and the Book of Common Prayer. By THOMAS VOWLER SHORT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Third Edition. 16s.

By the same Author, 4s.

PAROCHIALIA; consisting of Papers printed for the use of St. George's, Bloomsbury.

---

The SCRIPTURAL CHARACTER of the ENGLISH CHURCH. By the Rev. D. COLERIDGE, M.A., Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea. Octavo, 12s. 6d.

The series of Sermons, bearing the above title, were written exclusively for perusal, and are arranged as a connected whole. The Author has adopted this form to avail himself of the devotional frame of mind, presupposed on the part of the reader, in this species of composition; but he has not deemed it as necessary to preserve with strictness the conventional style of the pulpit, for which these discourses were never intended; they may, consequently, be taken as a series of Essays, or as the successive chapters of a general work.

ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS HISTORY, by the Rev. HENRY SOAMES, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's. Octavo, 16s.

The BOOK of PSALMS, newly Translated from the Hebrew, with Critical and Philological Notes. By WILLIAM FRENCH, D.D., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; and Rev. GEORGE SKINNER, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College. New Edition, revised. 12s.

PARISH SERMONS, by JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes. 12s.

CHRISTMAS DAY, and other SERMONS; by FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A., Chaplain of Guy's Hospital, and Professor of English Literature in King's College, London. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

By the same Author. Second Edition with Additions. 3s.

THREE LETTERS to the Rev. W. PALMER, on the Name *Protestant*; on the Character of the English Church; and on the Bishoprick at Jerusalem.

ORIGINAL FAMILY SERMONS, Contributed by upwards of ONE HUNDRED and FIFTY CONTEMPORARY DIVINES of the ESTABLISHED CHURCH; and published under the direction of *The Committee of General Literature and Education of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*. Five Volumes, at 6s. 6d. each.

SHORT SERMONS for CHILDREN, illustrative of the Catechism and Liturgy of the Church of England. Preached in the National Society's Central School, Westminster, by the Rev. C. A. JOHNS, B.A., F.L.S., Chaplain of the Central School. 3s. 6d.

The CHURCHMAN'S GUIDE; a Copious Index of Sermons and other Works, by eminent Church of England Divines; arranged according to their subjects. By JOHN FORSTER, M.A. Octavo, 7s.

INSTRUCTIONS for READING the LITURGY; by DAVID GARRICK, with Notes, and a Discourse on Public Reading, by RICHARD CULL, Tutor in Elocution. Octavo, 5s. 6d.

The WORKS of DOCTOR DONNE, Dean of St Paul's in the time of James I. and Charles I. With a Memoir. By HENRY ALFORD, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Six Volumes, Octavo, with a fine Portrait. 3l. 12s.

We cannot forbear repeating Mr. Coleridge's question, "Why are not Donne's Volumes of Sermons reprinted at Oxford?" Surely the character of some of his juvenile poems cannot be the reason. Donne's Life is placed in a cheap form in the Catalogue of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and deservedly so, in every respect. Why does Oxford allow one hundred and thirty Sermons of the *greatest preacher*, at least of the seventeenth century—the admired of all hearers, to remain all but totally unknown to the Students in Divinity of the Church of England, and to the literary world in general? *Quarterly Review*, vol. LIX. p. 6.



The LIFE of ISAAC MILNER, Dean of Carlisle; comprising his Correspondence with many of the leading men of his day, and other Writings hitherto unpublished. By his NIECE, MARY MILNER. With a Portrait. 18s.

The LIFE of ARCHBISHOP SANCROFT, to which are added, Three Sermons, and the Tract on *Modern Policy*. By GEORGE D'OYLY, D.D., F.R.S., Rector of Lambeth. New Edition, Revised. Octavo, 9s.

The LIFE of BISHOP BUTLER, the Author of *The Analogy*. By THOMAS BARTLETT, M.A., one of the Six Preachers of Canterbury Cathedral. Octavo, with Portrait, 12s.

The LIFE of SIR WILLIAM JONES. By LORD TEIGNMOUTH; New Edition, Revised, and with a Life of the Noble Author, by the Rev. S. C. WILKS, M.A. Two Volumes, 10s. 6d.

LIVES of ENGLISH SACRED POETS, from CHAUCER to HEBER. By the Rev. ROBERT ARIS WILLMOTT, of Trinity College, Cambridge. Two Volumes, 4s. 6d. each.

LIVES of EMINENT CHRISTIANS, by the Rev. R. B. HONE, M.A., Vicar of Hales Owen. Four Volumes, 4s. 6d. each.

The FIRST VOLUME contains the Lives of Archbishop Usher, Dr. Hammond, John Evelyn, and Bishop Wilson. The SECOND VOLUME, Bernard Gilpin, Philip de Mornay, Bishop Bedell, and Anthony Horneck. The THIRD VOLUME, Bishop Ridley, Bishop Hall, and Robert Boyle.

The FOURTH VOLUME, JOHN BRADFORD, ARCHBISHOP GRINDAL, and JUDGE HALE.

The BOOK of the FATHERS of the Christian Church, and the Spirit of their Writings. Octavo, 9s. 6d.

LUTHER and his TIMES, or History of the Rise and Progress of the German Reformation. By the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A., Author of *A Manual of Christian Antiquities*, &c. Foolscap Octavo, 5s.

A HISTORY of POPERY, and of its Influence on Society. With Accounts of the Inquisition, and State of Popery in Ireland, and Specimens of Romish Legends. Octavo, 9s. 6d.

The EARLY CHRISTIANS; their Manners and Customs, Trials and Sufferings. By the Rev. W. PRIDDEN, M.A. Fourth Edition, 4s.

The CIVIL HISTORY of the JEWS, from Joshua to Adrian; with Incidental Notices of Manners and Customs, Geography and Antiquities. By the Rev. O. COCKAYNE, M.A., King's College, London. 4s. 6d.

COMMENTS, EXPLANATORY and PRACTICAL, upon the Epistles for the Sundays, Fasts, and Holidays throughout the Year; for the Use of Families. By the Rev. J. F. HONE, M.A., Vicar of Tirley. 6s.

AN ILLUSTRATION of the METHOD of Explaining the NEW TESTAMENT by the Early Opinions of the Jews and Christians concerning Christ. By WILLIAM WILSON, B.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Edited by THOMAS TURTON, D.D., Dean of Westminster. A New Edition, carefully Revised. Octavo, 8s.

LECTURES on DIVINITY, delivered at the UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE, by JOHN HEY, D.D., as Norrissian Professor, from 1780 to 1795. NEW EDITION, Revised, from the University Press, Cambridge. Two Large Octavo Volumes, 30s.

AN INDEX to BUTLER'S ANALOGY, prepared by Dr. BENTHAM, Reg. Prof. of Divinity at Oxford, corrected by BISHOP BUTLER, and now adapted to the early and the Oxford Editions. By the Rev. T. BARTLETT, M.A., Author of the *Life of Bishop Butler*. 2s. 6d.

SACRED MINSTRELSY; A Collection of SACRED MUSIC from the FINEST WORKS of the GREAT MASTERS, BRITISH and FOREIGN; arranged as Solos, and Concerted Pieces, for Private Performance, with Accompaniments for the Piano-Forte. Two handsome Folio Volumes, Half-bound, Price Two Guineas.

SCRIPTURAL BREVIATES; SHORT COMPENDIUMS of SCRIPTURAL INSTRUCTION, according to the DOCTRINES and DISCIPLINE of the UNITED CHURCH of ENGLAND and IRELAND.

These BREVIATES are strictly applicable to all the purposes for which Tracts are generally employed, while, from their uniform orthodoxy, and the progressive style of their contents, they will be found greatly to assist the Parochial Clergy in their visitations and ministry. Several of the Classes, into which the Series is divided, will also be found highly useful in National and other Schools, where they may be used as class books, and afterwards presented to the children or their parents, at very little expense.

The two following Classes are already published, and others of the Series are preparing for the press.

AN INTRODUCTORY MANUAL to the READING and STUDY of the HOLY SCRIPTURES; comprised in one hundred Numbers of the SCRIPTURAL BREVIATES, and forming Class A. of the Series. Price 4s. bound in a Volume, or the Hundred Breviates for distribution, 3s.

SHORT COMPENDIUMS of FAITH and PRACTICE for the SICK; comprised in fifty Numbers of the SCRIPTURAL BREVIATES, forming Class K. of the Series. Price 2s. bound in a Volume, or the Fifty Breviates for distribution, 1s.

---

**PRINCIPLES of ENGLISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.**

By the Rev. W. WHEWELL, B.D., F.R.S. Master of Trinity College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy, Cambridge. Octavo, 5s.

ii.

The **DOCTRINE of LIMITS**, with Applications; *viz.* Conic Sections, the first three Sections of Newton, the Differential Calculus. By PROFESSOR WHEWELL. Octavo, with Illustrations. 9s.

iii.

The **MECHANICAL EUCLID**; containing the Propositions necessary for a Degree at Cambridge. By PROFESSOR WHEWELL. 5s. 6d.

iv.

The **MECHANICS of ENGINEERING**; for use in Universities and Colleges of Engineers. By PROFESSOR WHEWELL. Octavo, with Illustrations. 9s.

---

**PRINCIPLES of MECHANISM**, by R. WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. Designed for the Use of Students of the Universities, and for Students of Engineering generally. With 250 Wood Cuts. Octavo, 15s.

---

On the **DIFFERENTIAL and INTEGRAL CALCULUS**. By the Rev. T. G. HALL, M.A., Professor of Mathematics in King's College, London. Third Edition, enlarged. 12s. 6d.

ii.

**ELEMENTS of DESCRIPTIVE GEOMETRY**, chiefly intended for Students in Engineering; also by PROFESSOR HALL. With 80 Illustrations. 6s. 6d.

iii.

The **ELEMENTS OF ALGEBRA**, chiefly intended for Schools and the Junior Classes in Colleges. By the same. 6s. 6d.

---

**MATHEMATICAL TRACTS**. By GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, M.A., F.R.S., Astronomer Royal. Designed for the Use of Students in the Universities. Octavo, Third Edition, corrected. 15s.

---

**EXAMPLES of the PROCESSES OF THE DIFFERENTIAL and INTEGRAL CALCULUS**. Collected by D. F. GREGORY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Octavo, with Plates. 18s.

---

ARCHITECTURAL NOTES on GERMAN CHURCHES, with Notes of a Tour in Normandy and Picardy. By the Rev. WILLIAM WHEWELL, B.D., F.R.S., Author of *The History of the Inductive Sciences*, &c. A Third Edition, with Additions. 12s.

---

TRAVELS and RESEARCHES in ASIA MINOR, MESOPOTAMIA, CHALDEA, and ARMENIA; by WILLIAM FRANCIS AINSWORTH, F.G.S., F.R.G.S., in charge of the Expedition sent by the Royal Geographical Society, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to the Christian Tribes in Chaldea. Two Volumes, with Maps and numerous Illustrations. 24s.

---

SALOPIA ANTIQUA; an Enquiry from Personal Survey, into the Early Remains in Shropshire and the Welsh Borders. With a Glossary of Words used in Salop. By the Rev. CHARLES HENRY HARTSHORNE, M.A., F.S.A. Royal Octavo, 1*l.* 4s. Imperial, 2*l.* 2s.

---

The CAMBRIDGE PORTFOLIO; Papers illustrative of the Scholastic and Social State, the History, Antiquities, and Literature of the University. Contributed by Members, and Edited by the Rev. J. J. SMITH, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Caius College. Two Volumes, Royal Quarto, with numerous Illustrations. 4*l.* 4s.

---

The PUBLIC ECONOMY of ATHENS, by PROFESSOR BOECKH, of Berlin. Translated from the German, by G. CORNEWALL LEWIS, Esq., A.M., late Student of Christ Church, one of the Translators of MULLER's *Dorians*. New Edition, Revised. Octavo, 18s.

---

PINDAR'S EPINICIAN ODES, and the FRAGMENTS of his LOST COMPOSITIONS, revised and explained. With Copious Notes and Indices, by the Rev. JOHN WM. DONALDSON, M.A., Head Master of the Bury School. Octavo, 16s.

By the Same,

The NEW CRATYLUS; or, Contributions towards a more accurate Knowledge of the Greek Language. Octavo, 17s.

---

The SPEECHES of DEMOSTHENES, against Aphobus and Onetor; translated, with Notes explanatory of the Athenian Laws and Institutions, by C. R. KENNEDY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 9s.

---

A PRACTICAL ARABIC GRAMMAR. By DUNCAN STEWART. Octavo, 16s.

---

HEBREW GRAMMAR. By CHRISTOPHER LEO. 12s. 6*d.*

---

ELEMENTS of SYRIAC GRAMMAR. By the Rev. G. PHILIPS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge. Octavo, 10s.

---







BW143 .R54  
A manual of Christian antiquities, or,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00056 0815