

A BRIEF ANALYSIS
OF THE
SECTS, HERESIES, AND WRITERS
OF THE
First Three Centuries.

TO WHICH IS ADDED A SHORT SKETCH OF THE
HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
DURING THE SAME PERIOD,

WITH EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

Cambridge :
PRINTED FOR JAMES COOPER, TRINITY STREET.
LONDON: BELL & DALDY, 186, FLEET STREET.
DUBLIN: W. B. KELLY.

MDCCCLVII.

10. a. 36.



PREFACE.

A STRICT chronological arrangement of the heresies has not been attempted, for the authorities are so contradictory that it is almost impossible to reconcile them. Indeed the very nature of the case would shew the difficulty that must attend any attempt of this sort, for opinions upon important matters are seldom hastily formed, but are the growth of years, and have often been silently working their way for half a century, or more, before they can be properly said to have acquired sufficient importance to call for the notice of the historian. Some public act gives them a position in the page of history, but they may have been held by a large number of obscure individuals long before.

So again with respect to the doctrines of the various heretics, there must necessarily be much uncertainty, for we cannot rely confidently upon the truth of a picture which has been painted only by an adversary, however apparently anxious that adversary might be to state the case fairly.

It remains only to add, that as this little work lays no claim to originality, and does not profess to be anything more than a condensed arrangement of the labours of others, it has not been thought necessary to acknowledge, in each case, the source from which information has been derived. It will be sufficient if we here acknowledge ourselves generally indebted to the works of MOSHEIM, BURTON, JEREMIE, RIDDLE, HINDS, PALMER, &c., without making any parade of further research.

Matters of which *they* have treated are not likely to receive any additional illustration at the hands of a less experienced writer, but there may be some readers who have neither the leisure nor the inclination to read many works, but who would be glad to have the information that is to be obtained from them condensed into a small compass. This we have attempted to do, and we wish it to be understood that we quote the actual words of a passage whenever it happens to be so concisely expressed, that we could gain nothing by further abridgment.

INDEX.

Preface	Page iii
SECTS AND HERESIES :	
Pharisees	2
Sadducees	<i>ib.</i>
Essenes	<i>ib.</i>
Therapeutæ	3
Samaritans	<i>ib.</i>
Nazarenes	5
Ebionites	<i>ib.</i>
Nicolaitans	6
Elcesaitæ	<i>ib.</i>
GNOSTICS :	
Simon Magus	10
Menander	12
Dositheus	<i>ib.</i>
Cerinthus	13
Carpocrates	15
HERESIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY	
16	
<i>Syrian Gnostics</i>	17
Saturninus	<i>ib.</i>
Bardesanes	<i>ib.</i>
Tatian	19
Severus	20

	Page
<i>Gnostics of Asia Minor</i>	21
Cerdo	<i>ib.</i>
Marcion	22
Lucian	24
Apelles	<i>ib.</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Gnostics of Egypt</i>	25
Basilides	26
Carpocrates	27
Antitacti	28
Adamites	<i>ib.</i>
Gnostics	<i>ib.</i>
Valentinus	<i>ib.</i>
Secundus	31
Ptolemy	<i>ib.</i>
Marcus	<i>ib.</i>
Colobarsus	<i>ib.</i>
Heracleon	<i>ib.</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Lesser Gnostic Sects</i>	32
Sethites	<i>ib.</i>
Cainites	<i>ib.</i>
Ophites	<i>ib.</i>
Theodotus	33
Artemon	34
Melchisedechians	<i>ib.</i>
Praxeas	<i>ib.</i>
Hermogenes	35
Montanus	<i>ib.</i>
Millenarii	37
<hr/>	
HERESIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY	38
Manichæus	<i>ib.</i>
Hierax	40
Noetus	<i>ib.</i>
Sabellius	<i>ib.</i>
Beryllus	41
Paul of Samosata	<i>ib.</i>
Novatian	43
Arius	<i>ib.</i>

INDEX.

vii

SCHISMS :

	Page
Montanus	43
Novatus	44
Novatian	<i>ib.</i>
Donatus	46
Meletius	46

GREEK WRITERS :

Apostolic Fathers	47
Clemens	<i>ib.</i>
Ignatius	48
Polycarp	49
Barnabas	50
Hermas	<i>ib.</i>
Justin Martyr	<i>ib.</i>
Tatian	51
Hegesippus	<i>ib.</i>
Hermias	<i>ib.</i>
Dionysius of Corinth	<i>ib.</i>
" Alexandria	52
Athenagoras	53
Theophilus of Antioch	<i>ib.</i>
Irenæus	<i>ib.</i>
Clement of Alexandria	<i>ib.</i>
Hippolytus	54
Origen	<i>ib.</i>
Pamphilus	55
Methodius	<i>ib.</i>
Gregory Thaumaturgus	<i>ib.</i>

LATIN WRITERS :

Tertullian	56
Minucius Felix	<i>ib.</i>
Cyprian	<i>ib.</i>

Eusebius	57
--------------------	----

THE CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS.	Page 58
<hr/>					
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY	61
First Century	62
Second Century	69
Third Century	75
Fourth Century	83
<hr/>					
THE TEN PERSECUTIONS	86
<hr/>					
EXAMINATION QUESTIONS	89

THE SECTS, HERESIES AND WRITERS OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

It should be borne in mind that our word Heresy, which is now applied exclusively in an invidious sense, is derived from the Greek *αἵρεσις*, which means simply "choice," i.e. the sect or principles which a man chooses to adopt after consideration. St. Paul, speaking of himself, in his defence before Agrippa, (Acts xxvi. 5) says, "after the most straitest sect (*ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν*) of our religion, I lived a Pharisee," using the word evidently in a good sense. It is now, however, restricted in its signification to mean a departure from catholic truth in some principal point of Christian doctrine.

Schism, on the other hand, (from *σχιζω*, to divide) is a breach of the bond of Church-Membership and unity, but does not necessarily involve error in matters of faith. This distinction should be well observed, for several of the sects, usually classed amongst the Heretics, held sound doctrines. They differed only upon questions of Church discipline, and were therefore more properly Schismatics.

SECTS AND HERESIES.

The Pharisees, as our Saviour often laid to their charge, disregarded internal purity, and, by a vain ostentation and austere life, sought for popular applause. They attached a double meaning to the Scriptures, one literal, the other figurative, and ascribed even greater authority to ancient traditions and institutions, than to the actual commandments of God. (Matthew xv. 3—9). The Pharisee was the learned, formal, outwardly-righteous, rigid ceremonialist. They derived their name from the Hebrew word *pharash*, "to separate;" because they considered themselves separated from the common people by their extraordinary pretensions to piety.

The Sadducees were supported by the leading men of the nation. Their disbelief in a future life gave a stimulus to iniquity and every lust. They are said by Tertullian and others to have rejected all the Scriptures except those written by Moses; but this is probably incorrect. The Sadducee was the rich sensualist and man-of-the-world. They derived their name from *Sadoc* their founder.

Acts xxiii. 8. "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection; neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both." This accounts for the greater hostility of the Sadducees towards the Apostles, being "grieved that they preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead."

The Essenes held a middle course between the two former sects, differing from the Pharisees in their not relying upon traditions and ceremonies, and from the Sadducees in their belief in a future state. They practised

great austerity, and, considering the times in which they lived, were a very moral people. They are not referred to in the New Testament.

The Therapeutæ are generally considered a branch of the above sect, and are distinguished by the name of the "contemplative Essenes." They were found in the greatest numbers in Egypt. Although the two sects have many points of agreement, they must not be confounded with the Essenes of Palestine. They were "wild and melancholy enthusiasts, who conceived that no sacrifice should be offered to God except that of a composed mind, absorbed in the contemplation of heavenly things." They were the forerunners of the recluses and hermits of after ages. They are treated of at full length by Philo-Judæus and Josephus.

The Samaritans deserve a brief notice in this place, although perhaps not strictly belonging to our subject. They were originally colonists sent by Shalmaneser to inhabit the cities of Samaria, (2 Kings xvii. 24), when the ten tribes were carried away captive. They gradually embraced the Jewish religion, and attempted to become incorporated with the Jews so as to form one people. This union the Jews refused, and the result was, that the Samaritans erected an independent temple on Mount Gerizim. They had failed to identify themselves with the Jews, and consequently, in their expectation of the Messiah, they relied upon the words of the promise, that in Him *all nations* of the earth should be blessed; in this respect, taking a more enlarged and more correct view of the prophecy than the Jews did.

Nazarenes and Ebionites. These two sects are almost always classed together, though the latter held decidedly heretical opinions, whereas there is no reason

to think that there was, at first at any rate, any peculiarity in the tenets of the Nazarenes beyond an adherence to the Mosaic Law. It is plain, from the whole tenor of St. Paul's Epistles, as well as from the Acts of the Apostles, that many of the converted Jews entirely mistook the nature of the Christian covenant, and continued for several years to retain their attachment to the Law of Moses. It was very natural that they should not readily understand how ceremonies, which had been given to their forefathers by God himself, and which they had always been taught to look upon as of the highest importance, were now suddenly to be abrogated entirely, and justification to be obtained simply and only through faith in Christ. Accordingly, we read in Acts xxi. 20, that "many thousands of Jews which believed" were still "zealous for the law." So great indeed was their tenacity in this respect, that, even after Jerusalem had been destroyed, and the possibility of compliance with much of the Law thus removed, a very large number of them still clung to the hope that the glory of their capital would be restored, and still adhered, for the most part at least, to the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic Law.

When, however, Hadrian had raised *Ælia Capitolina* upon the ruins of Jerusalem [A.D. 119], and forbidden the Jews even to visit it, except on one day in the year, all their hopes seemed to be so entirely crushed, that the greater part of them were compelled, though reluctantly, to abandon them at last. So deeply rooted, however, were their prejudices that some few still retained, even yet, a lurking attachment to the Law of Moses, and continued to unite a belief in the chief doctrines of the Christian religion with the maintenance of those practices in which

they had been educated. These last were soon divided into two classes, the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*.

The Nazarenes did not hold any heretical opinions; they were simply Judaizing-Christians, maintaining the necessity of observing the Mosaic Law, as well as the Gospel. They held this, however, merely as regarded the Jews, without considering it binding upon other nations. The term Nazarene was originally applied by the Jews to *all* Christians, (see Acts xxiv. 5); but it is used in ecclesiastical history in a restricted sense, as denoting this sect only.

The Ebionites (whose name is derived by Tertullian from one Ebion, though more probably from a word signifying their *poverty*) were decidedly heretical in their doctrines. They held obedience to the Mosaic Law to be of universal obligation, and consequently they rejected the authority of St. Paul, whose writings opposed their conclusions. They rejected also the Prophets, and though they, of course, retained the Pentateuch, yet, strange as it may seem, they held it in but little veneration. Of the New Testament they retained only the Gospel of St. Matthew, which they altered to suit their purpose, and also forged other books under the names of some of the Apostles.

Their great point of heresy was with reference to the Incarnation. They held that Jesus was born of human parents in the ordinary way, and that Christ was a divine influence which descended upon him at his baptism. This, being one of the ordinary tenets of the *Gnostics*, will be more fully treated of under that head.

The Nazarenes and Ebionites both had their origin amongst those Christians who escaped to *Pella*, a little town beyond Jordan, at the time of the destruction of

Jerusalem. Their rise is sometimes dated as early as the destruction of the city by Titus, A.D. 72, but the more correct date is probably the early part of the second century, as stated above. We have taken them in this place, in order that the more purely Gnostic heresies may be treated of together, without interruption.

Nicolaitans. This sect is referred to by name in the Revelation, chap. ii. ver. 6, 15. But it is by no means clear whether there ever was a special sect of this name, or whether the corrupt practices of various sects were not referred to symbolically, as Neander supposes, as "destroying the people," (*νικᾶν τὸν λαόν*). The supposition that so corrupt and vicious a heresy should have Nicolas the deacon for its founder, as some persons say, is too absurd for belief. There may have been a man of that name who was their founder. Their conduct is said to have been most vicious and immoral, and they did not scruple to eat things offered to idols. Very little, however, is known about them.

Elcesaitæ. This sect was founded by one *Elxai*, a Jew who lived in the time of Trajan. "Though he was a Jew, and worshipped one God, and revered Moses, yet he corrupted the religion of his fathers by many false notions derived from Oriental Philosophy." He seems to have attempted a combination of parts gleaned from the various doctrines of Judaism, Christianity, and Oriental Philosophy. They turned towards Jerusalem when they prayed, kept the Sabbath, practised circumcision, and observed other ceremonies of the Jewish law: they expressed detestation of sacrifices, and, though they acknowledge only one God, contended that external compliance with idolatrous rites was not to be blamed, as long as the inward mind remained uninfluenced. They regarded

it as the part of an intelligent man, on trying occasions, to renounce his faith in words, provided he preserved it in his heart.

There is great doubt as to their tenets with respect to Christ. They spoke of him as a great king; but it is not clear whether they referred to our Saviour, or to another expected Messiah. They grounded their faith chiefly on a book which they supposed had fallen from heaven. They were much addicted to astrology and magic, esteemed water a divinity, and swore by the elements generally, and also by salt, bread, heaven, &c.

This sect is said by Eusebius to have become extinct almost as soon as it appeared.

GNOSTICS.

"At the head of all the sects which disturbed the peace of the Church," says Mosheim, "stand the Gnostics, who claimed ability to restore to mankind the lost knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of the true and supreme God." Almost all the early heresies were, in some degree or other, branches of Gnosticism—a highly refined and subtle philosophy, deriving its name from its assumption of superior knowledge. In the hands of different sects it was subject to various modifications, but there is generally a similar principle to be discovered running through them all. It will be advisable, therefore, before entering into details, to give a brief sketch of the sources from which their doctrines were probably derived.

Plato seems to have exceeded all other philosophers in wisdom, and to have held the most pure and reasonable views of the government of the world by one independent, powerful, and intelligent God. He also held the belief

of a future state, and of the immortality of the soul, but mixed up with this a number of fanciful and erroneous opinions; such as that "matter" was independent of the Deity, and co-eternal with him; that the First Cause formed the world out of the "*rudis indigestaque moles*" which had existed from all eternity, to the intractability of which matter, the origin of evil was owing.

The various attempts to account for evil without making God the author of it have furnished the most fertile topic of discussion in all ages, and have, perhaps, been productive of more errors and absurdities than all the other speculations of human reason. Evil being the contrary of good, was considered to be necessarily contrary to God who was the author of all good, and, if contrary to him, it must be independent of him, and therefore eternal. The Oriental Philosophy admitted the existence of *two* eternal principles,—one the Supreme God, who was the author of everything good; and the other the evil principle, who was opposed to the Supreme God, and was the creator of the world.

Gnosticism was a compound of Platonism, the Oriental Philosophy, and Judaism, mixed up with many other extraneous notions, borrowed from the heathens, or from the fancies of the various founders of the several sects, some of whom inclined more to the Platonic, and some to the Oriental theory. They all agreed, however, in introducing into their scheme a series of intermediate agents, or "*emanations*" from the two eternal principles, which they called *Æons*, and which varied in number according to the fancy of the different sects. One of these *Æons* is always supposed to be the Creator of the world, and the God of the Old Testament: he is considered to proceed from the evil principle, and to be in the highest degree

offensive to the Supreme God, who sends one of *his* Æons, Christ, to oppose him, and to deliver the world from his power. In order to avoid the difficulty of Christ being obliged to reside in a body composed of "matter," which, according to their notions, was the source of all evil, some supposed him to have had no real human body, but to have been a *man only in appearance*; hence they were called *Docetæ*, (from *δόκησις* an appearance): others held that the Christ was a divine influence which descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism, (in proof of which they quote the expression "*this day* I have begotten thee,") and returned to Heaven before his crucifixion. All "matter" being gross, they denied the resurrection of the body, as unfit for a higher state. Some of the sects, wishing to subdue their carnal lusts, which arose from the spiritual nature being bound up with a material, and therefore evil, nature, endeavoured to "bring their bodies in subjection," and carried this rigidity to such extremes as to deny themselves even innocent enjoyments, whilst others, acting on different principles, abandoned themselves wholly to the gratification of their passions.

When we speak of *Simon Magus* as the founder of Gnosticism, we do so only in a limited sense. The Fathers indeed are unanimous in naming him as the Founder of the Gnostic heresies. Eusebius calls him* *πάσης ἀρχηγὸς αἰρέσεων*, the ringleaders of all the heresy that crept into the Church, and Justin Martyr says that all Samaria looked up to him as a god, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that, though an impostor as to his miracles, he may have been sincere in his philosophy, and, being struck by the preaching of Philip in Samaria, he may have

* See Hammond's Commentary on 2 Thess. chap. ii. ver. 3—4; with reference to "the man of sin."

endeavoured to harmonize his own teaching with that of the Gospel, by introducing Christ into his system, as an *Æon* sent by God to free the world from the tyranny of the evil spirit, thus embodying in these mystical notions the two great Gospel doctrines of Christ being the Son of God, and that he came into the world to save us from our sins. As he thus became the first who corrupted the pure stream of Christianity with Gnosticism, the Fathers may in one sense have justly considered him as the founder of the heresy. The Gnostics may be divided into two great branches, the Asiatic, which adhered more closely to the Oriental Philosophy; and the Alexandrian, in whose tenets Platonism predominated: or, if we adopt Professor Jeremie's division, the Asiatic branch may be again subdivided into the Syrian and the Asiatic.

We now pass on to consider the various heresies in detail.

Simon Magus was a Samaritan who had studied philosophy at Alexandria. He professed to be a magician, and "used sorcery and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that he was some great one." (Acts viii. 9.) By his fictitious miracles, he persuaded the people that he had received from God the power of controlling evil spirits. Being aware of his own impostures, he was much struck by the real miracles which Philip worked by Divine power, and professed to be a Christian, perhaps in the hope of learning from Christians the art of working miracles. When this hope was cut off by St. Peter's rebuke, (Acts viii. 19—20), he not only returned to his sorceries, but wherever he went he laboured to obstruct the progress of Christianity. Mosheim says, "Simon undoubtedly belonged to that class of philosophers who admitted, as coexistent with the supreme and all-perfect

God, not only eternal matter, but an evil deity who presided over it. But the most shocking of his abominations was his pretence that the greatest and most powerful of the *Æons* of the male sex resided in himself, and that another *Æon* of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, resided in his mistress Helena."

The fathers accuse him of asserting that he came down from Heaven as the Father, in respect of the Samaritans,—as the Son, in respect of the Jews,—and as the Holy Spirit, in respect of the Gentiles; but that it was indifferent which of these names he went by. He did not acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, but considered him as a rival, and pretended himself to be the Christ. He believed not the resurrection of the body; but barely a resurrection of the soul. He taught that men need not trouble themselves about good works, all actions being indifferent, and that the distinction of actions into good and evil was only introduced by the angels for the purpose of keeping men in subjection. He rejected the law of Moses, and said that he had come to abolish it.

Having run through several provinces, and acquired great reputation, he came to Rome, in the time of Claudius, where a legend states that he was attempting to fly by the assistance of evil spirits, but that on the prayers of St. Peter the spirits were obliged to let him fall, when he was either killed outright, or so mortified at his failure, that he killed himself. Justin Martyr says that he saw a public statue inscribed to Simon, on an island in the Tiber, from which he infers that Divine honours were paid him at Rome. The mistake has been satisfactorily accounted for by the discovery, in the year 1574, of a stone in the Tiber bearing this inscription,

SEMONI SANCO, DEO FIDIO SACRUM, an altar undoubtedly dedicated to a Pagan God. [See Note to *Mosheim*, chap. v.; also *Calmet's Dictionary*].

Menander was also a Samaritan. He was a disciple of Simon Magus, and put forth similar doctrines. Mosheim says, "Menander is to be removed from the list of heretics, properly so called, and classed among the lunatics, or madmen, who foolishly arrogated to themselves the character of the Saviour of mankind. For it appears from the testimony of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian, that he wished to be thought one of the Æons, sent from the upper world to succour the souls which were here suffering miserably in material bodies; and to afford them aid against the machinations and the violence of the Dæmons who governed our world." His talent for supporting his imposture was probably not equal to that of Simon: for he is less famous in Ecclesiastical history, and his sect soon ceased to be noticed by historians.

Dositheus. This man is also ranked by Mosheim "not amongst the heretics, but among the enemies of the Christian name, or, if it be thought more proper, among the delirious and insane, for he wished to be accounted the Messiah, or, "that Prophet" whom God had promised to the Jews; he could not therefore have held Jesus Christ to be a divine ambassador, nor have merely *corrupted* his doctrines." His life and tenets are still more obscure than those of the preceding impostor; but his main object appears to have been the same. By some he has been made the disciple, by others the preceptor, of Simon. His career was quickly terminated. Having failed to obtain credit with the Jews, he proclaimed himself to the Samaritans as the Messiah, and an attempt having been made by the High Priest to

apprehend him, he took refuge in a cave, where he perished. Dr. Burton makes Dositheus to have preceded Simon, (see *Lectures*, p. 59); but we have followed Bishop Hinds.

Cerinthus. If we consider the pretensions of Simon Magus, Menander, and Dositheus, as the mere ravings of madmen, we shall give to *Cerinthus* the place which is usually assigned to him—that of the *first heretic*, properly so called. He is placed by some at the beginning of the second century, though the testimony of the early writers to the fact that St. John's Gospel was directed chiefly against the Cerinthians, would place him at the close of the first. There is also a legend which relates that St. John being in a bath at Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus also there, he hurried out of the bath, without bathing, saying, "Let us go away, lest the bath should fall to pieces while Cerinthus, the enemy of truth, is in it." Though we may reject the story itself, it affords some additional ground for presuming that the persons named in it were contemporary. As this heresy was so important in itself as to call for the especial opposition of St. John, and as moreover it formed the basis of several subsequent ones, it may be well to examine it at some length, especially with reference to the divinity of "the Word," or second person of the Trinity, and the application of the Gnostic doctrine of the Logos to Christ.

The Alexandrian Jews had taken to ascribe many of the operations of God to his Logos, or mind, or reason: and though they did not really make the Logos of God a separate being from God, they adopted a mystical phraseology in which the Logos might sometimes appear to be *personified*. The Gnostics carried this system further, and actually made the Logos a distinct "emanation" from

God. When they also adopted Christ into their system, it was an easy process to identify him with the Logos which they had already personified, and we may infer from the opening of St. John's Gospel, that even the orthodox Christians had taken to use the term Logos as an epithet of Jesus Christ. If considered as a mere name, the application was harmless: but as an identity of terms is likely to lead to an identity of doctrine, there was a danger lest the Gnostic notion of the Logos should be substituted for the real notion of Jesus Christ. St. John, therefore, begins by asserting that the Logos of the Christians had existed from all eternity—was himself God—and was the creator of the world: all which points were directly opposed to the system of the Gnostics [Burton]. Cerinthus was a Jew who had studied at Alexandria, where he had become deeply imbued with the principles of Oriental philosophy. He afterwards became a convert to Christianity, but his fancy having been over-excited, and his judgment perplexed, by Orientalism, he was not in a proper state to receive it in its simplicity. In his ingenious attempts to harmonize Judaism and Orientalism, he softened down some of the grosser tenets of Eastern wisdom, in order to unite them with the faith of Mosaic revelation. For instance, the Creator of the world was no longer, as formerly, represented as an evil principle opposed to good, but only as a subordinate Æon, whose work was imperfect, and had gradually become so corrupt that there was need of a superior Æon to restore it. Such an one he beheld in Christ, the Word incarnate. This Æon Christ, he supposed, entered into the body of a certain Jew named Jesus, (a very righteous and holy man, but still only the son of Joseph and Mary by ordinary generation,) by

descending upon him in the form of a dove, at the time when he was baptized by John in the river Jordan. After his union with Christ, this Jesus vigorously assailed the God of the Jews, the Creator of the world; for which he was seized by the rulers of the Jewish nation, and crucified. Christ, however, being of a spiritual nature, and impassible, could not suffer, and he was therefore supposed to have left the man Jesus at the time of his apprehension. The sufferings and death of Jesus were therefore merely those of a man, and formed no part of the scheme of redemption, which was to be accomplished only by his preaching during the time that the Christ resided in him.

Cerinthus appears to have held the idea of the emanation of several "pairs of *Æons*," which was afterwards more fully elaborated by Valentinus, of which we shall have to say more in another place. In common with most of the early sects, he retained some parts of the Mosaic law, though he required his followers to renounce the Jewish lawgiver. He promised them a resurrection of their bodies to enjoy the exquisite delights of a millennium, which some say he represented as one of sensual enjoyment, though this is probably unfairly stated by an adversary. He certainly held that Christ would hereafter return, and would unite himself again with the man Jesus, in whom he had before dwelt, (*i.e.*, be clothed with a visible body), and would reign on earth with his followers during a thousand years.

Carpocrates. Dr. Burton places Carpocrates with Cerinthus at the close of the first century, but others assign to him a later date. As we propose to follow the order of Professor Jeremie for the remaining heresies, we shall take Carpocrates amongst the "Gnostics of Egypt."

HERESIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

Professor Jeremie has devoted so much attention to the Sects and Heresies of the Second and Third Centuries, and has written so fully upon them, that we shall adopt him as our chief authority in all questions referring to them. Those of the First Century he has not treated of.

The following is his classification of the various Gnostic Heresies of the Second Century. He divides them into three branches.

1. Syrian Gnostics.

Saturninus.

Bardesanes.

Tatian.

Severus.

2. Gnostics of Asia Minor.

Cerdo.

Marcion.

Lucian.

Apelles.

3. Gnostics of Egypt.

Basilides.

Carpocrates.

Valentinus.

Secundus.

Ptolemy.

Marcus.

Colobarsus.

Heracleon.

4. Lesser Gnostic Sects.

Sethians.

Cainites.

Ophites.

SYRIAN Gnostics.

Saturninus conceived a Supreme Being who created the angels, seven of whom he supposed to have made the world. The Supreme Being having descended in a visible form to survey their work, the angels made his image their model, according to which they made man. But man, so made, had only animal life, until the Supreme God imparted to him a reasonable soul. The Evil Principle, jealous that any but himself should have made animated bodies, and that God should have imparted to them a virtuous soul, made another race of men, to whom he gave an evil soul. Hence the difference between the good and bad among mankind. The creators of the world having revolted from the Supreme God, Christ was sent down from Heaven, clothed, not with a real body, but with the appearance of one, to point out to the good souls the way to escape from the dominion of evil, and to return to Heaven. The way to do so was, however, a very difficult one. The souls that would ascend to God, after the dissolution of the body, must abstain from wine, flesh, marriage, and all things which exhilarate the body or delight the senses. Saturninus taught in Syria, which was his native country, and especially in Antioch, and drew many after him by his great show of virtue.

Bardesanes was a Syrian, born at Edessa, who flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

He was probably brought up in the Christian faith, and for some time shewed great firmness in defending his religious belief; he was equally zealous in refuting the heresies that were then infecting his countrymen, for which purpose he wrote a work against Marcion [Burton]. Unfortunately, he did not continue sound in his opinions, but

afterwards fell into the Valentinian heresy, from which he subsequently withdrew; but, not being able entirely to disengage himself from the false notions he had once adopted, he became the author of a system of his own.

The errors of Bardesanes arose chiefly from an attempt to explain the origin of evil. He thought it absurd to trace evil to a Supreme Being—pure, beneficent, and perfect. He sought, therefore, a distinct cause, which he described as self-existent, and opposed to the Supreme God. The good principle alone was infinite, omnipotent; the evil principle being confined to earth.

The Supreme Being created the world and its inhabitants. The human soul was at first pure and innocent, clothed with an ethereal body, conformable to its nature; but, after it had been led into sin by the tempter, it was driven from Paradise, and imprisoned in a gross, carnal body; such being, according to Bardesanes, the meaning of the “coats of skins” with which God clothed Adam and Eve after the fall, and such the “body of this death” from which the apostle longed to be delivered. (Romans vii. 24.)

The union of the soul with the carnal body being thus the cause of evil, whatever tends to controul the passions which enslave the soul is to be cultivated, as assisting us to break the bonds of the maleficent power. Bardesanes insisted particularly on the declaration of St. Paul, “that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.”

Bardesanes admitted the whole of the Old and New Testament—held the unity of God—believed that the God who was the Father of Jesus Christ was the Creator of the world, and even that the Word, or Son, co-operated in the creation. He does not appear to have been so heretical as most of the others of the Gnostic school.

Tatian, by birth an Assyrian, a distinguished and learned man, and disciple of Justyn Martyr, was more noted among the ancients for his austere moral principles, which were rigid beyond measure, than for the speculative errors or dogmas which he proposed as articles of faith to his followers. He is usually considered the founder of the sect called *Encratites*; but it should be remembered that this name (derived from *ἐγκρατεύουμαι*) was applied to all the austere sects generally, so that though the Tatianists were certainly Encratites, it does not necessarily follow that all Encratites were Tatianists.

Tatian's heretical opinions were probably derived from Valentinus and Marcion, both of whom he may have met at Rome [Burton]. They were briefly these: he maintained that the Creator was a subordinate Deity, whose words, "Let there be light," he represented, not as a command, but as a prayer addressed to the Supreme Being. He ascribed the Law to one God, and the Gospel to another. Holding matter to be the origin of evil, he asserted that Christ had not a real, but only an apparent, body. For the same reason also, he endeavoured, by excessive rigour, to mortify the body, appealing to the words of St. Paul, "He that soweth to the flesh, shall, of the flesh, reap corruption." He condemned marriage, and commanded his followers to abstain from animal food. They also avoided wine, and even at the Eucharist used only water, from which circumstance they are sometimes called *Hydroparastatæ*, or "offerers of water," also *Aquarii*. They were also called Apotactites* (from *ἀποτασσόμεαι*, to renounce). The principle upon which they "renounced" the enjoyments of life was, evidently, because the Creator

* Strictly speaking, however, the *Apotactites* were a later branch of the sect of Encratites. They added to the rigorous discipline of Tatian by "renouncing" all property. Hence the name.

of the world was supposed by them to be at enmity with God, and therefore they would have as little to do with the things of this world as possible.

Tatian was author of several works—amongst others, a *Harmony of the Gospels*, in which he is said to have selected, or omitted, passages according as they supported, or opposed, his peculiar views.

Severus espoused and considerably extended the principles of Tatian, becoming also more decidedly heretical, in that he rejected the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul.

Severus considered that the intermixture of good and evil in the world showed it to be subjected to opposite principles, some beneficent, and others mischievous; subordinate, however, to the Supreme Being. These principles had, by a kind of compact, distributed on earth an equal proportion of blessings and evils. Man, presenting an union of virtues and vices, was formed by the joint efforts of good and evil spirits. His duty, therefore, was to distinguish what he had received from these respective powers. Now, since the indulgence of the passions engenders misery, he considered them to have been implanted in us by the noxious powers. Reason, however, gives birth to such pleasures only as promote tranquillity, and he therefore supposed it to be given by the beneficent powers. Man, thus formed of contrary parts, was placed upon earth, the good beings having placed round him such aliments as serve to support the body, without exciting the passions; whilst the evil beings had placed all that extinguishes reason and influences passion. As the miseries of man have been chiefly caused by drunkenness and lust, Severus concluded that wine and women were the productions of the evil principle.

GNOSTICS OF ASIA MINOR.

The Gnostics of Asia Minor, who were the followers of *Cerdo*, *Marcion*, *Lucian*, and *Apelles*, may be considered as simply *Marcionites*, for *Cerdo* was quite eclipsed by his disciple *Marcion*, and *Lucian* and *Apelles* did little more than carry on and improve the system of their master—*Marcion*.

Cerdo. When *Antoninus Pius* was Emperor, and *Hyginus* Bishop of Rome, that is to say, between the years A. D. 138–142, two leaders of Gnostic sects—*Valentinus* and *Cerdo*, came to Rome. It has been a matter of much dispute, whether this heresy had its rise at Rome, or whether *Cerdo* had not fully matured his doctrine, and already promulgated it in Syria, first. In the absence of direct historical evidence, probability appears rather in favour of the latter view, for the warmer imaginations of the Eastern Christians were more readily worked upon by the subtle disputes that were carried on in the schools of Alexandria and Antioch; and these cities were the hotbeds in which nearly all the mischief had its origin, which, under the name of philosophy, inundated the Church during the second century. But, as *Tacitus* says, “everything that was bad upon the earth found its way to Rome,” so these heretics may have gone thither, for no other reason than because Rome was the capital of the world, and they were ambitious of exhibiting their powers in the largest field.

Cerdo held two opposite principles, one good and unknown, God, the father of Jesus; the other, evil and known, the Creator, who spake in the law and appeared to the prophets. The former he called “good,” the latter “just.” The author of the Mosaic law he calls “just,” because he required “an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a

tooth," and would direct us to love a friend and hate an enemy: whereas the God of the Gospels bids us return good for evil, and love even our enemies. He consequently despised the Old Testament, and maintained that Christ's mission was for the purpose of overthrowing the empire of the Creator of the world.

Cerdo was at one time a Christian, and it is said that he renounced his errors, and was received again into the Church; but this having occurred more than once, he was finally ejected.

Marcion was a native of Sinope, in Pontus, who came to Rome during the reign of Antoninus Pius. Mosheim says that "Marcion failing to obtain some office in the Church of Rome, in consequence of some misconduct, joined the party of Cerdo, and, with great success, propagated their tenets over the world." Dr. Burton, however, says that "his lapse into heresy took place *before* his journey to Rome."

It is very difficult to ascertain the exact nature of his heretical opinions, as the accounts given by different writers vary so materially. He is variously represented as having held two, three, and four first principles; but the difference arises from a lax use of the term "principle." Mosheim's account of the matter is as follows: "In the manner of the Orientals, Marcion taught that there are two first causes of all things—the one perfectly good, the other perfectly evil. Intermediate between these two, ranks the Creator of this world, who was the God and lawgiver of the Jews: he is neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature, or, as Marcion expressed it, he is *just*, and therefore dispenses punishments as well as rewards. The evil deity and the Creator of the world are perpetually at war. Each wishes to be worshipped as God, and to subject the in-

habitants of the world to himself. The Jews worship the latter, and the heathen the former. Each is an oppressor of rational souls, and holds them in bondage. In order, therefore, to put an end to this war, and give freedom to the souls which are of Divine origin, the Supreme God sent among the Jews Jesus Christ, who is his son, clothed with the appearance of a body which would render him visible, with commission to destroy both the kingdom of the world's Creator and that of the evil deity, and to invite souls back to God. He was assailed both by the prince of darkness and by the God of the Jews, or the world's Creator; but they were unable to hurt him, because he had only the appearance of a body. Whoever will abstract their minds, according to his prescriptions, from all sensible objects, and renouncing as well the laws of the God of the Jews, as of the prince of darkness, will turn to the Supreme God, and, at the same time, subdue and mortify their bodies by fasting and other means, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions. The moral discipline of Marcion was, as the nature of his system required, very austere; for he condemned marriage, (that being the means by which the world is peopled,) wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body."

In support of the assertion, that the Saviour's body was only a phantasm, he referred to St. Paul's expression, that Christ "took the *form* of a servant," "and was made in the *likeness* of man, and was found in *fashion* as a man," *i. e.*, as Marcion contended, not *really*. The Gnostic doctrine of matter being the origin of evil renders it always necessary that the body of Christ should be different from the ordinary human body, and involves also the denial of the resurrection of the material body.

Marcion wrote a work called *Antitheses*, in which he

opposed passages of the Old and New Testament, with a view of showing, from the disagreement of the Law and the Gospel, that the same God could not be author of both. So distinct, indeed, did he consider the two systems, that he would not allow that Christ, the son of the good God, was the Christ or Messiah foretold by the prophets. This last he considered was a Saviour promised to the Jewish nation only, who was to restore their condition, whereas the former was to deliver the whole human race.

Marcion seems to have differed from the Gnostics of his age in not professing to be acquainted with secret traditions, under cover of which he could neglect received notions: he confined himself to the Scriptures, but pretended to be able to discern parts genuine, and parts corrupted, and parts spurious, in these Scriptures. He corrected what he conceived to have been altered, with as much boldness and presumption as he rejected what he imagined to have been interpolated. His system was, therefore, far more dangerous to Christianity than entire fabrications, inasmuch as it tended to shake and confound the very foundations upon which the weight of Christian evidence must rest. He compiled a Gospel of his own, chiefly from that of St. Luke. His objections, as stated in his *Antitheses*, were refuted by Tertullian, who wrote five books against him.

Lucian was one of the disciples of Marcion, who designed, by certain modifications, to improve his system, and who appears to have formed a distinct sect. We are not, however, informed in what particular respects he deviated from his master. He is said by Tertullian to have held that neither body nor soul would rise again after death, but a kind of third substance. He was author of several apocryphal works.

Apelles, also a disciple of Marcion, considerably altered

the system of his master; the chief points of difference being the following. He held but one principle, one God of perfect goodness, who created all the angels, one of whom was the Creator of the world, who, having drawn down the souls of men from their celestial abode, encompassed them with sinful flesh. He was not in his nature evil, but only imperfect, and, being unable to prevent the introduction of evil into the world, he repented of his work, and requested the Supreme God to send his son Jesus to correct the world which he had formed. In process of time, his request was granted, and the purpose effected. The souls of men were to be saved; but the body, composed of gross matter, the work of imperfection, was not to rise again. Apelles maintained that Christ possessed a real body, but of ethereal substance, by which theory he sought to obviate the objections against the material body of Christ, viz., that it necessarily placed him in connection with the source of evil—matter.

GNOSTICS OF EGYPT.

The chief points in which the Gnostics of the Egyptian class differed from those of the Asiatic are the following:

1. They did not so distinctly recognize the antagonism of two eternal principles, one good and the other evil, though they admitted the eternity and corrupt nature of matter.
2. They considered the person of Jesus Christ as twofold; consisting of the man Jesus, and the Divine Christ which descended upon him at his baptism.
3. They generally attribute to him a *real* body, though they do not all agree on this point.
4. Their moral discipline was much less rigorous than the Asiatic—indeed, it seemed to countenance licentiousness.

Basilides is generally placed at the head of the Egyptian Gnostics. He was gaining followers in Alexandria at the same time that Saturninus was propounding opinions equally irrational in Antioch, *i. e.*, during the reign of Hadrian.

There was some similarity in their ideas; but Basilides went much farther than Saturninus in the development of his scheme. He supposed the Supreme God to have produced five* superior *Æons*, two of whom, Wisdom and Power, produced the angels of the highest order. These angels built for themselves a residence or heaven, and produced other angels, of a nature a little inferior, who also built for themselves a residence. Other generations of angels succeeded, and other heavens were built, until there were as many orders of angels and heavens as there are days in the year. Over all these angels, Basilides placed a Lord, whose name, Abraxas, contains letters which, according to their value in the Greek computation, amount to 365, the number of the angels. The inhabitants of the last, or lowest, heaven, which is visible to us, formed, out of the mass of matter, our world, and a new order of beings to inhabit it. The Supreme Being approved of their world, and endowed men with souls, but left them to be governed by the angels. The latter, however, endeavoured to extinguish the worship of the Supreme Being, and to establish their own worship. On a distribution of the world, the Prince of this lower Heaven had the Jewish nation for his share, and gave them a law by Moses. The other angels presided over other nations. Finding that the angel of the Jews was ambitious and attempted to usurp power over all the rest, they united against him. Hence arose the numerous wars in which the Jews were so continually engaged.

* Mosheim says seven.

The world having become corrupted, God, in compassion to those souls whom he had endowed with reason, sent down his son, or highest *Æon*, who descended into the man Jesus at his baptism, and, using him as an instrument, revealed to mankind the knowledge of the true God, and performed various miracles. This object being accomplished, the man Jesus was crucified, but not the Christ, thus denying both the incarnation and atonement.

Irenæus says that, in the schemé of Basilides, it was Simon of Cyrene who was crucified, having been transformed into the likeness of Jesus, who himself assumed the form of Simon, stood by, and smiled at the illusion of his enemies, and afterwards ascended into Heaven.

It has been said that the moral system of Basilides favoured every kind of lust and iniquity; but, however faulty in this respect the practice of his followers may have been, it is probable that they availed themselves of a construction of which his principles were susceptible, but which their author never contemplated.

Basilides taught that the soul could not be disengaged from the present body, in which it expiated sins committed in a former life, till it had been purified by successive transmigrations from body to body.

Carpocrates [see page 15.] held the usual Gnostic tenets common to his school, viz., one Supreme Principle; the formation of the world by inferior *Æons*, or angels, out of "eternal and malignant matter;" divine souls unfortunately enclosed in bodies; and the like.

The distinguishing feature of his heresy was the supposition that Jesus Christ was born in the ordinary way of Joseph and Mary, but that he excelled other men, not only by the holiness and virtue of his life, but by the wonderful firmness and purity of his mind, which had

retained the remembrance of what he had seen in a pre-existent state with the Father. He admitted that Christ had been educated among the Jews, but had despised them, and had therefore obtained power to surmount his sufferings, and afterwards ascended to the Father.

Carpocrates maintained the notion of the transmigration of the soul, which must perform all that was destined for it, before it can obtain rest.

The morality of the sect is said to have been of the lowest kind. They are charged with asserting that nothing was good or evil in itself, but that the distinction between right and wrong existed only in human opinion. They are also said to have held community of women, and to have indulged in the grossest licentiousness.

There are some minor heresies which are considered branches of the Carpocratian. They are the following :

- (1) **The Antitacti** (from *αντιτασσω*, to oppose) who considered themselves bound to practise all that the Scriptures forbid, and thus "oppose" the God of the Jews.
- (2) **The Adamites**, called also *Prodicians*, from their founder Prodicus, who pretended that they were by nature the children of the Supreme Deity, and therefore privileged to live without controul.
- (3) A small section of the Carpocratians arrogated to themselves an especial claim to the title of *Gnostics*; in the same way that a small sect of modern Dissenters assumes to itself the title of the "Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Valentinus came to Rome at the same time as Cerdo. [See page 21]. His heresy is so complicated that it almost

defies a brief, and yet complete, analysis: we must therefore refer the reader who desires an accurate account to Professor Jeremie's copious exposition of it. The following are its main features.

The theory of emanations, which was in some measure adopted by all Gnostics, received considerable increase from the fertility of his speculative powers. He supposed a Supreme Being, infinite, invisible, incomprehensible, and therefore called *Buthos*, the *depth* which the understanding cannot fathom, who, having spent numberless ages in repose, resolved to reveal himself, and for this purpose employed his thought, *Ennoia*, also called *Συγγη*, silence, who alone had dwelt with, or within him. The first manifestations, or *Æons*, produced, were *Noûs*, intelligence, and *Ἀλήθεια*, truth.

These *Æons* are to be considered only as revealed forms of the Supreme Being; not separate existencies so much as personified agencies, whose combination constituted the *Pleroma*, or fulness, of the attributes and perfections of the Godhead. They comprised altogether thirty *Æons*, of whom half were supposed to be males, *i.e.*, active agencies, and the other half females, *i.e.*, passive principles.

In proportion as these *Æons* were removed from the Supreme God, they decreased in knowledge and perfection. The lower *Æons* had, therefore, only a partial knowledge of the hidden God, and the desire of one of them in particular, *Σοφία*, to know more of him produced a confusion in the *Pleroma*, one result of which was that *Σοφία* gave birth to an imperfect being, who was incapable of remaining in the *Pleroma*, and was cast out into *Chaos*. This being, called *Achamoth*, formed the *Demiurgos*, by whom the world was made, and reduced the rude and shapeless mass of matter to some degree of order. Out

of the more subtle parts of matter the visible heavens were made, and out of the grosser parts the earth was formed. Man was composed of both kinds, to whom, without the knowledge of the Demiurgos, his mother Sophia—Achamoth imparted also some portion of intelligence, or divine light. Jealous of this addition he tempted man to transgression in Paradise, and made him fall; having then clothed him with a gross, corporeal covering, he subjected him to the influence of evil passions. The degeneracy of the soul would then have been in danger of increase, but that the divine influence of Sophia enlightens and fortifies it by some invisible power, and those who combat evil, and the powers of nature, strengthen the seeds of divine life, and become more spiritual.

Valentinus divided man into three classes—the spiritual—the material—and the animal. The spiritual are they who, having the seeds of divine life, display it in this world, and these will in time arrive at such perfection as to be able to cast away the animal principle altogether. The material are doomed to certain perdition, and, at the end of the world, will be consumed in the fire that is to consume all matter. The animal occupy a middle place, depending upon their behaviour: if they incline chiefly to the material, they will perish; but if to the spiritual, they are capable of receiving eternal happiness, though of a degree inferior to that of the first class.

The mission of Christ was to assist the development of the spiritual principle. His person was twofold, composed partly of the animal, and partly of the spiritual principle. He had nothing material, having passed through the body of the Virgin, like water through a canal, *i.e.*, deriving nothing from her nature, but merely using her as a medium for his birth. The carnal and animal Christ

alone was crucified: the spiritual Saviour left him when he was examined by Pilate.

Such is a very brief outline of the complicated and tedious fable of Valentinus. The sect obtained great celebrity, and he had several followers who introduced considerable alterations into his system. The most noted were:—

- (1) **Secundus**, who divided the *Æons* into two sects, the right and left, or light and darkness, thus introducing something of the Oriental antagonism of two principles.
- (2) **Ptolemy** made some alterations in the number and nature of the *Æons*. He held also that the Demiurge, or Creator of the world, must have been of a middle nature, since both in the Mosaic law, and in the works of creation, so much good is found mixed up with evil.
- (3) **Marcus** added some cabalistic notions to the system of Valentinus. He attached great mystery to the letters of the alphabet, without which, truth could not be discovered, and in which its whole perfection resided.
- (4) **Colobarsus** was at first the coadjutor of Marcus, and afterwards separated from him. His alteration consisted chiefly in presenting a new system of generation of *Æons*.
- (5) **Heracleon** was a man of some learning, who applied himself to writing commentaries on some parts of the New Testament, and, instead of attaching himself to the speculative parts of the Valentinian system, he turned his attention more to practical details.

LESSER GNOSTIC SECTS.

Sethites. According to their notion, there were originally two sects of men—the material, created by evil beings; and the animal, created by the Demiurge. Abel, the representative of the animal race, having through weakness been overcome by Cain, the representative of the material race, Sophia substituted Seth, to whom she imparted the additional aid of the spiritual principle. His descendants formed a family of spiritual persons, who struggled against the angels of darkness. When Sophia resolved to destroy the wicked by the deluge, this family escaped; but Ham, who was of the other race, contrived to enter clandestinely into the ark, and thus perpetuated the evil race. The spiritual men being thus again oppressed, Seth ultimately came to their assistance as the Messiah.

Cainites. This sect is said to have paid divine honours to Cain, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and in fact to have held in high veneration all the wicked men mentioned in Scripture. This (if true) could only have been done on the supposition that the God whom these men opposed was himself opposed to the Supreme being, and therefore that by despising the former they made themselves acceptable to the latter. They held Judas Iscariot in great esteem, and they considered that he procured the death of the Saviour, in order to frustrate the scheme of redemption, which he alone had sufficient wisdom to see would be injurious to mankind.

Ophites, so called from *Οφίς*, a serpent, also known by the name of *Serpentinians*, in consequence of the honours they paid to the serpent, in the belief that it was under the figure of that animal that wisdom had

revealed herself to mankind, and by inducing Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of knowledge, had conferred great benefit on man. The Ophites were however divided amongst themselves on this point, some considering the serpent as the faithful minister of Sophia, the friend of mankind: others, as the cause of man's fall. They appealed particularly to the passage which compares the Son of Man to the brazen serpent. They kept serpents in a box, and used them at their religious services, by allowing them to crawl and twine themselves amongst loaves of bread which were supposed to be thus sanctified.

With these minor sects we conclude the various modifications of the Gnostic Heresy; and pass on to other speculations of a less fanciful, but more dangerous, character—those which relate to the fundamental doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Theodotus. Many of the Gnostic sects had believed that *Jesus* was a man, but they always conceived the *Christ* which descended upon him, to be an emanation from God. It was reserved for Theodotus, at the end of the second century, to assert the impiety that *Jesus Christ* was a mere man, born indeed in a miraculous manner of the Virgin Mary, by the divine operation of the Holy Ghost; but still having had no preexistence and inherent divinity. This view of the nature of Christ he is said to have adopted in order to excuse himself from the charge of having *denied God*, when, during the time of persecution, he apostatized from the faith. Theodotus was a tanner of Byzantium, but nevertheless a man of considerable learning. After the taking of Byzantium by the forces of Severus, he went to Rome, in the year 196, and was excommunicated by Victor, bishop of Rome, for his heresy.

Artemon maintained the same doctrines as Theodotus, apparently with greater fame, but it is difficult to determine which of these two men preceded the other.

Melchisedechians. Among the followers of Theodotus was another man of the same name, a banker by profession, who is said to have founded a sect called Melchisedechians. They held the opinions of Theodotus respecting Christ, but entertained particular notions respecting Melchisedec, whom they considered as not a human being, but literally "without father and mother," his beginning and end being alike incomprehensible: they regarded him as superior to Christ, who is only called a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

Praxeas on the other hand fell into the opposite extreme. He conceived that the distinct personality of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity was inconsistent with the unity of God. He asserted that it was the Father himself who descended into the Virgin, was born of her, suffered, and was in fact Jesus Christ. In order to support this view, he appealed to the expressions "I and my Father are one." "He who has seen Me, has seen the Father also," &c. From his making the *Father suffer* his sect were called *Patripassians*, though Praxeas denied the fairness of the appellation. He asserted that the Father did not suffer *in* the Son, but sympathized *with* the Son. Praxeas was chiefly opposed by Tertullian, who probably was not very favourably disposed towards him, in consequence of his having persuaded Victor to an act of severity against the Montanists, which party Tertullian had joined. Praxeas was originally a presbyter of the Church in Asia, and came to Rome, where he propounded his heresy, and afterwards proceeded to Africa, where he is said to have acknowledged his errors; but subsequently relapsed into them again.

The followers of Praxeas, like those of Theodotus, were also called Monarchians (*μονη αρχη*), from their maintaining the Unity of God—the former denying the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity—the latter making Christ only a man.

From the arguments used by Tertullian in confuting this heresy, we learn what was the teaching of the Church at that time.

Hermogenes was a painter, who lived in Africa. Though no Gnostic, he held notions somewhat similar to theirs, respecting the origin of evil. He argued thus—God could not have produced the world out of nothing, for, if he had, it would have been perfectly good, which we see it is not:—neither could he have made it out of himself, for evil could not form part of his nature—therefore he must have made it out of already existing matter; to the defects of which, the origin of evil is to be traced. It is evident that this does not remove the difficulty, for it may be asked why did not the Supreme Being purge matter of its evil qualities. If he *could* not, he is not omnipotent, if he *would* not, he is not infinitely good.

Hermogenes argued also that the title “Lord” given to God is only a relative term, and implies the existence of something to be lord over,—that something was matter.

He was opposed by Tertullian from whose work our information is derived; and also by Theophilus of Antioch.

Montanus made no alteration in the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. His chief innovations affected discipline. He enjoined abstinence, and multiplied fasts. He regarded second marriages as adultery, and censured marriage generally. He denied absolution to the greater sins committed after Baptism, and condemned flight during persecution, or the purchase of safety by

money. His followers appear to have considered themselves as above the rest of the Church, and looked upon their less rigid brethren as the "carnally-minded," they themselves being of course the "spiritually minded:" a kind of self-laudation not confined to their sect or to their age only. It does not appear however that they separated from Church communion, until some ill-advised proceedings against them drove them into open separation, and made them decided schismatics. They then established a separate Church, which was founded first at Pepuza, a small town in Phrygia, [Mosheim] from which circumstance, (or perhaps from Montanus being born at Ardaba, a town of Mysia, but on the borders of Phrygia) they are also called, *Phrygians*, or *Cataphrygians*, and *Pepuziani*. They have other names peculiar to small sections of them, such as *Artoturitæ*, from using bread and cheese in their mysteries: *Tascodrugitæ*, from two Phrygian words (*τασκὸς* a stake, and *δρῶνργος* a nose) from their putting the forefinger on the nose whilst at prayer, &c., &c.

With regard to Montanus himself, he is said to have asserted that he was the Paraclete, or Comforter, promised by Christ; but upon this point Dr. Burton observes, "It seems certain that those persons have misrepresented his meaning, who understand that he identified himself with the Holy Ghost, and it is most probable that he spoke of his own inspiration as a supplement to that of the Apostles, proceeding from the same Holy Spirit, but vouchsafed in a fuller measure." He was a wild enthusiast, and it is therefore not surprising that the precise meaning of the incoherent expressions which he uttered in paroxysms of phrenzy should be difficult to ascertain.

Preeminent amongst his followers were two ladies of

rank and fortune, Maximilla and Priscilla, who pretended to be prophetesses. Tertullian, the great opponent of other heresies, became one of his converts, and defended his cause in several works. [See WRITERS.]

Millenarii. The doctrine of the Millennium was held under different modifications, by many of the fathers in the primitive ages, but never by the Church. It originated chiefly in the error of affixing a literal interpretation to the figurative language of a highly mystical book like the Apocalypse.

We have already seen that the personal reign of Christ upon earth was held by Cerinthus, but he was perhaps not the first* who maintained the doctrine. He is also said, whether justly or not, to have represented it as a period of sensual enjoyment.

According to Eusebius, the first person who introduced the doctrine, was Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, a man of slender capacity but extensive reading, who had published certain parables of Christ not recorded in the Gospel, and various fables which he pretended to have received by unwritten tradition, which would seem to confirm the supposition that his imagination was more lively than his judgment was sound. Even the adversaries of Papias however have never charged him with the sensual views of Cerinthus. His notion of the millennium was confined to the idea that, previous to the final judgment, there would be a resurrection of the just, who would reign with Christ upon earth for a thousand years. This idea, which gradually died away, has recently been revived by some writers of modern times.

* See Dr. Maitland's Essay upon this point. The learned author's views, however, are somewhat at variance with the opinions of other equally learned men.

HERESIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

Manichæans. This heresy arose in the reign of Probus. Its originator was *Manes*, or *Manichæus*, a Persian of considerable talent and learning, and author of several works. His pretensions were somewhat similar to those of Montanus. Like him, Manes is said to have represented himself as the Paraclete, or Comforter, though Beausobre denies that "he ever endeavoured to pass for the Holy Spirit;" but considers his fanaticism confined to his "assuming the authority of an Apostle of Christ, and a Prophet immediately inspired by the Paraclete, to reform all religions, and to reveal to the world truths in which our Lord had not thought proper to instruct his first disciples."

The Persians appear from remote antiquity to have believed in the existence of two principles—one good, and the other evil. Some supposed them equally eternal and independent, while others supposed each of them to have proceeded from a Supreme Being, or first cause. This idea many of the Gnostics had borrowed, as we have seen, but they loaded it with the complication of a series of successive emanations, whereas Manes inculcated the more simple belief that God was the cause of good, and matter the cause of evil.

Light being the greatest of blessings, the beneficent Being was supposed to reside in pure Light,—darkness on the other hand being naturally connected with everything vague and terrible, the evil spirit was said to dwell in darkness. These two spirits are always at war; in the course of their contests the partial confusion of good and evil took place.

Man was of a compound nature, having a soul derived from the good principle, but by the machinations of the evil spirit, these souls were encased in carnal and therefore evil bodies. To assist them the Son and Holy Ghost were sent by God. The former is supposed to reside in the sun and moon, the latter in the air.

The object of Christ's mission was thus explained. He informed men of their true origin, the causes of the captivity of their souls, and the means of recovering their former dignity. Having wrought innumerable miracles, in order to confirm his doctrine, He taught them, by His mystical crucifixion, how they should mortify incessantly their flesh and its passions. He shewed them also, by His mystical resurrection and ascension, that death destroys not the man but only his prison, and restores to purified souls the liberty of returning to their heavenly country.

As all human souls cannot acquire perfect purity in the course of one life; he admitted the *transmigration* of souls, in order to allow them to work out their salvation in other bodies: those who failed utterly, were handed over to the powers of darkness. The souls, on leaving this world, pass to the moon, which is pure water, where they are partially purified, and then transmitted to the sun, which is pure fire, where they are still further purged from the impurities of matter, and made fit to inhabit the realms of bliss. The Holy Ghost, residing in the air, continually assists the souls, pouring over them its salutary influence.

The supposition that the body was made by the evil spirit, necessarily involved the usual consequences—the assertion that Christ was a man in appearance only; the denial of the resurrection of the body; the rejection of marriage; abstinence from all sensual enjoyments; and the rigid mortification of the body.

Manes asserted that the four Gospels were either not composed by the authors whose names they bear, or that they had been corrupted. He recognized some parts of the New Testament, but rejected all passages that opposed his own hypotheses. He also rejected the Old Testament, and admitted the apocryphal books written by some of the earlier heretics. He is said to have composed a Gospel of his own, but this is uncertain.

Hierax was a native of Leontium, in Egypt. He has been said, though perhaps erroneously, [Mosheim] to have been a disciple of Manes, from whom he differed in many respects. The object of Christ's mission he believed was to promulgate a new law more perfect and strict than that of Moses. Hence all those who aspired to the attainment of virtue he held would practise excessive abstinence. He denied the resurrection of the body, and maintained that children who died before the age of reason could not enter into the kingdom of heaven, which was promised to those only who had successfully combated the passions of the flesh, which young children of course had had no opportunity of doing.

With respect to the Father and the Son, he compared them to two wicks lighted in the same lamp, and fed by the same oil. He supposed Melchisedec to be the Holy Spirit.

Noetus was a native of Smyrna, (some say, Ephesus). He taught that there was but one person in the Godhead, who was at one time called Father, and at another, Son. He maintained therefore that it was God the Father who was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the Cross. His followers, like those of Praxeas, were hence called *Patripassians*.

Sabellius was a bishop of Ptolemais, in the diocese of

Alexandria. His heresy, which has acquired more reputation than almost any other, consisted in asserting that the different persons of the Godhead are merely different *operations* of one Being, who is called Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, according as he is viewed in his capacity as Creator, Redeemer, or Sanctifier of mankind. He gave the law, as Father; he was incarnate, as Son; he descended upon the Apostles, as Holy Ghost. It is necessary to distinguish accurately between the various Trinitarian heresies, some of which appear at first sight to resemble one another very closely. *Noetus*, it will be observed, supposed the whole divinity of the Father to be in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part which was put forth like an emanation or energy. To illustrate his view by a comparison, he supposed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be three denominations of one essence; just as body, soul, and spirit, form one man. Noetus acknowledged only one divine person: Sabellius divided this one divinity into three.

Beryllus, bishop of Bozrah, in Arabia, taught that Jesus Christ had no distinct personal existence before his appearance on earth, and that he had only the divinity, or a portion of the divinity, of the Father residing in him. He seems to have thought that Jesus Christ, when he was born into the world, did not receive a soul like ordinary human beings, but that this divine emanation held in him the place of a soul.

Beryllus was afterwards convinced of his errors by Origen, and returned to the doctrine of the Church.

Paul of Samosata was bishop of Antioch about the year 265. He is represented as "rapacious and fraudulent in amassing wealth; proud and haughty in his demeanour; and even openly licentious in his moral conduct." Allow-

ing something for exaggeration, we may suppose that he was a man of wealth, and more fond of outward show than became a Christian bishop. His heretical opinions affected the doctrine of the Trinity, and also that of the Incarnation. He held that the Logos and the Holy Ghost were in the Father merely as reason is in man, without any real or personal existence: that, properly speaking, there was neither Father, nor Son, nor Holy Ghost, but simply one God. With respect to the Incarnation, he held that the Logos had no preexistence distinct from God himself, but was put forth by God after the birth of Jesus: that Christ was born a mere man, but that the wisdom, or reason (λόγος) of the Father descended into him, and enabled him to teach, and work miracles: that on account of this union of the Divine "Word" with the man Christ, we might say Christ was God, though not in the proper sense of the term. It will be observed that *Paul* approached very nearly to the heresy of *Sabellius*, but with somewhat more of the Gnostic idea of an "emanation" Christ being united to the man Jesus.

Many councils were held to examine his errors. One of them, held at Antioch, was attended by a large number of bishops, some of them from very distant countries. Firmilianus, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, presided, and, wishing to avoid the scandal of an open rupture, deferred his judgment for some time, hoping that Paul would retract his opinions: this hope being disappointed, the council met again some five years afterwards, and Paul was unanimously deposed and excommunicated.

His followers were called *Paulians*, or *Paulianists*, but must not be confounded with a sect which appeared some centuries afterwards, called *Paulicians*.

Novatian is to be considered rather as a schismatic than a heretic, and he will therefore be more fully mentioned under the head of "Schisms"; but he also held heretical opinions which call for notice in this place. He maintained that such as had been guilty of heinous sins after baptism could not be admitted into the Church, which indeed had no power to pardon them, and would even herself contract pollution by receiving them into her communion. Hence they called themselves *Cathari*, or Puritans, and rebaptized their proselytes. Novatian however admitted the necessity of penance, on the ground that the hope of salvation was not, like the reconciliation of the Church, denied to impenitent sinners.

Arius was a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria. He entered into a theological controversy with his bishop *Alexander*, whom he accused of Sabellianism. His heresy, which has acquired a more permanent reputation than any other, consisted in his maintaining that the Son was a created being, begotten indeed of the Father before all time and ages, but still created *by* him, and therefore not perfectly equal to him, or co-eternal *with* him. The celebrated council of Nice, held in A.D. 325, at which upwards of 300 Bishops were present, condemned his opinions, which nevertheless continued long to disturb the peace of the Church.

SCHISMS.

Having had occasion to treat so fully of the principles of *Montanus*, we need not do more than remind the reader that the violent and injudicious measures resorted to against him, drove him unnecessarily into an open act of schism and hostility to the Church. [See page 36].

Novatus. The excessive severity of the Decian persecution had caused many Christians to deny their faith, who, when the fury of the storm had blown over, were stung with remorse at their having "lapsed," and sought to return to Church-Communion. *Cyprian*, then Bishop of Carthage, refused to allow the profession of the Christian faith to be thus put off and put on at pleasure, and refused to admit them, except in cases where they were at the point of death, until they had given proofs of their sincerity by a term of probation. At this juncture, *Novatus*, who had before shewn somewhat of a turbulent disposition by improperly ordaining a man named *Felicissimus* to be a deacon, in direct opposition to the wishes, and without the authority of his bishop, now endeavoured to secure popularity for himself, by advocating greater leniency towards "the lapsed." He even went so far as to establish an actual party in the Church, in open opposition to *Cyprian*, who, being still obliged to remain in exile, was not so well able to repress these factious proceedings, but he refused to give way at all to the schismatics, and when at length he was enabled to return to Carthage, he called a council which condemned *Novatus* and his party.

Novatian. About the same time as the preceding a similar contest was going on at Rome. *Novatian*, who was a man of considerable learning and ability, was probably disappointed at not being elected to the see of Rome, and he spread a report, that *Cornelius*, who had just been made bishop, had formerly lapsed, and was an improper person to hold the office. Matters were in this state when *Novatus* came from Carthage to Rome, and easily persuaded *Novatian* to commence a schism, as he himself had just done at Carthage. The similarity

of the names of these two leaders, and of the proceedings with which they were connected, causes them to be often confounded. It is rather remarkable that Novatus, who had been so lenient towards the lapsed at Carthage, should have suddenly become so rigid at Rome. This alone shews that his conduct proceeded from love of opposition.

The party of Cornelius retorted upon Novatian, that *he* was disqualified, not only for a bishop, but even for a priest, because he had received clinical baptism, *i.e.* had been baptized in his bed when he lay dangerously ill, which according to the law of the Church in those days precluded a man from being ordained.

A council was held at Rome, which condemned Novatian and those who took part with him.

Novatian added to these schismatical proceedings some heretical opinions, which we have before noticed [page 43].

Donatus. *Cæcilianus* having been elected to the see of Carthage, by the majority of the clergy and people, some few bishops of Numidia, to whom notice had not been sent, felt themselves aggrieved at the election having taken place without them, and a party was formed to oppose the new bishop. One of the principal leaders of this faction was Donatus, who gave the name to the schism.

They accused *Cæcilianus*, first, of having been improperly consecrated by bishops who had been *traditores*, *i.e.* had delivered up the books belonging to the Church during the time of persecution: secondly, as some say, of having been himself a *traditor*, but perhaps more properly of having been hard-hearted towards the Christian martyrs during the Diocletian persecution, and of having forbidden food to be carried to them when in prison.

A council of 70 bishops, most of them however Donatists, proceeded to examine the question. Cæcilianus offered to be consecrated again, if it could be shewn that his former consecration was invalid, but the council took no notice of his arguments or proposals, and proceeded most improperly to elect another bishop for the see of Carthage. Their choice fell upon one Majorinus. For some time the Donatists continued to elect bishops of their own, though the Church always recognized Cæcilianus, and his successors, as the legitimate bishops of Carthage.

The Donatists brought their controversy before Constantine, who ordered a council at Rome to enquire into it. The Donatists being condemned, complained of the small number of bishops who were present at it, and said that their own council of 70 bishops who had elected Majorinus, ought to have more weight than so small a council. Constantine therefore directed a larger tribunal to meet at Arles, who also decided against them, as did Constantine, on a special examination of their case; but notwithstanding all these defeats, the party continued long to harass the Church.

The **Meletian** schism arose as follows. *Meletius*, Bishop of Lycopolis, taking advantage of the absence of Peter, then Bishop of Alexandria, took upon himself to make regulations, which no one but the bishops of dioceses could do. Some of the other bishops wrote to Meletius, expostulating with him upon the irregularity of his conduct, but in vain. He continued to exceed his bounds of jurisdiction and duty, and being supported by Arius and others, made himself the head of a party. Peter, on his return to Alexandria, caused a sentence of deposition to be passed against Meletius, but the latter, so far from complying with it, treated the sentence

with contempt, and the bishop himself with personal insolence.

The question was at length set at rest by the decision of the great council held at Nice, in Bithynia, A.D. 325.

ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

Those writers who are certainly known to have been the immediate pupils of the Apostles are distinguished by the name of *The Apostolic Fathers*. They are usually said to be five in number: *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Barnabas*, and *Hermas*, though it will be seen presently, that only the three first are properly so called: the writings which passed for some time under the names of the two latter, being now generally admitted to be spurious.

Clemens Romanus, the third Bishop of Rome, is supposed to be the "fellow-labourer" mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians, (chap. iv. 3). Neither the date of his appointment to the superintendence of the Church, nor the time of his death, can be exactly ascertained. He wrote an *Epistle to the Corinthians*, with a view to allay the dissensions which existed in that Church. It displays no assumption of authority on the part of the Bishop, or Church of Rome: it is simply the letter of a Christian pastor, consisting chiefly of gentle and brotherly exhortations to peace. Other works attributed to Clement, but now considered spurious, are a *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. *The Recognitions*. *An Epistle to James, our Lord's Brother*. *The Apostolical*

Constitutions and Canons; and the *Clementine Homilies*. He is supposed to have suffered martyrdom under Trajan, but this is by no means certain.

Ignatius was a disciple of St. John. The Emperor Trajan, on passing through Antioch, of which place Ignatius was bishop, condemned him to be exposed to wild beasts in the Amphitheatre at Rome. At various points on his journey thither, the bishops of several Churches, as representatives of their respective bodies, waited upon him, to take a solemn leave of the venerable martyr. To several of these Churches he afterwards addressed epistles, thanking them for their demonstration of Christian sympathy, and giving them sundry admonitions. These epistles have furnished matter for considerable discussion amongst the learned, as to whether certain longer or shorter copies of them were the genuine ones, it being doubted whether the longer ones were made so by interpolation, or the shorter ones by abridgment. Abp. Usher, Bp. Pearson, and others, have taken part in this controversy. It is now generally admitted that the shorter copies are the most correct, though even these have been somewhat interpolated. This is confirmed by the recent discovery of a Syriac version of three of the epistles, which is shorter than either of the Greek copies. The cause of so sharp a controversy respecting their genuineness is the high tone which they assume respecting the authority of Christian Ministers. The Epistles are seven in number, six of them are addressed to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, and one to Polycarp. Ignatius was surnamed *Theophorus*, because, in his answer to Trajan, he called himself so, saying that he carried Christ in his breast. This name has been derived from

the very far-fetched supposition that he was the very child whom Jesus took up in his arms.

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. He lived to witness the rise 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 only a portion has been preserved, but we possess an old Latin translation of the entire Epistle. Polycarp suffered martyrdom at Smyrna, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, at an advanced age; as we learn from an Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, which gives a detailed account of his sufferings. In this document many of the venerable Bishop's last sayings are recorded, amongst which is his answer to the proconsul, who was urging him to obtain his liberty by reproaching Christ, to whom the old man replied, "Eighty and six years have I now served Christ, and he has never done me the least wrong; how then can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour."

In this Epistle also we find it stated, that when the fire was raging furiously round him at the stake, "the flames, making a kind of arch like the sail of a ship filled with the wind, encompassed as in a circle the body of the holy martyr, who stood in the midst of it, not as if his flesh were burnt, but as bread that is baked, or as gold or silver glowing in the furnace. Moreover, so sweet a smell came from it, as if frankincense, or some rich spices had been smoking there."

A voice from heaven is also said to have been heard, encouraging him with the words, "Be strong Polycarp, and quit thyself like a man."

The narrative adds, that their enemies endeavoured to prevent the Christians from obtaining the remains of the martyr, "lest forsaking the crucified, (Jesus), they should begin to worship this Polycarp: not considering that neither is it possible for us ever to forsake Christ, nor worship any other than Him. For HIM indeed as being the Son of God do we *adore*; but for the *martyrs* we worthily *love them* as the disciples and followers of the Lord, and on account of their exceeding great affection towards their Master and King."

This passage is of importance, as being the avowal of those very persons whose authority is insisted upon by the Church of Rome for the primitive custom of worshipping relics!

Barnabas. An Epistle bearing the name of Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul, is generally classed amongst the works of the Apostolic Fathers; but very improperly so, for St. Barnabas either *was* the author of it, or he *was not*. If he were, it should be placed in the canon of Holy Scripture, as the work of *an Apostle*; if he were not, the only ground upon which its claim to authority rests, is taken away, and it is to be considered merely as a spurious writing.

Hermas, mentioned in Romans xvi. 14, is said to have been the author of a well meant but weakly conceived kind of allegory, entitled *The Shepherd*, but it was probably written about the middle of the second century, by another *Hermas*, brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome.

Justin Martyr was born in Samaria, and went to Ephesus to study Philosophy. He applied successively to the masters of the Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean,

and Platonic Schools, and being disappointed with all, and convinced of the insufficiency of all systems of human philosophy, he turned to Christianity, and being satisfied of its truth became a disciple. He presented his *first Apology* to Antoninus Pius, and his second to Marcus Aurelius. He wrote also an imaginary *Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew*, which contains various arguments to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. There are other works attributed to him which are either decidedly spurious, or at any rate doubtful.

Tatian was an Assyrian, who came to Rome to prosecute his studies, and there became a convert to Christianity, and a friend of Justin Martyr. He composed a "*Discourse against the Gentiles*," which is alone extant. It is sometimes printed with the works of Justin Martyr, which is probably the cause of a work bearing this title having been attributed to Justin. He also wrote a "*Harmony of the Gospels*," which has not come down to us. He was founder of the Encratites.

Hegesippus was an Ecclesiastical Historian, of whose writings only a few fragments remain.

Hermias was a convert to Christianity, who wrote a short treatise entitled "A Satire on Heathen Philosophy," in which he ridicules the numerous discrepancies found in the several systems of the Greek philosophers. It is sometimes appended to the works of Justin Martyr.

Dionysius of Corinth was bishop of Corinth during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. He addressed various epistles to different Churches, containing instructions and remonstrances on points of Christian doctrine and discipline. There were others of this name, as *Dionysius the Areopagite*, afterwards the first bishop of Athens; *Dionysius*, Bishop of Rome, and

Dionysius of Alexandria, a pupil of Origen, and afterwards master of the catechetical school at Alexandria: he was then made a presbyter, and ultimately became bishop of Alexandria. During the severe persecution by Decius, he was obliged to seek safety by flight. He was once taken prisoner, but having escaped, he retired to a desert part of Libya, where he remained concealed until the death of Decius. After the return of Dionysius 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 lasted 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—and generally in opposing faction and heresy, and in promoting the peace of the Church.

In refuting the errors of Sabellius, Dionysius used some expressions which caused his own orthodoxy to be called in question by the bishop of Rome, whose name also was Dionysius, but his defence showed that if he had been accidentally betrayed into an indiscreet use of terms in the heat of argument, his deliberate views were in accordance with the teaching of the Church.

During the persecution under Valerian, Dionysius was summoned before the governor of Egypt, and required to renounce the Christian religion, and on his refusal was banished to a remote part of Libya.

After his return a second time to Alexandria, he wrote against Paul of Samosata, and would have attended the council which met at Antioch to consider his errors, if his health had not failed him. He died in A.D. 265. Only a few fragments of his works have come down to

us. We have taken him out of his proper place, in order that we might mention together those persons who bore the same name.

Athenagoras was a native of Athens. Whilst reading the Scriptures, with a view to find materials for a treatise against the Christians, he became converted and wrote in their behalf. He presented an *Apology*, called *An Embassy in behalf of the Christians*, to Marcus Aurelius. He also wrote a treatise on the *Resurrection of the Dead*.

Theophilus, a convert from heathenism, was Bishop of Antioch, and wrote three books in defence of Christianity to *Autolycus*, a learned heathen friend.

Irenæus, though bishop of a Western Church, Lyons, belonged originally to Asia Minor, where he had received instruction from two of the disciples of St. John, Papias and Polycarp. Having gone from Asia to Gaul, he was ordained presbyter by Pothinus, bishop of Lyons. During his discharge of that office he was selected to carry letters respecting the Montanists from the Christians in Gaul to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome. After the martyrdom of Pothinus, Irenæus was elected his successor to the see of Lyons.

Of his writings many are known to us only by name, but the most important of his works, a *Treatise against Heresies*, in five books, has been preserved, partly in the original Greek, and partly in an old Latin translation. He also composed two letters, one to Blastus "concerning Schism," and another to Florinus concerning the unity of God. There is no evidence of his having suffered martyrdom.

Clement of Alexandria, a convert from heathenism, was a presbyter of Alexandria and succeeded Pantenus as master of the school there. He may be considered

the most learned of the fathers. His three principal works still extant are his *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, his *Pædagogus*, and his *Stromata*. He wrote many other works of less importance, of which the greater part are lost. He retired into Cappadocia during the persecution by Septimius Severus, and is supposed to have died about A.D. 220.

Hippolytus wrote several commentaries, according to Jerome, but very little is known about him. He is called by ancient authors both bishop and martyr, but neither the seat of his bishopric nor the time or place of his martyrdom are known. It appears that he was a disciple of Irenæus, and that he lived in the time of Alexander Severus.

Origen surnamed *Adamantius* was born at Alexandria. He studied under Clemens in the school at that place. His father Leonides suffered martyrdom, and their property being confiscated, Origen was left at 17 years old with his mother and six younger brothers dependent upon him. By great exertions he supported himself and them, and rising into favour with Demetrius the bishop, was appointed to the mastership of the catechetical school of Alexandria. His assiduity was wonderful and his literary labours would almost surpass belief. It is impossible here to enumerate his works, the chief of which are his *Answer to Celsus*, his *Commentaries*, *Homilies*, *Hexapla*, and *Tetrapla*, &c. &c. Origen left Alexandria on several occasions. During one of his journeys, when at Cæsarea, he was requested, though a layman, to expound the Scriptures in the Church. Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, who was probably jealous of the rising fame of Origen, complained of this step as an infringement of the rules of the Church, and recalled him. The bishop was still more incensed when, on a subsequent

journey, Origen was ordained priest by the bishops of Palestine, a step which Demetrius considered as an improper interference with his duties, and he caused a council to condemn Origen, and forbid him to teach or even reside in Alexandria.

In the Decian persecution he was thrown into prison, and severely tortured, but he never obtained the crown of martyrdom for which he so ardently longed. He was released on the death of Decius, and died soon afterwards at Tyre in his 70th year. "Notwithstanding the fervour of his piety, the modesty of his language, and the purity of his morals, the memory of this no less learned than humble and pious Christian has been branded, his name anathematized, and his salvation denied." [Jeremie]. It is much to be regretted that he lent the weight of his name and great ability to the fanciful mode of interpreting Holy Scripture, which obtained in the school of the later Platonist or Eclectic philosophy.

Pamphilus, a presbyter of Cæsarea, laboured to collect the works of ancient writers, particularly of Origen, the greater part of whose writings he transcribed. Amongst other works he wrote five books to defend Origen from the charge of heresy brought against him by

Methodius, bishop of Tyre, but formerly of Olympus, or Patara, in Lycia. He suffered martyrdom at Chalcis, during the persecution of Diocletian. He wrote a treatise in praise of a single life, called "the Banquet of the Ten Virgins." He is better known for his Treatises against Porphyry and Origen.

Gregory, surnamed Thaumaturgus, on account of the miracles he is said to have worked, was Bishop of Neocæsarea. He wrote a *Panegyric on Origen*, a *Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*, a *Creed*, and some Epistles.

LATIN WRITERS.

Tertullian is the most ancient Latin Ecclesiastical writer whose works remain. He was the son of a centurion at Carthage, but whether originally a heathen or not is disputed. After having remained in the Church till he had attained the middle age of life, he separated from it and became a Montanist. His works are very numerous, both before and after his secession, and perhaps the latter are not the least valuable; for, on becoming a Montanist, he attempts to expose the practice and discipline of the Church, thereby informing us very much more fully than we could otherwise have learnt, what that practice and discipline was.

Minucius Felix, probably an African lawyer, wrote a dialogue between a Christian and a heathen, Minucius himself being supposed to be the arbitrator, in which the heathen advocate is vanquished. It is called *Octavius* from the name of the Christian advocate.

Cyprian. Thascus Cæcilius Cyprianus was born in Africa, probably at Carthage, of heathen parents, about the year 200. He soon became remarkable for his abilities, and taught rhetoric at Carthage. He lived in great affluence and splendour, and, as some say, with very questionable morality. Being converted to Christianity by one Cæcilius, a Carthaginian presbyter, he became quite an altered man, and attained a very high degree of Christian holiness; giving strong proof of the sincerity of the change which had taken place in him, by distributing his property amongst the poor. Out of gratitude to him who had been the means of his conversion, he assumed the prænomen of Cæcilius, and took charge of the family of his benefactor on his death.

Immediately after his conversion he applied himself to the study of Holy Scripture, in which he attained such proficiency that he was rapidly advanced in the Church, and about the year 249 was made bishop of Carthage. While the persecution of Decius raged, he took shelter in retirement; when it had subsided he applied himself to remedy the relaxed state of discipline which it had occasioned. [See history]. His conduct during a pestilence which afflicted Carthage, afford a noble instance of piety and judgment. When the streets were strewed with dead, and the living fled with selfish fear, abandoning their nearest and dearest friends, Cyprian assembled the Christians, and strongly as well as successfully inculcated the great duties of humanity.

In the persecution by Valerian, he was banished to Curubis, a place about fifty miles from Carthage. He was permitted by Galerius Maximinus, the next proconsul, to return from exile, but shortly afterwards, refusing to renounce his religion, he was sentenced to death by the same officer, and immediately beheaded.

He has left behind him many valuable works, the chief of which are his *Epistles*, which throw great light on the history of the Church—his treatise respecting "*the Lapsed*," and the *Unity of the Church*, reflecting severely on heresy and schism. Shortly after his conversion he wrote a *letter to Donatus on the Grace of God*, and a treatise on *The Vanity of Idols*. Other works of his are *on the Lord's Prayer—on Good Works and Alms—on Patience—an Exhortation to Martyrdom, &c. &c.*

Eusebius does not properly belong to our subject, not being a writer of the first three centuries, but we cannot conclude this sketch without some brief notice

of the "father of ecclesiastical history." He was elected Bishop of Cæsarea, in the year 315. He was highly favoured by the Emperor Constantine, whose life he afterwards wrote. He was charged with being an Arian at heart, but the fact probably is that, although sound in his own 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 therefore would not go all the lengths they would have wished.

He was author of several works, of which some parts are lost, but he is best known by his *Ecclesiastical History*, his *Life of Constantine*, and his *Harmony of the Gospels*, in which the passages are arranged in ten lists, or *Canons*, (*κανόνες*) according as they are found in one, two, three, or all four of the Gospels.

The Christian *Apologies* were treatises written as expositions of Christianity, to defend it from the attacks, or to answer the objections, of the heathen.

The Apologists were

Quadratus.

Aristides.

Justin Martyr.

Melito of Sardis.

Apollinaris.

Abercius.

Athenagoras.

Miltiades.

Theophilus of Antioch.

Tatian.

Hermias

A BRIEF SKETCH
OF
THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE
FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FROM
THE ASCENSION OF OUR LORD, TO THE
COUNCIL OF NICE, A.D. 325.

THE object of this Sketch is not to relate History, or to supply the place of more extensive reading, but merely to assist in *impressing facts upon the memory*—the ecclesiastical-history student's greatest difficulty.

In framing the outline, the most prominent points in the history of each century have been kept in view, and the details have been filled in with especial regard to such questions as are usually found in the Examination Papers of the University, in order that the greatest quantity of useful matter may be compressed into the least possible space, and the whole arranged in such a form as may be most easily retained by the memory.

The chronological order followed, is that of Dr. Burton, who differs very materially from most other writers, but he has paid so much attention to this particular part of the subject, that his dates are probably the most correct.

FIRST CENTURY.

A.D. 31. Forty days after our Lord's Resurrection he ascended into heaven, having commanded his Apostles to remain in Jerusalem "until they should be endued with power from on high."

Having made up the original number of twelve by the election, by lot, of Matthias in the place of the traitor Judas, they were all assembled together on the day of Pentecost, ten days after the Ascension, when, with a sound as of a rushing mighty wind, cloven tongues, as of fire, were seen to descend upon each of them, and they received the gift of the Holy Ghost, by which they were endued with the miraculous power of speaking in strange languages, which was to qualify them for executing the mission of their divine Master, "Go ye and teach all nations."

This we may consider as the first commencement of the Christian *Church*, and HE who has promised to be "with it alway" now showed the power of His support by the addition of 3,000 souls in one day, at the preaching of Peter. We read shortly afterwards of "the number of the men being about 5,000;" of "multitudes being added to the Lord," and even of "a large company of priests being obedient to the faith;" so "mightily grew the word of God and prevailed," by such apparently humble means. But as the Jews had persecuted the Master, so (according to His prediction) do they now persecute the followers, who added to the already existing causes of enmity this also, that they preached in Jesus the resurrection of the dead; which drew down upon them

the more especial opposition of the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection.

Peter and John are first imprisoned, afterwards the whole twelve; but by the advice of Gamaliel they are allowed to depart, after having been beaten and commanded to desist from "speaking in the name of Jesus."

To assist in the service of the now enlarged community *Seven Deacons* are appointed to attend to the distribution of the alms; some disputes having arisen on the subject. Their duty was also to preach, baptize, and assist in the administration of the Eucharist. Their names were—

Prochorus, Stephen, Nicanor, Timon, Philip, Parmenas, and Nicolas.

The names of two call for particular notice, viz. *Stephen*, who has the honour of being the *first Christian Martyr*; and *Philip*, who, on the dispersion of the disciples, went down into Samaria, where he preached with great success, and performed many miracles. It was here that he met with *Simon Magus*, who is said to have been the founder of the Gnostic Heresy. [See Heresies.] Being conscious that his own miracles were impostures, he was probably greatly impressed by the real miracles of Philip, or he may have been struck by Philip's preaching, and been really anxious to reconcile the two systems.

Stephen's death was followed by systematic persecution, and the disciples were all "scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the apostles." To this we may attribute in a great measure the rapid spread of the Christian religion in distant parts.

We now witness the miraculous *conversion of Saul*, the bitter persecutor of the Church, and now going to Damascus for the purposes of persecution, into one of its

most active defenders; so much so indeed that when (after a period of retirement in Arabia for the purpose of moral and intellectual training) he enters upon his work, we find that he was obliged to be "let down by the wall in a basket" in order to escape from the fury of the Jews of Damascus, whom he had confounded by preaching in the synagogues that Christ was the Son of God.

Such is a brief history of the Church during the *first year* of its existence.

A.D. 32. The time was now come for fulfilling the grand scheme of the admission of the Gentiles into a participation in the benefits of the Gospel, and for the destruction of the partition wall which had hitherto separated the Jewish nation from the rest of the world, as a peculiar people. This was effected by the conversion of Cornelius, the Centurion and *first Gentile convert*, and whilst St. Peter was preaching to those assembled, "the Holy Ghost fell on all that heard the word," as it had done before upon the Apostles" at the beginning.

A.D. 37. *Tiberius* is succeeded by *Caligula*, who greatly offends the Jews, in A.D. 39, by ordering his statue to be erected in the temple at Jerusalem. The Jews are so fully occupied with this insult that the Christians are not thought of, and we read that "the Churches had rest." Caligula was assassinated in the 4th year of his reign, and was succeeded by *Claudius*.

A.D. 42. Barnabas brings Saul from Tarsus, his native city, to Antioch, where they labour together with great effect. The Church now assumes a more definite character, so much so that the disciples are no longer called by vague names, such as "believers," &c., but—*Christians*.

A.D. 43. Herod Agrippa kills "James the brother of

John," being the first *Apostle* who is a martyr. He proceeded to "take Peter also," but he was delivered by an angel who opened the prison doors and led him out.

A.D. 44. There being a famine in Judæa (as predicted by Agabus) Barnabas and Saul are sent with a contribution to Jerusalem, and on their return to Antioch they are set apart by the Holy Ghost "for the work to which they are called."

A.D. 45. In company with Barnabas, Saul now starts on his FIRST APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, from Antioch to the seaport Seleucia, through the Island of Cyprus, where he converts the deputy Sergius Paulus, in honour of whom he changes his own name to PAUL; thence to *Perga*, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, whence he is obliged to flee for fear of being stoned to Lystra, where he is stoned and left for dead, but recovers and proceeds to Derbe, returning by the same route to Perga, thence to Attalia, and back to Antioch.

On his return there arises the great question of the necessity for Gentile converts to comply with the Mosaic Law, which is settled by the *first Christian Council* of Jerusalem, A.D. 46.

St. James the Less, "the Lord's brother," (more properly cousin) and first Bishop of Jerusalem, was the president of this council. He afterwards suffered martyrdom, by being thrown from the roof of the temple and beaten to death with a fuller's club. He was the author of the Epistle which bears his name.

St. Paul, having separated from Barnabas on account of a dispute about Mark who was a relation of Barnabas, now starts (A.D. 46) on his SECOND APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY. From Antioch, through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches, to Derbe and Lystra, where he meets with

Timothy, through Phrygia and Galatia to Mysia, where, by direction of the Holy Spirit (Acts xvi. 6—7), he leaves Asia at Troas (where Luke joins him), and crosses over to Neapolis, and Philippi, where he is beaten and imprisoned. Here he converts the woman of Thyatira, dispossesses the Pythoness and converts his jailor, who is alarmed at an earthquake which occurs in the night. Paul passes through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, where he preaches in the synagogue with great effect, but is compelled by the Jews to leave it, and proceed to Berea, where he is better received; but Jews coming from Thessalonica oblige him to leave this place also, and proceed to Athens, where he delivers his eloquent address on Mars Hill, and makes a convert of Dionysius the Areopagite, afterwards Bishop of the Church at Athens [*Eusebius*]. He then passes on to Corinth, where he remains eighteen months. He is taken before Gallio, the deputy proconsul of Achaia, but not punished. From Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, he crosses to Ephesus, thence to Cæsarea and Jerusalem, to keep the feast of Pentecost, and returns to Antioch. After remaining there a few months he departs on his

THIRD APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, through Galatia and Phrygia, visiting the different churches there, to Ephesus, where he remains three years, [Acts xx. 31], during which he probably visits Crete, leaving Titus as its bishop. On a tumult being raised by the worshippers of Diana, he leaves the city and goes into Macedonia and Illyria, revisits Corinth, and winters there, proposing to sail thence into Syria, but to avoid a plot of the Jews he goes round by Macedonia again to Philippi; then crossing to Troas, he coasts along to Miletus, where he sends for the elders of the Church from Ephesus, and delivers a

charge to them; thence by Coos and Rhodes to Patara, Tyre, Ptolemais, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem. A.D. 53.

Shortly after his arrival in Jerusalem he is in the temple with four other men who had a vow, when the Jews lay hands upon him, and are about to kill him, when Lysias the chief captain comes down with a guard and rescues him. Having pleaded that he is a Roman citizen he is sent to Cæsarea, where the Roman governor Felix resided, before whom he is accused, and defends himself with great effect. He is however left in prison to please the Jews. Festus succeeds Felix as procurator of Judæa (A.D. 55), and examines Paul, who appeals to Cæsar. Having once more pleaded his cause before Festus, Agrippa, and Bernice, he is sent prisoner to Rome: is shipwrecked on the voyage, winters at Malta, and arrives in Rome A.D. 56. Here he remains "two whole years in his own hired house," preaching and teaching the Gospel freely.

What St. Paul did after his release is not clearly known. It appears most probable that he went into *Spain*; some assign his visit to Crete to this period, though we have placed it earlier, on the authority of Dr. Burton.

A.D. 64. *Nero* sets fire to Rome, and to screen himself throws the blame upon the Christians, and commences the *First persecution* which lasted four years. Amongst the victims to its fury are—*Linus*, the first Bishop of Rome; *St. Peter*, who was crucified with his head downwards; and *St. Paul*, who visited Rome a second time in A.D. 67.

Meanwhile the excessive oppression of *Florus*, the Roman procurator of Judæa, had driven the Jews into open rebellion, which *Vespasian*, then *Nero's* general, was

sent with a large force to repress. During this war Nero kills himself, and *Galba*, *Otho*, and *Vitellius*, having successively occupied the throne for a brief period, *Vespasian* is made Emperor by the army, and leaves his son *Titus* to continue the Jewish war. After a long siege, accompanied by the greatest horrors and fearful loss of life, *Jerusalem is taken*, and levelled with the ground, A.D. 72. *Josephus* has written the account fully.

The Christians of Jerusalem, profiting by our Saviour's warning, (Matth. xxiv. 16), had removed to *Pella*, a small town beyond Jordan. Here, and according to some authorities at this time, arose the two sects of *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*, [see Heresies], but others more properly refer them to a later date.

After the destruction of Jerusalem many of the Christians returned thither with Simeon their bishop.

Neither *Vespasian* nor *Titus* persecuted the Christians, but the latter was succeeded, A.D. 81, by his brother *Domitian*, whose enmity to them was long growing, and finally broke out in the *Second persecution*, A.D. 93. The cruelty of *Domitian* led to his assassination A.D. 96, and *Nerva*, a mild and enlightened prince, gave relief to the persecuted Christians.

This century closes with the death of the venerable Apostle and Evangelist, *St. John*. After his return from exile he retired to Ephesus, near which city he is supposed to have died, at the advanced age of one hundred. He was banished by *Domitian* to the island of Patmos, where he wrote the Apocalypse [Rev. i. 9]. *Tertullian* relates that when at Rome he was plunged into a cauldron of boiling oil, and came out unhurt, but this is not very well supported.

SECOND CENTURY.

Contrary to what might have been expected from an enlightened and otherwise excellent Prince, like *Trajan*, the second century opens with the *Third persecution*. *Simeon*, Bishop of Jerusalem, a venerable man of one hundred and twenty years of age, and *Ignatius*, Bishop of Antioch, being among its victims; the latter being condemned by the Emperor himself, when passing through Antioch on his way to Parthia. He was sent to Rome, and exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. [See Writers.]

A.D. 111. About this time *Pliny* the younger, who was the proprætor of Bithynia, writes his celebrated *letter to Trajan*, stating the great progress of Christianity in his province, and the consequent decline of the old religion, and asks for the Emperor's instructions. Trajan's answer directs that the Christians are not to be sought for, but that, if accused and convicted of professing Christianity, they are to be punished. This letter, though probably not intended to produce persecution, was easily abused by the heathen for that purpose.

A.D. 117. Trajan is now succeeded by *Hadrian*, who has been improperly added to the list of persecutors. It is true that the Christians suffered much during his reign, but that is no more than they had ever done, sometimes from the enmity of the Jews, sometimes from the heathen; but there is nothing to shew that Hadrian was at all connected with these popular outbursts. His written instructions to the different governors of provinces, such as for instance his answer to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul of Asia, shew that if they had been acted on it would have been less easy for their enemies to have molested

the Christians. He directs that informers are not to be encouraged, but that both parties should be fairly heard, and no one condemned without clear proof of some positive violation of the laws. This does not look like persecution; but in order to make a literal interpretation of prophecy [see Rev. xvii. 12—14,] accord with fact, it is usual to consider this as the *Fourth persecution*. Hadrian spent a good deal of time in travelling through his dominions, in the course of which, *apologies* on behalf of the Christians were presented to him by *Quadratus*, afterwards Bishop of Athens, and *Aristides*, an Athenian philosopher, both of which are lost. On his visit to Jerusalem, at the beginning of his reign, Hadrian had greatly insulted the Jews by giving to the city, which was now rising out of the ruins, as much as possible the appearance of a Roman town, and had even built a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the very site of the national sanctuary. Taking advantage of his absence in another part of the kingdom, the indignation of the Jews burst forth into *revolt*, under *Bar-Cochab*, in A.D. 132, which ended in their entire subjection. From this time no Jew was allowed even to come within sight of Jerusalem, except for an hour on the anniversary of its destruction by Titus. The very name of the city was now changed to *Ælia Capitolina*. This is probably the more correct time from which to date the rise of the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*; since the final blow to all Jewish hopes being now struck, would make those who still clung to Judaism among the Christians so small a number as to deserve the name of a mere sect. The church at Jerusalem was now presided over by its *first Gentile Bishop*—*Marcus*.

Antoninus Pius having been adopted by Hadrian, not long before his death, succeeds him as Emperor, in A.D.

138. Although not a persecuting Emperor, the Christians suffered severely from the fury of the populace in this as in the former reign, Telesphorus, Bishop of Rome, being one of their victims. *Justin Martyr* now writes his *first apology*, as an answer to the calumnious accusations which were brought against the Christians.

A.D. 158. The Eastern and Western Churches having now for some time differed as to the time of keeping *Easter*, *Polycarp*, Bishop of Smyrna, undertakes a journey for the purpose of conferring with *Anicetus*, the Bishop of Rome, on the subject. The Eastern Churches kept the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might be (hence afterwards called *Quartodecimani*). The Western Churches kept it on the *Sunday* following. Neither of the Bishops was able to convince the other, as each appealed to apostolical tradition,—the former to John and Philip, the latter to Peter and Paul. The controversy was, however, maintained with perfect goodwill on both sides.

A.D. 161. *Marcus Aurelius*, who now succeeds *Antoninus Pius*, added to the general antipathy of a heathen the additional hatred of a bigot, being a Stoic philosopher, and, therefore, likely to view Christianity with less indifference than his predecessors. Accordingly we find that, although he certainly at first issued an edict confirming those of Hadrian and Trajan, which gave the Christians the benefit of a fair trial, yet he afterwards allowed so much severity to be exercised, that this *Fifth persecution* was the severest that they had yet endured.

Justin Martyr presented his *second apology* to the Emperor, but did not long survive it. He was at first scourged, and afterwards beheaded, with many other companions.

Amongst other well-known persons who perished in this persecution we find—*Publius*, Bishop of Athens; *Papias*, Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia, who was the first who held the doctrine of a Millennium; and, above all, the aged and apostolical Bishop of Smyrna, *Polycarp*. [See Writers.]

Several apologies were presented in this reign by Justin, Athenagoras, Tatian, Abercius, Apollinarius, and Melito, of Sardis.

About the middle of this century, the *schism* of *Montanus* had its rise. [See Heresies].

A.D. 174. Aurelius being this year engaged in the German war, and his army suffering much for want of water, it is said that they were relieved by a miraculous shower, which fell at the prayers of some Christian soldiers, who thence acquired the name of *the thundering legion*, in consequence of which the Emperor is said to have issued an edict highly favourable to the Christians. Probably, however, the edict and the miracle are both equally fabulous. At any rate we have direct evidence that the persecution did *not* cease, for we have detailed accounts of the sufferings of martyrs at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, in which it is said that “the amphitheatre was surfeited with victims.” Amongst them was *Pothinus*, the aged Bishop of Lyons. He was succeeded in his office by *Irenæus*. [See Writers].

A.D. 180. Aurelius now dies, having reigned for nineteen years, during the whole of which time he had in vain endeavoured, by means of persecution, to stop the progress of Christianity, which had nevertheless increased rapidly; so much more mighty was the support of the great Head of the Church, than all the efforts of man to “prevail against it.”

The storm, which had been raging so long, did not entirely pass away during the first part of the reign of Commodus, who now succeeds to the throne, as we learn from the writings of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, and also from the apology of Miltiades. *Apollonius*, a member of the Senate, was put to death at Rome, which shews that Christianity was beginning to prevail amongst the higher classes. It may, perhaps, appear strange that our religion should suffer persecution from the wise and accomplished Trajan and the philosophic Aurelius, and yet enjoy peace under a monster of cruelty and impiety like Commodus. This arose from his entire contempt for all religion. The temples of his own heathen gods were turned into scenes of debauchery, and he was, therefore, not likely to care much what religious opinions his subjects held. He was, moreover, equally cruel to all, and the heathen had to look to themselves instead of molesting the Christians. It is also said that Marcia, the Emperor's favourite mistress, had once been a Christian, and used her influence over the Emperor on their behalf.

As evidence of the wide spread of the Gospel at this time, it is said that a *British prince*, named *Lucius*, wrote to Eleutherus, now Bishop of Rome, to send him some persons to instruct his people in the Gospel. The story is probably invented to support the authority of the See of Rome.

A.D. 190. About this time *Pantaenus* is reported to have taken a journey to *India*; the inhabitants of that country having made a request similar to that of Lucius. Whether he went to what we now call India, or merely to part of Arabia, is uncertain. He is said to have found there a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, in Hebrew, which had been left there by the apostle *Bartholomew*.

A.D. 192. On the last day of this year Commodus is killed, and *Pertinax* and *Didius Julianus* having occupied the throne for a few months successively, the Empire is thrown into confusion by the appearance of three rival candidates.

Septimius Severus ultimately prevails and succeeds to the throne. The *Easter question*, which had been discussed with so much temper and good spirit by Polycarp and Anicetus, was now revived in a more serious form, by *Victor*, Bishop of Rome, taking upon himself to dictate to the Eastern Churches, and endeavouring to compel them to conform to the Western practice. *Polycrates*, Bishop of Ephesus, called a synod of the Asiatic Bishops, and an answer was returned to Victor to the effect that they should adhere to their own practice. Victor behaved with great violence and bad spirit throughout, and brought upon himself a severe rebuke from Irenæus, now Bishop of Lyons, who was one of his own party as Bishop of a Western Church, though, having come to Lyons from Asia, he might have been expected to take the other side in the question, but probably felt it his duty to conform to the practice which he found existing in the West.

From the death of Aurelius to the close of the century the Church had rest from external persecution, but it now began to suffer severely from internal enemies. Temporal afflictions had served as a bond of union to keep all the Christians firm in the faith for which they were called upon to suffer; but, when these were removed, more opportunities were given for the public discussion of points of doctrine, and accordingly we find that in the last twenty years of this century heresies began to appear in abundance, as they had before done during the comparatively

peaceful reign of Antoninus Pius. They now, however, begin to assume a more formidable character. They had hitherto been confined to the mystical confusions of Gnosticism, they now proceed to involve in doubts the doctrine of the Holy Trinity itself.

The power of working miracles may be supposed to have ceased by about the middle of this century, for, supposing only the apostles to have been able to *confer* the power, the last person upon whom any of them could have laid his hands would, according to the ordinary course of nature, have been dead by about the middle of this century. Mosheim, however, refers to their existence in the third century. We may reasonably suppose that this power was gradually withdrawn as the Church became more firmly established, and the necessity for extraneous aids diminished.

THIRD CENTURY.

The first nine years of the reign of Septimius Severus had been too fully employed in contests with other rivals to the throne to allow him to attend to matters of less importance, but at the close of the year 201 he commenced the *Sixth persecution*, which was no doubt owing in a great measure to the unwillingness of the Christians to serve in the army. This in the eyes of a warlike Emperor, who owed his throne to his military activity, would look very much like disaffection, and dispose him to use great severity. This persecution raged most fiercely in Alexandria, where *Leonides* the father of *Origen* was martyred. [See Writers]. Clement of Alexandria was obliged to save his life by flight, and Demetrius, the

bishop, committed the care of the Alexandrian school to Origen. So severe was this persecution, that several writers began to predict, on the faith of prophecy, that the end of the world was at hand. To such an early date may we trace the existence of opinions which are still being urged in these our own times.

A.D. 208. Severus sets out with his two sons, Caracalla and Geta, to complete the conquest of Britain, and dies at York A.D. 211.

This put a stop to persecution, for *Caracalla*, who murdered his brother *Geta*, in order to have sole possession of the throne, was a tyrant to all his subjects equally, and cared nothing for any religion. The Christians therefore enjoyed as much peace as the rest of the nation.

Alexander, Bishop of Cappadocia, was on a visit to Jerusalem at the time when *Narcissus*, its bishop, after an absence of some years, was re-elected to the see, but being a very old man it was deemed advisable that he should have some one to assist him in his duties, and *Alexander* was appointed co-bishop of Jerusalem, and continued in the office alone on the death of *Narcissus*. This is the earliest mention of the *translation of a bishop*.

A.D. 215. The inhabitants of *Alexandria* having provoked *Caracalla*, by allusion to his crimes, he ordered a general *massacre* of the inhabitants, not of the Christians in particular, though they probably suffered as much if not more than the rest.

A.D. 217. The disgraceful reign of *Caracalla* at length came to a close, and his successor *Macrinus* having reigned only one year, the empire was given to *Elagabalus*, who was formerly a priest of the Sun, at Emessa, in Phœnicia. After a vain attempt to suppress all other worship, except that of the Sun, he was put to death,

after a reign of not quite four years, being then only eighteen years old.

A.D. 222. Another youthful Emperor, *Alexander Severus*, now ascended the throne, at the early age of sixteen, who approached nearer to Christianity than any of his predecessors. He is said to have had an image of Christ in his room, to which he prayed every morning, but he prayed also to the heathen deities. With such views of religion he would hardly have listened to any scheme for harassing the Christians. Indeed he may be said to have expressly tolerated their worship, for when the keepers of a tavern claimed a piece of ground and buildings that had been occupied by Christians for the purpose of a Church, the emperor adjudged it to the latter, adding that it was better for God to be worshipped there in any manner, than for the ground to be used for a pot-house. This is the earliest mention of a *Church*, in the sense of a *building*, set apart for public Christian worship.

A striking proof of the inroad that Christianity was making upon heathenism is to be found in the fact that even the Platonic philosophers were, about this time, obliged to modify their views, by incorporating some of the leading doctrines of Christianity with those of Plato, and thus produce the school of the later Platonist, or Eclectic, philosophy. It is much to be regretted that *Origen*, who was a man of great powers, but with a fanciful imagination, lent the weight of his name and ability to this allegorical mode of interpreting our Scriptures.

A serious quarrel now arose between *Demetrius*, the Bishop of Alexandria, and *Origen*, owing to the latter having been ordained in an irregular manner, at Cæsarea,

which was in another diocese. Origen was condemned by two councils, and left Alexandria in consequence. [See Writers].

Baptism of Montanists is now declared to be *invalid*, and the want of charity with which this controversy was carried on, widens the existing breach still more, and confirms the schism.

A.D. 235. The good and liberal-minded Alexander Severus having been assassinated at Mentz, he is succeeded by *Maximinus*, a Thracian, who was popular with the army on account of his great strength, but he was totally unqualified for the possession of the throne. His first act was to kill all who had been attached to his predecessor, and as he had been particularly lenient towards Christians, Maximinus now makes them the special objects of his fury, and thus commences the *Seventh persecution*. His reign however fortunately only lasts three years, and the accession of *Gordian* restores peace to the Church.

Donatus, Bishop of Carthage, now holds a council of ninety African Bishops to condemn a man named Privatus. This council is worthy of note, as the large number of African Bishops who attended it mark the progress which Christianity must have made in that country.

A.D. 244. Gordian is now succeeded by *Philip* who is said to have been a Christian, "but it seems certain that he was not." [Burton].

A.D. 249. Nearly forty years had now elapsed since the death of Septimius Severus, and, with the exception of the short reign of Maximinus, the whole period had been one of comparative tranquillity to the Christians. As might have been expected, this season of peace had produced its usual fruits—decay of purity, and corruption

of morals. But a storm was now gathering which was to purify the air by its severity. *Decius* had now ascended the throne, and he has left behind him a name which is connected with the horrors of the *Eighth persecution*, which though short, was for the time it lasted the severest of them all. So fearful indeed was it, that many procured safety for themselves, either by actually sacrificing to heathen deities, or by purchasing from the heathen magistrates a certificate stating that they had done so. These persons who thus *lapsed* from the faith were divided into three classes—*Sacrificati*, who had sacrificed to idols; *Thurificati*, who had burnt the incense in the temples; *Libellatici*, who had obtained the certificate.

Many of those who fled from persecution never returned to their former mode of life, but acquired a liking for the security and tranquillity of a hermit's life. This was especially the case in Egypt, where the country abounded with caves. One of them has acquired celebrity as *Paul the Hermit*, being the first.

Decius having expressed a particular antipathy to Christian bishops, and *Fabianus*, the bishop of Rome, having been martyred, it was deemed advisable not to elect a successor just at once till the fury of the storm should have blown over.

Cyprian, who now filled the *see of Carthage*, being obliged to fly for his life, *Novatus* one of his *presbyters*, took advantage of his absence to create a faction against him. No sooner had the violence of persecution begun to abate than many of the *lapsed* wished to be re-admitted into the Church, for which purpose imposition of hands by the bishop was required. *Novatus* however wished to act without him as he was absent. He was

also very lax in admitting persons who had obtained the *libellos pacis*, or commendatory letters of dying martyrs, but Cyprian was very firm in resisting such improper and irregular conduct, and would not consent to allowing the profession of the Christian faith to be thus put off or put on at pleasure, and he decided that, unless they were actually at the point of death, they should go through a course of probation to test their sincerity. Novatus however advocated greater indulgence, thereby taking effectual means to secure popularity for himself.

On Cyprian's return he called a council which confirmed his decision and excommunicated the schismatics.

Contemporary with this schism at Carthage, was another at Rome, where *Cornelius*, who had been elected bishop, was opposed by a presbyter named *Novatian*; a name so like that of Novatus, that these two leaders are often confounded, especially as the latter also went to Rome and took part with Novatian against Cornelius, whom they accused of having "lapsed." It is remarkable that Novatus who had advocated leniency at Carthage should be so rigid at Rome. His conduct in both cases probably arose merely from love of opposition. The party of Novatian being condemned by the Church, became schismatical, and even in minor points heretical, [See Heresies].

Gallus, who succeeded Decius, continued the persecution, but his reign fortunately only lasted seventeen months. He was succeeded by *Valerian*, who was an old man of seventy, and had always shewn himself favourable to the Christians, so that his accession freed them from molestation.

The See of Rome now again becomes involved in disputes with other Churches, through the arrogance of

its Bishop. It appears that two members of the Church of Rome had been refused admission to communion with an Asiatic Church, in consequence of their baptism having been originally administered by a heretic, which was not considered to invalidate the Sacrament according to the Roman practice, if it were rightly administered. Stephen resented this in a very haughty manner, and became embroiled with several other bishops, amongst whom was Cyprian, who very firmly and yet temperately maintained the invalidity of heretical baptism.

For the first four years of his reign Valerian was very kindly disposed towards the Christians, but suddenly, in the year 257, by the persuasion of Macrianus, a most bigoted pagan who was his prime minister, he commenced the *Ninth persecution*, which numbered among its victims *Stephen*, Bishop of Rome, and his successor in the see, *Xistus*, and *Cyprian of Carthage*.

A.D. 259. Valerian was taken prisoner by the Persians, and remained so till his death. His son *Gallienus* who succeeded to the empire, immediately issued an edict for releasing the Christians from persecution, but Macrianus retaining authority in Egypt and the East, they were still exposed to severe trials in those parts, until the death of Macrianus two years afterwards.

From the accession of Gallienus we may date the commencement of another period of peace to the Church, but it was marked, as before, by the growth of religious dissensions amongst the Christians themselves.

A.D. 265. A council was held at Antioch to consider the opinions of *Paul of Samosata*, the Bishop of Antioch, who had broached heretical doctrines on the subject of the Divinity of Christ. The council deposed him, and

elected a successor in his place, but the ejected bishop still kept possession for some time.

A.D. 268. Gallienus was now succeeded by *Claudius Gothicus*, who has been said, upon no sufficient authority, to have persecuted the Christians at Rome. He died in 270, and the empire was given to *Aurelian*, who, had he lived, would probably have been one of the persecuting emperors, as he showed strong symptoms of a disposition to be hostile to Christianity, but he died after a brief reign of five years. Some historians reckon one of the *ten persecutions* in this reign, but the facts do not warrant it, since the edicts that he issued had not been *put in force* when *Tacitus* revoked them, on his accession. He reigned only a few months; and his brother *Florianus* did not long survive him.

The six years during which *Probus* reigned, were peaceful, but were marked by the rise of Manichæism. The brief reigns of *Carus*, *Carinus*, and *Numerianus* having occupied only two years, we now come to one of the most painful periods in the annals of the Church.

The reign of *Diocletian*, which lasted from A.D. 284 to A.D. 305, presents us with the longest and most bloody persecution which the church had to encounter. The Christians were no longer a small body; they filled posts of honour in the imperial household, and in the government of the provinces; they were no longer a small sect meeting stealthily in caves or upper rooms, but they had their churches, and their men of wealth, learning, and importance; thus when the fury of persecution was turned towards them, the victims were more easily found. *Diocletian* finding the empire too large for him to manage, associated *Maximianus Hercules* with himself in the government, and a few years afterwards the two

emperors strengthened their positions still more by giving the title of *Cæsar* to *Galerius* and *Constantius*. Of these four, the last was the only one who did not join in the enmity to the Christians, and it may therefore easily be understood that a systematic persecution carried on by three rulers, in different parts of the empire, must be more general in its effects than those which followed the edicts of one man. The malice of the heathen had now an additional source of gratification in the destruction of the Churches. It is impossible to imagine, much less can we describe, the horrors of this long continued persecution. It was a common sight to see crowds of Christians, even aged bishops, transported from their homes to work at hard labour in the mines; some had one of their eyes put out, others had their feet dislocated. Amid such scenes as these did this century close with *the Tenth persecution*.

FOURTH CENTURY.

A.D. 305. The first years of this century were terrible ones for the Christians, 700,000 of whom are said to have perished in this persecution, which lasted for ten years. It extended to every part of the empire, and even Britain now contributed its first martyr *St. Alban*, who was put to death at Verulam, which is now called after his name. In this year, however, owing to increasing infirmity, Diocletian abdicates, and Maximianus is persuaded to do the same.

Galerius and Constantius now assume the title of emperors, giving to *Severus* and *Maximinus* that of Cæsars.

About this time arose the *Meletian schism*. *Peter*,

bishop of *Alexandria*, being obliged to save his life by flight, *Meletius*, bishop of *Lycopolis*, exercised a jurisdiction which belonged by right solely to the absent metropolitan. This case was very similar to that of Novatus at Carthage.

Considerable political changes now took place which materially affected the Christian Church. The next few years were occupied almost entirely by the struggles for power of numerous rivals, until *Constantine*, who had been created Cæsar by Galerius, having gradually strengthened his position, attained to the government of the western empire. Eusebius, in his life of Constantine, relates that he heard from the Emperor's own lips the account of his having seen a cross in the heavens, inscribed with the words, "*By this conquer*," when he was marching against *Maxentius*, and that Constantine accordingly had the cross inscribed on his standards, and on the shields of his soldiers. Whether there be any truth in this story or not, it is certain that Constantine declared in favour of the Christians. It should be borne in mind however, that notwithstanding the grievous persecutions it had passed through, Christianity had spread so widely that the Christians formed a considerable part of the empire, and when it is also taken into consideration that there would always be a large body of waverers, who would turn with the favour of the emperor for the time being, it is by no means improbable that Constantine's proceedings were dictated less by good feeling than by sound policy, and that he materially strengthened his position by acting as he did. Be that as it may, we now find Christianity recognized by the state, and protected by the laws. We even find an order issued that a sum of money should be paid to the clergy of the

African Church from the public treasury, and exempting persons engaged in the sacred ministry from the burden of filling public offices. A factious party at Carthage, called Donatists, from the name of their leader, applied for a share in these immunities, and at the same time accused *Cæcilianus*, the lawful Bishop, of having been improperly elected. A council held at *Arles*, A.D. 314, acquitted *Cæcilian*, and pronounced sentence of excommunication against the *Donatists*, who thereupon openly established themselves in opposition to the Church, and were guilty of many *schismatical* acts.

Matters of great importance to the Church were now accumulating, and in order that they might be the more effectually settled, Constantine called the *first general council* which assembled at *Nice*, in Bithynia, A.D. 325. Three hundred Bishops are said to have been present, and it is reported to have sat for a period varying according to different accounts from six weeks to two years.

The points discussed were (1) *The Arian Controversy*, [See Heresies] (2) The time of keeping *Easter*, and (3) *The Meletian schism*. With respect to the Arian controversy the council decidedly condemned *Arius*, and supported his opponent *Alexander*, the bishop of *Alexandria*, who, with *Athanasius*, maintained the catholic doctrine of the Trinity. The decree of the council was, however, far from healing the breach, the Western Church supporting it, but the Eastern refusing to do so. The *Easter* question was settled in favour of the Western Churches, as it remains to this day in our own Church. It may be observed, however, that the early British Church followed the Eastern practice, for on the arrival of St. Augustine, at the close of the sixth century, he

found the British Church differing from the Roman practice; from which we may infer that it owes its origin to the Eastern, and not to the Western Church. Hence the assumption of authority by Rome in after times was the more unwarranted.

The Meletian schism was condemned, but the judgment was not very decided in its language.

Though not strictly belonging to our subject, it may be well to mention briefly the *first four General Councils*—they were—

1. The council held at *Nice*, in Bithynia, A.D. 325, as described above.

2. The council of *Constantinople*, held A.D. 381, which condemned the *Heresy of Macedonius*, and asserted the Divinity of the third person in the Holy Trinity.

3. The council of *Ephesus*, held A.D. 434, condemned the Nestorian heresy, which “divided the persons” of the Trinity.

4. The council of *Chalcedon*, held A.D. 451, condemned the Eutychian Heresy, which “confounded the substance” of the persons of the Trinity.

THE TEN PERSECUTIONS.

For the sake of easy reference, it may be found convenient to have the so-called ten persecutions presented at one view, in a tabular form. The exact number *ten* depends however upon a forced interpretation of Rev. xvii., 12—14, to which historians have endeavoured in various ways to accommodate the reluctant testimony of history. If general persecutions only are reckoned, there were *not ten*, but if local ones are taken into account,

there were *more than ten*. It is also worthy of note that, at the time St. John saw his vision, *one* of these persecutions was passed, and *another* was nearly over; and yet, in verse 12, the ten kings who are to "make war against the Lamb" are said to have "received no power *as yet*," i.e. they were to be future to that period. The so-called *ten* are as follows:

- | | | | |
|----|----------------|----------------|---|
| 1 | Nero, | A.D. 64 to 68. | Chiefly confined to Rome. |
| 2 | Domitian, | 93 to 96. | |
| 3 | Trajan, | 107 to 117. | Trajan ought to be considered as merely having <i>permitted</i> persecution during his reign. |
| 4 | Hadrian, | 117 to 138. | Improperly called a persecution. |
| 5 | M. Aurelius, | 163 to 180. | |
| 6 | Sept. Severus, | 201 to 211. | |
| 7 | Maximinus, | 235 to 238. | |
| 8 | Decius, | 250 to 251. | Continued for a year by Gallus. |
| 9 | Valerian, | 257 to 259. | |
| 10 | Diocletian, | 298 to 305. | Continued in parts of the Empire till 308. |

EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

THESE questions are chiefly selected from papers given at the Voluntary Theological, and B.A. Examinations, but they are not arranged in any particular order, as their being wholly independent of one another renders them more useful to the student, and tests his knowledge of the subject better than if questions upon the same points were placed together. The numbers after each question refer to the *page* where the answers will be found.

How did the Eastern and Western Churches differ with respect to the time of keeping Easter? What is the practice of the Church of England? p. 71, 85.

What were the tenets of the Manichæans. p. 38.

Give an account of the Apostolical Fathers; state their extant writings, and mention any controversies that have arisen about the genuineness of any of them. p. 47—9.

What was there peculiarly dangerous in the doctrines advanced by Marcion, as distinguished from other Gnostic heresies? p. 24.

Give an account of the controversy arising out of the case of the Lapsed. By what names were different classes of the Lapsed known? p. 79.

Give a brief sketch of St. Paul's Second Apostolical journey. p. 65, 66.

Give some account of the Meletian schism. p. 83, 84.

What were the tenets of Valentinus? p. 29.

Who was the first Gentile Bishop of Jerusalem; when was he appointed? p. 70.

Relate the miracle of the "thundering legion." p. 72.

What heretics were called *Patripassians*; and why? p. 34.

Sketch briefly the life of Ignatius. Are any of his writings extant? p. 48.

When may the Christian Church, properly so called, begin? On what occasion was the first great accession made to it? Who was the instrument of it? p. 62.

Which side did Irenæus take in the Easter controversy? Was it the side he might have been expected to take; if not, how do you account for his taking the side he did? p. 74.

Explain the origin and tenets of the Nazarenes and Ebionites. p. 3.

Explain briefly the Donatist schism, and give an account of the proceedings adopted against them. p. 45.

Give an account of the life and writings of Cyprian. p. 56, 57.

What were the first four general councils: where, when, and for what purpose, were they held? p. 86.

Enumerate the early Apologists. What was the intention of their writings? p. 58.

Give an account of the life and death of Polycarp. From what source do we derive our information concerning his death? p. 49.

What were the distinctive tenets of Montanus? p. 35.

What is the distinction between heresy and schism? Were Sabellius, Novatus, Paul of Samosata, Montanus, and Manes, heretics or schismatics? p. 1, 40, 44, 41, 35, 38.

What were the distinguishing tenets of the Gnostics? From what source were they derived? p. 7.

Who was Artemon? p. 34.

To what period may we suppose the miraculous powers in the Church to have continued? p. 75.

What was the leading object of St. John's Gospel? Against which of the early heretics was it particularly directed? p. 13.

Did the divisions in the Church of Corinth, to which St. Paul's Epistles to that Church bear witness, call for any interference after his time? p. 47.

What was the custom of the British Church with respect to the keeping of Easter; what may be inferred from it as to the origin of that Church? p. 85, 86.

Can you assign any reason why the Gnostics should deny the resurrection of the body? p. 9.

Till what time were the Apostles commanded to "tarry in Jerusalem," after Christ's ascension? Did they obey the command? What was the result? p. 62.

What were the heresies of Noetus and Beryllus; and how did that of Noetus differ from the heresy of Sabellius? p. 40, 41.

Who were called *Apotactitæ*, and why? p. 19.

Barnabas and Hermas are generally ranked amongst the Apostolic Fathers. Shew how the former, at any rate, is improperly so considered. p. 50.

On what occasion was the first attempt made by a bishop of Rome to usurp authority over other Churches? By whom was he resisted? On what other occasion was the see of Rome involved in disputes with other Churches? What distinguished bishops were opposed to one another in the controversy? p. 74.

What is known of Justin Martyr? What works have we of his? To whom were the two most important treatises addressed? p. 50, 51.

Who propagated the first erroneous doctrines concerning the Holy Trinity? How did they differ from those held by Praxeas? p. 33, 34.

How are the Gnostics usually divided? In what respect did the schools chiefly differ? p. 10.

Who was Paul of Samosata? p. 41.

Give a brief history of the Church during the first year of its existence. p. 62—4.

Where did Irenæus probably pass his youth? With which

of the Apostles does he connect his teaching; and through whom? What station in the Church of Lyons did he occupy? p. 53.

Can you assign any reason for the difference of the behaviour of the Sadducees towards the followers of Christ, before and after his resurrection? p. 2.

Mention the names of the most celebrated Christians who suffered martyrdom during the persecutions under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, and Marcus Aurelius. p. 67, 68, 69, 72.

How far may Simon Magus be said to have been the founder of the Gnostics? Give some account of him. p. 9, 10.

Can you give any reason why the genuineness of certain copies of the epistles of Ignatius should be made a matter of so much controversy? What is the point in dispute respecting them, and how has it been recently set at rest? p. 48.

What was the date of the first Christian council? Where was it held, and for what purpose? Who was its president? What became of him? p. 65.

To what date did St. John live? With what Church is he more particularly connected? p. 68.

Who is reckoned by Primitive writers the founder of all heresies? By what general designation were the sects known? What was the etymology of the name? p. 9.

From whom do all modern Ecclesiastical Historians derive the principal part of the facts relating to the early Church? What was his date? Where was his residence? Mention some of his chief works. p. 58.

St. Paul, in Romans xv. 24, speaks of his intention of visiting Spain; at what period of his life may he be supposed to have gone there? p. 67.

Who was the first bishop of Rome, and what became of him? p. 67.

What is the subject of the Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Church of Corinth? Had any similar exhortation ever been addressed to that Church before: if so, by whom? p. 47.

To what Churches were the epistles of Ignatius addressed, and on what occasion? p. 48.

Where were the "disciples first called Christians," and when? How were the followers of Christ previously designated? p. 64.

What terrible persecution of the Christians occurred in the neighbourhood of Irenæus? Under what Emperor? p. 72.

How do we indirectly ascertain what was the teaching of the Church in its earliest ages? p. 62.

From what circumstance are we informed of the progress which Christianity had made in Africa by the middle of the third century? p. 78.

By whom was the eighth persecution carried on, after the death of Decius? p. 80.

What circumstance threw Cyprian into contention with Stephen, bishop of Rome? p. 81.

To which Emperor did Justin Martyr present his Second Apology? p. 71.

How did Hadrian behave towards the Jews; and towards the Christians? p. 69, 70.

What were the tenets of Tatian? Did he found any distinct sect? By what names were his followers known? Give the derivation of the several names. p. 19.

What was the opinion of the Docetæ respecting Christ? whence is the name derived? p. 9.

Enumerate the persecutions which took place in the Second Century. p. 69—71.

What was the heresy of Basilides? p. 26.

Who was Marcion? Give a brief sketch of his particular system. p. 22.

Give the date of the destruction of Jerusalem. By whom was the siege conducted? From what historian do we derive our information? p. 68.

When and where is St. John supposed to have died? p. 68.

In Acts ix. 31, we read that "the Churches had rest;" to what was this probably owing? p. 64.

Who were the persecuting emperors? p. 87.

Which of the emperors were most favourable to the Christians? p. 77.

Who was Tertullian? p. 56.

Give a sketch of the heresy of Bardesanes. p. 18.

Two leaders of Gnostic sects came to Rome together; who were they, and what were their doctrines? p. 21, 28.

Relate the story of Lucius the British prince. p. 73.

Who were Marcus, Colobarsus, Heracleon? p. 31.

Who were the Ophites? By what other name are they known? Explain the origin of the name. p. 32.

Who was Pantænus? What was the object of his journey to India? p. 73.

What martyrs of note suffered under Trajan? who under M. Aurelius? p. 69, 71.

What was the date of the burning of Rome, by whom was the act supposed to be done; by whom was it *said* to be done? What befel the Christians in consequence? p. 67.

Who was Cerinthus; and what story is there which would assist us in fixing the date at which he lived? p. 13.

Who was Hermogenes? p. 35.

What orders did Hadrian give respecting the Christians? to whom were they addressed? p. 69, 70.

What were the points discussed at the council of Nice? When did it meet? How many bishops are said to have been present? p. 85.

Who was Dionysius of Alexandria? Mention other persons of note of the same name. p. 52.

Who were the chief leaders of Gnostic Heresies? p. 16.

Who were the Therapeutæ? p. 3.

When do we find the first mention of a *Church*, as a building set apart for public worship? p. 77.

Relate the circumstances of the quarrel between Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, and Origen. p. 54.

What gave rise to the later Platonist or eclectic philosophy? p. 77.

What martyrs of note suffered in the persecution under Valerian? p. 81.

Relate the story of the conversion of Constantine. Upon whose authority is it related? p. 84.

For what purpose did the council of Arles meet; by whom was it summoned? What was its date? p. 85.

Who was Hegesippus? p. 51.

How did Aurelius behave towards the Christians, and what story is connected with him? Shew that it is not supported by facts. p. 72.

Mention the names of some distinguished martyrs who suffered in the persecution under Nero. p. 67.

Who first held the doctrine of a millennium? p. 37.

Have we any of the writings of Irenæus? p. 53.

Why may we suppose the persecution under Diocletian to have extended further than any other? What martyr of note suffered during it? p. 82.

Where was the first general council held? Mention some other celebrated general councils. p. 86.

When did the Trinitarian heresies first arise? p. 13.

Give a brief sketch of St. Paul's Third Apostolical Journey. p. 66.

Give a sketch of the life of Origen. p. 54.

Name "the ten persecutions." Why is the exact number ten specified? Do you consider the facts warrant such a selection? p. 87.

What were the *libelli pacis*? Who opposed their abuse? p. 80.

What was the heresy of Arius? What council condemned his opinions? p. 43.

Who was Hierax, and what opinions did he put forth respecting the salvation of Infants? p. 40.

Mention the heresies of the Third Century. p. 38—43.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY W. METCALFE, GREEN STREET.



UNDER
MILE
per
EET...



