

Chapter 1 : Theophilus :: Claremont Coptic Encyclopedia

The Apologia in Rufinum Rufinus in Rome, teaches Origenism – Rufinus attacks Jerome – Jerome replies – Vigilantius writes against Jerome – His reply – Death of Nepotian. CHAPTER XXIII.

Rufinum, i, 2 says that the total length of the Commentaries on Jb and the Psalms was about 40, lines, i. The latter, at a rough estimate, must be nearly 35, lines in its present state. But Jerome, as we shall see, was not acquainted with so many Homilies as have come down to us; we must deduct about 5, lines, and this will leave 10, for the Commentary on Job, making it two sevenths of the length of the other. It is the term, and the only term. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, 1, The shape of sentences though simple is always good; to take one test word, *saepe*, which was almost if not quite extinct in common use, occurs fairly often near the end of a period, where it was needed for rhythm, which frequenter would have spoiled. The Homilies on the titles of Psalms ix. His system of interpretation is admirably described in the fourth of Dr. The references to Origen are in brackets. Here again the spirit of independence manifests itself towards the end of the work. Hilarii *Tractatus de Mysteriis et Hymni*, etc. The *De Mysteriis* occupies pp 3 - Among these is Ebert, *Litteratur des Mittelalters*, p. Hilarius in *hymnorum carmine Gallos indociles vocat*. There would be nothing extraordinary in this; the early efforts, and especially those of the Arians which Hilary imitated for a better purpose, often departed widely from the propriety of later compositions, as we shall see in one of those attributed to Hilary himself. It is written in stanzas of six lines in the ms. He suspends judgment, and will not say that it is unworthy of Hilary. The Benedictine editor, Coustant, gives a few stanzas as specimens, and summarily rejects it. This would point to some German land as the home of the author; in no country of Romance tongue could such an error have been perpetrated. *Perire* is used for *perdere*, but this is not unparalleled. In the same volume is an exposition of the beginning of St. In spite of some difference of vocabulary, there is no strong reason why this should not be by Hilary; cf. Mai also prints in the same volume a short fragment on the Paralytic St. It appears, like the Homilies on the Psalms, to be the report of some extemporary addresses, and is more likely than any of the preceding to be the work of Hilary. It is quite in his style, but the contents are unimportant. But we must remember that the scribes were rarely content to confess that they were ignorant of the name author whom they transcribed; and that, being as ill-furnished with scruples as with imagination, they assigned everything that came to hand to a few fandler names. Two further works ascribed to Hilary are obviously not his. *Pitra*, in the volume of an already cited. Auxentius, in his account of the matter, does not even mention the bishops. They cannot have been more than , and probably were less and we must remember that the Homoean decision was only obtained by fraud, as Auxentius well knew. These documents narrate at great length events which began six years earlier, and with which Hilary and his province had no direct concern. This proves that the fragments are not a portion of the *Liber adversus Ursacium et Valentem*. Internal evidence proves not less clearly that they cannot be excerpts from some other work of Hilary. It is of course, notorious that he never did so; the mistake is one which Hilary could not possibly have made. None the less, these fragments are both in themselves and in the documents which they embody, one of our most important authorities for the transactions they narrate, and are indisputably contemporary and authentic nor is there any reasonable doubt as to the genuineness of the thirteen. Those of them which reveal the inconstancy of Liberius have been assailed by some Roman Catholic writers, though they are accepted by others. The same suspicion has extended to others among the fragments, because they are found in company with these revelations concerning Liberius. But the doubts have been suggested by the wish to disbelieve. It begins with a public letter in which Germinius makes a declaration of faith in Homoeousion terms, without any mention of the reasons which had induced him to depart from the Homoean position. This is followed by a reproachful letter, also intended for publicity, from Valens, Ursacius, and others. They had refused to attend to the rumour of his defection: They demand an explicit statement that he never had said, and never would say, anything of the kind; and warn him that he is gravely suspected, complaints of his teaching having been made by certain of his clergy to neighbouring bishops, which they trust will be proved groundless. Germinius made no direct reply to this letter, but addressed a manifesto to a number of more sympathetic bishops, containing the scriptural

proofs of the divinity of Christ and recalling the fact that the Homoean leaders, before their own victory, had acquiesced in the Homoeousian confession. Any teaching to the contrary is the work, not of God, but of the spirit of this world, and he entreats those whom he addresses to circulate his letter as widely as possible, lest any should fall through ignorance into the snares of the devil. Germinius was assured of safety in writing thus. Germinius had been a leader of the Homoean party, and it is at least possible that his change of front was due to his knowledge that the Emperor, though he would not eject Homoeans, had no sympathy with them and would allow them no influence. Forster in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for , p ff. Baltzer on the *Theologie and Christology of Hilary in the program of the Rottweil Gymnasium* for and respectively. The Introduction to the Benedictine edition is useful, though its value is lessened by an evident desire to make Hilary confirm to the accepted opinions of a later age. Dorners great work on the Doctrine of the person of Christ, in the English translation, with the *Dogmengeschichte* of Schwane ed. Indebtedness to other works is from time to time acknowledged in the notes. In 5,44 in Trin. But he uses both, to illustrate two truths concerning our Lord. Silence in such a case is itself a criticism. For the sake of conciseness the word Person has been often in the English where it is absent, and absent designedly in the Latin. The word occurs Trin. In the *De Trinitate* he usually prefers a periphrasis ; - *assumpta caro, assumpsit carnem*. The two natures in the Incarnate Christ are also mentioned, though, as we shall see, Hilary here also avoids a precise nomenclature. The passages to which he refers are *Comm. John*, additional note to 14,28 This was the doctrine of all the earlier theologians, soon to be displaced in the stress of controversy by the opinion that the inferiority concerns the Son only as united with man. *John*, additional note to xiv, Athanasius brought the father into direct connection with the world ; cf. He is also often named Jesus Christ in this connection, e. The same conclusion is constantly drawn in the *Comm. Man* has a double origin. First, he is made after the likeness of God. This is the soul, which is immaterial and has no resemblance and owes no debt, as of effect to cause, to any other nature i. It is not His likeness, but is after His likeness. Secondly, there is the body, composed of earthly matter. It appears in the earliest of them; in *Comm. Made flesh through the Word*. But he is influenced see especially p. And Hilary was too early in the field, too anxiously employed in feeling his way past the pitfalls of heresy, to escape the danger of occasional inconsistency. 19, *perfectum ipsa de suis non imminuta generavit*. So ib, 2,25, *uigenitus Deus Virginis utero insertus acc rescit*. He grew there, but nothing more. In *Virginem* exactly corresponds to *ex Virgine*. The unity of glory departed through His obedience in the Dispensation. Other explanations which have been suggested are quite inadmissible *Dorner p*. Perhaps it should be decided, as in *Tr. Elementa* is, I think, somewhat more frequent. *Natura assumpti corporis nostri natura paterna divinitatis invecata*. But such expressions are rare; *hominem adsumpsit* is the normal phrase. *Ixviii 4*, he speaks as if the two natures had been forced to coalesce by a Power higher than either. But, as we have seen. The expression *utriusque,natura persona* in Trin. But, Hilary, though he shares and even exaggerates the general tendency of his time, has also a strong sense of the danger of Apollinarianism *Homo assumptus* is constantly used, and similarly *homo noster* for our manhood, e. This often leads to an awkwardness of which Hilary must have been fully conscious, though he regarded it as a less evil than the use of an abstract term. The purpose of the Old Testament Theophanies, it will be remembered, was the same. God appeared as man, in order to make men familiar with the future reality and so more ready to believe. The freedom of Christian martyrs from pain is frequently noticed in early writers. By a line of thought which recalls that of Mozley concerning Miracles he refuses to argue from our experience to that of Christ. That He suffered, in the sense of having wounds, and death inflicted upon Him, is a fact; that He was conscious of suffering is an inference, a supposition *putatur dolere quia patitur*, *Tr*. In fact, the passage last cited states that He has no *natura dolendi*; so also x, 23, 35, and cf. Or as Hilary puts it, Trin.

Chapter 2 : Bonavallis Rare Books Arnoldus

Written in , this is book three of Jerome's Apologia contra Rufinum ("Apology against Rufinus" (Dekkers, no.). The first two books of Jerome's Apologia were complete in themselves, but Jerome continued the work in this third book after receiving a letter from Rufinus.

Their Importance to Judaism. The early teachers and defenders of Christianity. The most important of the fathers lived and worked in a period when Christianity still had many points of contact with Judaism, and they found that the latter was a splendid support in the contest against paganism, although it had to be combated in the development of Christian doctrine. So the Fathers of the Church are seen at one time holding to a Jewish conception of the universe and making use of Jewish arguments, at another rejecting a part of such teaching and formulating a new one. In the contest of Christianity against paganism the Church Fathers employ the language of the Hellenistic literature as found in Philo, Josephus, the Apocrypha, and the Sibylline Books, all of which draw upon the Prophets of the Old Testament. Thus, practically, only the polemic features in the activity of the Church Fathers directed against Judaism can be considered as new and original. But in order to wage successful war against paganism, they, as well as Christians in general, had to acquaint themselves with the religious documents of Judaism and this was possible only if they entered into personal relations with the Jews: The contemporaries and, in part, the coworkers of those men who are known from the Talmud and the Midrash as the depositaries of the Jewish doctrine, were the instructors who transmitted this doctrine to the Church Fathers also. Hence such a mass of haggadic material is found in the work of the fathers as to constitute an important part of Jewish theological lore. This article is primarily concerned with their interpretation of the texts of the Bible and of the Apocrypha, which differs in essential points from those of the Jews. This dialogue, already mentioned by Celsus, may be wholly imaginary and without historical basis. The Jewish auditors are not only able to follow the intricate discussion intelligently, but their demeanor also is seemly Tryphon especially proves himself a true disciple of Greek philosophy, and his scholarship is freely acknowledged by Justin ib. At the close of, the debate, Jew and Christian confess that they have learned much from each other, and part with expressions of mutual good-will ib. Justin was born and reared in proximity to Jews for he calls himself a Samaritan ib. Of the relations of Clement of Alexandria to Judaism nothing positive is known. During the persecutions of the Christians of Alexandria, in or , Clement sought refuge for a short time in Syria Eusebius, l. Here he may have learned much at first hand from the Jews. A Jewish mother could readily have taught her son the Hebrew language, so that they might sing the Psalms together Jerome, "Epistola xxxix. Origen often mentions the views of Jews, meaning thereby not the teaching of certain individuals, but the method of exegesis prevalent among the Jews of his time. The Jews with whom he maintained personal intercourse were men of distinguished scientific attainments. Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus, Epiphanius. Eusebius, the celebrated Church historian, also learned from the Jews, as has already been mentioned, and was under the influence of Jewish tradition. Nevertheless he uses the word "Jew" as a term of reproach, calling his opponent, Marcellus, "a Jew" "De Ecclesiastica Theologia," 2: Ephraem distances all his ecclesiastical predecessors in his hatred of the Jews, displaying a bitterness that is explicable only on the ground that he at one time had personal relations with them, and had formed an adverse opinion of them. Epiphanius, too, shows his dependence on the Jews, especially in the book, perhaps wrongly ascribed to him, "De Prophetarum Vitis" which contains, besides many extraneous inventions, numerous Jewish traditions of the lives of the Prophets. Jerome surpasses all other Church Fathers in his erudition as well as in his importance for Judaism. It must be emphasized, in spite of Christian assertions to the contrary e. He sought his information in many quarters, especially among the educated Jews Preface to Hosea compare "Epistola lxxiii. Of only three of his Jewish teachers is anything known. Although he has much to say in praise of this man, Jerome will not admit that he learned much from him Preface to Job , designating him often as one who merely read the Scriptures to him "Onomastica Sacra," xc. Jerome lived about forty years in Palestine, apparently studying all the time under Jews commentary on Nahum 2: His enemies severely censured him for his intercourse with the Jews, but he was proud of it. He asks how it could be held to impugn his faith in the

Church, that he informs his readers in how many ways the Jews construe a single error. It is most useful to cross the threshold of the masters, and to learn the art directly from the artists" ib. When he questioned the Jews on Biblical matters, they often either did not answer at all, or, at least from the standpoint of the Church Fathers, "lied" Jerome, "Epistola cxii. An alleged letter from Jerome, probably forged by Rufinus, was sent to the Christian communities in Africa, in which Jerome professed to admit that, misled by the Jews, he had translated erroneously "Adversus Rufinum," book iii. It mortified Jerome that his translation of the Bible, the Vulgate, so famous later on, should be passed over in silence by all the Jews, and that there was no one who knew enough Hebrew to appreciate the merits of the new translation "Epistola cxii. He even believed that all the Jews of Africa had conspired to oppose him, as actually happened in one place. The bishop had to strike it out as "a lie," being in danger of losing his congregation. Before this, Tertullian of Carthage had spoken of the impertinence and derision shown by a Jew "Apologia," xvi. Weiss, "Die Grossen Kappadocier Exegeten," p. Gregory of Nyssa c. The same may be said of the other Church Fathers who lived in Europe that is, in sections sparsely settled by Jews. In the paschal controversy he advocated separation from Judaism. This appears especially in the "Homilies" of Aphraates c. The Church Fathers adopted from the Jews a mass of interpolations, interpretations, and illustrative anecdotes, which may best be designated by the well-known term, "Haggadah," but which they themselves called variously. Goldfahn has counted in Justin Martyr "Dialogus cum Tryphone" twenty-six Hebrew traditions and six polemico-apologetic Haggadot. Among these may be mentioned: Clement is acquainted with the old Haggadah to Exodus 2: Origen derives still more from the Haggadot. Moses is the author of eleven Psalms "Selecta" to Psalm 12, ed. Eusebius makes a distinction between esoteric and exoteric exegesis the Haggadot he often classes with the exoteric interpretation, contrary to Clement and others, who see therein a secret doctrine. Among his Haggadot may be mentioned the following: Abraham observed the precepts of the Torah before it had been revealed "Demonstratio Evangelica," 1: The traitor Shebna was a high priest compare Lev. The passage Zechariah After the advent of Jesus, the three powerful estates, kings, priests, and prophets, disappeared from Israel "Demonstratio Evangelica," Jerome, on Zechariah Something similar is found in Aphraates on Numbers Aphraates gives the above as a self-evident exegesis without mentioning its Jewish origin. He does the same with his numerous other Haggadot, which were doubtless derived from the Jews. Ephraem Syrus likewise gives his Haggadot in the name of scholars, expounders, etc. The Haggadot, however, were so generally accepted, that their Jewish origin gradually came to be forgotten. Ephraem Syrus, for instance, says, on Genesis His explanation of Genesis But the one most conversant with Jewish traditions, and their greatest admirer, is Jerome. He says, for example, on Jeremiah He is also the only Church Father who is acquainted with the technical terms of the Hebrew tradition for instance: The haggadic elements in Jerome are so numerous that they would fill volumes some of the more noteworthy ones may be mentioned here. Akiba, which has come down only anonymously compare Eccl. The Church Fathers who lived after Jerome knew less and less about Judaism, so that, the history of the later periods is no longer of any interest in this connection. The dialogue between Justin and the Jew Tryphon is remarkable for the politeness with which Jews and Christians speak of one another later on, however, examples are not wanting of passionate and bitter language used by Christians and Jews in their disputations. Origen complains of the stubbornness of the Jews Homily x. Ephraem Syrus assumes a very insulting tone toward the Jews he calls them by opprobrious names, and sees in them the worthless vineyard that bears no good fruit. Like Eusebius, who used the misfortunes of the Jews for polemic purposes com. After Jerome has enumerated all the countries whither the Jews had been dispersed, he exclaims: What especially angered the Christians was the fact that the Jews persisted in their Messianic hopes. In his sermon against the Jews Ephraem says: Jerome, on the other hand, speaks with great eloquence of the Messianic hopes of the Jews. Many Messianic passages of the Bible were applied by the latter to the emperor Julian, others to the distant future, differences which resulted in interminable polemics. Disputations Between Jews and Christians. The writings of Jerome vividly portray the character of the polemics of that period. The Christian who should undertake to dispute with the Jews had to be learned in doctrine Preface to Psalms. But these disputations must be held lest the Jews should consider the Christians ignorant on Isaiah 7: The proceedings were very lively. Reference is made, even if only figuratively, to the planting of the feet against each other, to the pulling of the

rope, etc. It is incredible that the Jews were so frantic as to "scream with unbridled tongues, foaming at the mouth, and hoarse of voice" on the Epistle to Titus 3: Nor is it probable that the Jews "regretted when they had no opportunity to slander and vilify the Christians" Preface to Joshua , although the Jews of that age show no diffidence in sustaining their part in these discussions. They were accused of avoiding questions that arose on the more difficult passages of the Bible on Isaiah But the Jews had allies in their opinions for pagans and Christian sectaries agreed with them on many points, drawing upon themselves the polemics of the Church Fathers. Avowed Attacks on Jews. Of the numerous polemical works directed against the Jews, only a few can be mentioned here. Corssen, Berlin, in the "Altercatio" the Jew is converted. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena," ed. Connected with these in time as well as in subject are the six sermons of John Chrysostom against the Jews "Homilies," i. In these he bitterly complains of the Christians for still clinging to Jewish customs, a circumstance mentioned by other Church Fathers as well. Jerome gives striking examples in his commentaries on Matthew This attitude of the multitude was of course earnestly combated by the Church Fathers thus an anonymous work mentioned by Photius "Myriobiblion," ed. The founder of Christian dogmatics, Augustine, in defiance of all dogmatic principles of classification, groups Jews, heathens, and Arians in one class "Concio ad Catechumenos".

The Church Fathers adopted from the Jews a mass of interpolations, interpretations, and illustrative anecdotes, which may best be designated by the well-known term, "Haggadah," but which they themselves called variously.

A complex and controversial patriarch, Theophilus was much admired for his many writings, his destruction of pagan temples and subsequent church-building program, as well as his important role as a mediator of schisms at Antioch, Bostra, and Jerusalem during the early part of his tenure. For his integral part in the deposition of Chrysostom at the so-called Council of the Oak, Theophilus was excommunicated by Pope Innocent I. The notoriety of Theophilus in this affair was apparently so great that later generations had to restore his image. He appears as a saint in both the Coptic and Syrian churches, and his festival day is fixed on 18 Babah Forget, , p. Theophilus studied under Athanasius and distinguished himself both in piety and scholarship. In his career as patriarch, Theophilus razed several pagan places of worship at Alexandria and elsewhere, the most famous of which were the Serapion and the Mithraion. Socrates states *Historia ecclesiastica* 5. Theophilus was responsible for building more than seven churches Orlandi, , pp. Theodosius allowed him to convert the temple of Dionysius to a church Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 7. The Alexandrian Synaxarion has reference to seven churches, but names only those sacred to the Virgin, Raphael, and John the Baptist and Elisha Forget, , pp. The Raphael church is known from *History of the Patriarchs Vol.* The Synaxrion Forget, , p. In the Syriac text about the Holy Family, the patriarch claims to have built a church dedicated to John the Baptist, which figures prominently at the end of another Syriac text on the life of John the Baptist Mingana, , pp. Theophilus also converted the Serapion into a glorious church. John of Nikiou, *Chronicle*, 78; Zotenberg, , pp. He later brought the body and head of the saint for reinterment in a tomb within that church. To the emperors Theodosius I and his son Arcadius, Theophilus built two churches. Theophilus also built or renovated several other churches and monasteries beyond Alexandria. Eutychius, *Annals* , PG According to several sources, the emperor Theodosius I gave Theophilus the keys to all the pagan temples in Egypt, from Alexandria to Aswan, with permission to build churches with whatever riches found therein. In several accounts, Theophilus finds an inscription with three thetas, signifying God theos , the emperor Theodosius I, and Theophilus. Palladius called the patriarch a "lithomaniac" *Dialogue*, 22; Coleman-Norton, , Isidorus of Pelusium labels him a "money worshiper, crazy about stone" *Epistles*, 1. The Schisms at Antioch c. Flavian had the support of the emperor but not the pope. Evagrius was the champion of the influential Melitian faction at Antioch. Ambrose apparently thought little of both. Flavian refused the request of Theophilus to attend a council of arbitration. Evagrius died not long afterward, but Flavian was not accepted until , when in a highly unusual incident of cooperation, Theophilus worked with John Chrysostom to end the schism and to reconcile Flavian with Pope Siricus. In a schism arose between Rufinus of Aquileia and John of Jerusalem on the one side and Jerome and Epiphanius of Constantia in Cyprus on the other. Both sides accused the other of Origenism. Theophilus corresponded with both factions and appears to have been sympathetic to them equally. One Bagadius had been deposed by two bishops, who died by the time the meeting convened. Agapius was the replacement. With the concurrence of Nectarius and Flavian, Theophilus judged that although he could not comment on the actions of the dead, in the future at least three bishops, and preferably all their colleagues, should pronounce depositions. He therefore presumably accepted the appointment of Agapius. The meeting and apparent concord between Theophilus and Flavian while they were at odds is perhaps explained by their attending the consecration of the church of Peter and Paul near Chalcedon, where Theophilus was to have his infamous Council of the Oak in By this interpretation, the judgment concerning Bostra was a development from the consecration; it was not the major event. Pelagius, *In defensione trium capitulorum*; see Geerard, , p. Jerome observes *Epistle* 82 that the monks rushed to greet Theophilus on the occasion of his visits. According to one apothegm, the patriarch enlisted the help of the monks for the destruction of the Serapion at Alexandria PG He also sent his nephew and successor, Cyril, to study with the monks, especially the learned Serapion, in Nitria. The argument of Theophilus with Isidorus over a gift of money complicated these amicable relations. Fearing the wrath of Theophilus, Isidorus fled to

the valley of Nitria where he had many friends, particularly Dioscorus, Ammonius, Euthymius, and Eusebius, collectively known as the "Tall Brothers" because of their stature. The ensuing conflict is well known from ancient and modern sources Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6. Before the problems with Isidorus, Theophilus had been quite friendly with the Tall Brothers and had awarded them important posts. For example, Theophilus appointed Dioscorus to the bishopric of Hermopolis Parva in Lower Egypt, a position he accepted reluctantly. Later, the four monks became disaffected with the materialism of Theophilus Socrates, 6. They returned to the Nitrian communities. Stung by their ostensible disloyalty and, according to Sozomen 8. Theophilus never censured him. Using Origenism as a convenient, if hypocritical, means by which to ruin the Tall Brothers, Theophilus made a great show of his tenacity to the orthodox faith. The Tall Brothers fled first to Palestine and then, with fifty of their colleagues, to Constantinople, where they sought refuge with John, later known as Chrysostom Socrates, 6. The important and balanced eyewitness account of Sulpicius Severus of the situation prevalent at Alexandria shortly after the Tall Brothers had left Dialogues 1. Opposition to John Chrysostom Prior to the dispute with the Tall Brothers, Theophilus had nominated his presbyter Isidorus for the archiepiscopate of Constantinople upon the death of Nectarius late in On several occasions Isidorus had proven his discretion and his loyalty to the elected patriarch. Nonetheless, John, then bishop at Antioch, was elected early in He even supported John in his efforts to end the schism at Antioch. Once the four Tall Brothers and their colleagues fled to Constantinople and found shelter with him, however, the ill will of Theophilus was renewed Socrates, 6. Like the debacle with the monks, the struggle with John is well documented, especially by Palladius and in a letter written by Chrysostom himself and preserved by Palladius, who reports Dialogue , Coleman-Norton, , John sent a letter to Alexandria and asked his colleague to honor him by forgiving the monks. Although Sozomen denies 8. At this, the Tall Brothers wrote to the patriarch at Alexandria, stating that they anathematized all incorrect doctrine, and to John, with a list of the grievous injuries they had suffered from Theophilus. Their accusations must have been shocking, because Palladius, never one to spare Theophilus an unkind word, emphatically refrains from detailing the contents of their petition lest his audience doubt his credibility Dialogue 25; Coleman-Norton , A counter council at Constantinople was also envisaged to try John. Theophilus urged Epiphanius of Cyprus and his eastern colleagues to attend, thus violating the sixteenth canon of the Nicene council that he had previously accused John of transgressing. This canon prohibited clergy from interfering in the affairs of other churches. Meanwhile, Theophilus set off for the capital see Coleman-Norton, , p. Heretofore, John had ignored the actions of Theophilus and Epiphanius. When Epiphanius announced that he would not meet with him until he denounced Origen and expelled the Tall Brothers, John finally retorted that he would deal further with Epiphanius only after the council originally summoned by Eudoxia against Theophilus had been convened. Shortly thereafter, the Tall Brothers met with Epiphanius and asked whether he had actually read any of their works. Epiphanius had not and was finally convinced of their innocence. After harsh words with John, he set sail for Cyprus, only to die at sea Socrates, 6. Having stopped at Chalcedon en route to Constantinople, Theophilus gathered various bishops hostile to John and urged them to hasten to the capital. He set about organizing the infamous "Council of the Oak," just outside Chalcedon. John refused to appear at the "council" or "synod" until his enemies were removed from the bench and replaced by more impartial judges. This request was never granted. Many of the twenty-nine charges recorded against John by Photius PG John went into exile three days later, only to be recalled almost immediately. Not long after, opinion once more turned against John at a second synod convened by Arcadius, which confirmed his condemnation. Theophilus himself was in trouble. John denounced him in a letter to Pope Innocent I Palladius, Dialogue , and Theophilus also notified the pope of his actions. Possibly at this time Theophilus composed his famous condemnation of John, which survives in three Latin translations Baur, , pp. Angered by the arrogance of Theophilus, Innocent called for a synod wherein the patriarch was to substantiate his claims against John on pain of excommunication Palladius, Dialogue 8, 12, Innocent prevailed upon the emperor, Honorius, to call for a synod. The emperor wrote to his brother and colleague, Arcadius, giving his assent and labeling Theophilus as the culprit in the whole affair Palladius, Dialogue Whether such a council was held is unknown see Baur, , pp. Theodoret has kind words for him Epistle 83, PG The fame of Theophilus as an exegete is apparent from the number of

quotations from his works Richard, ; Reuss, , pp. The list of his spurious writings is truly impressive Richard, , p. His work has four divisions: Paschal letters, other correspondence, homilies, and other miscellaneous items. Around , Theophilus sent Theodosius I a Paschal canon establishing the Easter cycle for one hundred years to make the Alexandrian schedule universal PG Despite his friendship with the emperor PG Nonetheless, the canon was widely used and admired long after his death by persons such as Pope Leo I and Proterius of Alexandria PL As late as the eighth century, Bede recalls *Historia ecclesiastica* 5. Of the annual Paschal letters written by Theophilus throughout his tenure, many fragments survive. References or allusions to the Easter epistles of Theophilus are scattered throughout late antique literature Richard, , pp. Numerous other letters survive, in whole or in part.

Chapter 4 : Theophilus of Antioch | Revolv

-\ Nc \ ' 1 l : . ; t f!i^5iifliS!Â£l^>MS0/lf!f(ilt!2iiJidi^ji<^y^iif^j^ SAINT JEROM ^ff^frmm-- 1 Cl)e jTatftrs for (Dngli'sl) IAcaierg, SAINT JEROME. BY Rev.

There is also a Theophilus of Alexandria c. Theophilus, Patriarch of Antioch [1] Greek: His death probably occurred between and William Sanday [6] describes him as "one of the precursors of that group of writers who, from Irenaeus to Cyprian , not only break the obscurity which rests on the earliest history of the Church, but alike in the East and in the West carry it to the front in literary eminence, and distance all their heathen contemporaries". Works Eusebius and Jerome mention numerous works of Theophilus existing in their time. The ostensible object of *Ad Autolycum* is to convince a pagan friend, Autolycus, a man of great learning and an earnest seeker after truth, of the divine authority of the Christian religion, while at the same time exhibiting the falsehood and absurdity of paganism. His arguments, drawn almost entirely from the Old Testament , with but very scanty references to the New Testament , are largely chronological. He makes the truth of Christianity depend on his demonstration that the books of the Old Testament were long anterior to the writings of the Greeks and were divinely inspired. He contrasts the perfect consistency of the divine oracles, which he regards as a convincing proof of their inspiration, with the inconsistencies of the pagan philosophers. He contrasts the account of the creation of the universe and of man, on which, together with the history contained in the earlier chapters of Genesis , he comments at great length but with singularly little intelligence, with the statements of Plato , "reputed the wisest of all the Greeks", [8] of Aratus , who had the insight to assert that the earth was spherical, [9] and other Greek writers on whom he pours contempt as mere ignorant retailers of stolen goods. He supplies a series of dates, beginning with Adam and ending with Marcus Aurelius , who had died shortly before he wrote, thus dating this work to the years of the reign of Commodus , Theophilus regards the Sibylline books that were still in Rome as authentic and inspired productions, quoting the Sibylline oracles scholars dispute that these are the same largely as declaring the same truths with the prophets. The omission by the Greeks of all mention of the Old Testament from which they draw all their wisdom, is ascribed to a self-chosen blindness in refusing to recognize the only God and in persecuting the followers of the only fountain of truth. The pagan religion was a mere worship of idols, bearing the names of dead men. Almost the only point in which he will allow the pagan writers to be in harmony with revealed truth is in the doctrine of retribution and punishment after death for sins committed in life. He discovers the reason of blood coagulating on the surface of the ground in the divine word to Cain , [16] the earth struck with terror refusing to drink it in. In addition, Theophilus misquotes Plato several times, [17] ranking Zopyrus among the Greeks, [18] and speaking of Pausanias as having only run a risk of starvation instead of being actually starved to death in the temple of Minerva. Rather, Theophilus himself puts it as "God, his Word Logos and his Wisdom Sophia , " [19] perhaps following the early Christian practice of identifying the Holy Spirit as the Wisdom of God, as he seems to demonstrate in his interpretation of Psalm As the Patripassionist heresies arose, however, the formula of "Father, Son, Holy Spirit" became more prominently featured, as such beliefs denied the persons of the Economy an earlier developed term for the Trinity. As Theophilus does not appear to be introducing the word Trinity in novel fashion, it is probable that the word was in use before this time. In like manner also the three days which were before the luminaries, are types of the Trinity, of God, and His Word, and His wisdom. And the fourth is the type of man, who needs light, that so there may be God, the Word, wisdom, man. Conditional immortality and resurrection *Ad Autolycum* 1: His references to Psalms , Proverbs , Isaiah , and Jeremiah are also numerous, and he quotes from Ezekiel , Hosea and other minor prophets. His direct evidence respecting the canon of the New Testament does not go much beyond a few precepts from the Sermon on the Mount, [25] a possible quotation from Luke More important is a distinct citation from the opening of the Gospel of St. According to Eusebius, Theophilus quoted the Book of Revelation in his work against Hermogenes ; a very precarious allusion has been seen in ii. A full index of these and other possible references to the Old and New Testament is given by Otto. While Theophilus makes no mention of the name of Jesus or use the word Christ or the phrase Son of God , he identifies the Logos as the Son of God in his second letter,

when he writes, For the divine writing itself teaches us that Adam said that he had heard the voice. But what else is this voice but the Word of God, who is also His Son? Not as the poets and writers of myths talk of the sons of gods begotten from intercourse [with women], but as truth expounds, the Word, that always exists, residing within the heart of God. For before anything came into being He had Him as a counsellor, being His own mind and thought. But when God wished to make all that He determined on, He begot this Word, uttered, the first-born of all creation, not Himself being emptied of the Word [Reason], but having begotten Reason, and always conversing with His Reason. And hence the holy writings teach us, and all the spirit-bearing [inspired] men, one of whom, John, says, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, showing that at first God was alone, and the Word in Him. Then he says, The Word was God; all things came into existence through Him; and apart from Him not one thing came into existence. The Word, then, being God, and being naturally produced from God, whenever the Father of the universe wills, He sends Him to any place; and He, coming, is both heard and seen, being sent by Him, and is found in a place. And about your laughing at me and calling me Christian, you know not what you are saying. First, because that which is anointed is sweet and serviceable, and far from contemptible. For what ship can be serviceable and seaworthy, unless it be first anointed? Or what castle or house is beautiful and serviceable when it has not been anointed? And what man, when he enters into this life or into the gymnasium, is not anointed with oil? And what work has either ornament or beauty unless it be anointed and burnished? Then the air and all that is under heaven is in a certain sort anointed by light and spirit; and are you unwilling to be anointed with the oil of God? Wherefore we are called Christians on this account, because we are anointed with the oil of God. Theophilus lived in the reign of this emperor. The chronology puts the creation of the world at about BC: The leading chronological epochs correspond to the Old Testament prophets. Patristic Citations The silence regarding his Apology in the East is remarkable; we fail to find the work mentioned or quoted by Greek writers before the time of Eusebius. It is quoted by Lactantius [35] under the title *Liber de Temporibus ad Autolyicum*. There is a passage first cited by Maranus in Novatian [36] which shows great similarity to the language of Theophilus. Jena, is by far the most complete and useful. English translations by Joseph Betty Oxford , W. Grant Clarendon Press, Notes Eusebius Ecclesiastical History iv. *Fasti Romani* John Lightfoot , S. *Apologia ad Autolyicum* i. On Illustrious Men Ch.

The one undoubted extant work of Theophilus, the 7th Bishop of Antioch (c. c.), is his Apology to Autolycus (Apologia ad Autolycum), a series of books defending Christianity written to a pagan friend.

Dunn Australian Catholic University, Brisbane Introduction The only consciousness of gender we find in the letters of Roman bishops from the late fourth and early fifth centuries was with regard to marriage. Men are considered as men only in marital relation to women and women are considered as women only in marital relation to men. Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere Cambridge Heid, Celibacy in the Early Church: My point is simply that a reading of what survives of Innocent will reveal that his concerns lay primarily with other aspects. In addition, those giving advice to widows and virgins need to live what they preach. Several verses of scripture Rom 8: Christian ministers, even more than lay people, need to be available for prayer and prayer required a state of purity 1 Cor 7: Even sexual relations prior to marriage after baptism fornicatio were enough to disqualify him from ordination, for one who is to forgive sins needs to be free from sin himself. Is the married candidate meant to be sexually continent with his wife " of course, being sexually active with anyone other than his wife would be adultery " from the time of baptism or only from ordination? The way the letter reads would seem to suggest, at first glance, the former, but this would be especially restrictive. Was Damasus equating continence with chastity? The next surviving letter from a Roman bishop on the topic of clerical marriage comes from Siricius in a letter Directa of written in response to one written to Damasus by Himerius, bishop of Tarragona Tarraco in the Spanish province of Tarraconnensis, which is often acknowledged as the very first papal decretal. Siricius responded negatively, since this would violate the blessing already imposed upon her by a priest 8 Y. The English summary of this letter in K. He is able to argue this because on he argues that Siricius not Damasus was the author of Dominus inter. Chadwick, Priscillian of Avila: Burrus, The Making of a Heretic: Conti, Priscillian of Avila: The problem Himerius and Siricius both faced was how to support clerical continence without appearing to support Priscillian. His answer was that they should be banished from the monastery and the church and only offered forgiveness at death. This required that they remember that God ordered such Old Testament priests to be holy Lev So the conclusion was reached that from the day of ordination all priests and deacons sacerdotes atque leuitae were bound by those restrictions of sobriety and chastity pudicitia since they offered sacrifice daily²⁰ and since only those who were in the Spirit i. As Tina Sessa reminds us, the marital behaviour of clergy was closely linked to questions of advancement through the developing cursus honorum and later from the end of the fifth century related to the fact that they had households of their own where questions of inheritance became an issue as distinctions between personal and official resources became blurred. The fourth question was about those who had married more than once and who had been admitted to clerical ranks. Here attention is turned to the issue of eligibility for ordination rather than the behaviour of those ordained already. Siricius blamed the Spanish metropolitans for allowing this situation of clerics married more than once to happen. A series of scriptural quotations demonstrated that a priest sacerdos was to be married only once from the New Testament and that he was only to marry a virgin from the Old Testament. One may note the use of this text in Dominus inter. For the impact of Jovinian and Jerome on Siricius and Ambrose , see Brown, The Body and Society: Coustant, Epistolae Another letter Cum in unum of Siricius, written after the Synod of Rome to those bishops who could not be present, and which is preserved for us in the acts of the African Synod of Telepte or Zelle,²⁷ follows Ambrosiaster and highlights the requirement for clerics to be involved in the daily requirements of their ministry. Both 1 Corin-thians 7: With the letters of Innocent I we shall notice that emphasis reversed. It deserves to be considered in some detail. In his letter Etsi tibi of early to Victricius, bishop of Rouen Rotomagensis ,³² Innocent responded to some questions on which the Gallic bishop had sought the guidance and direction of his Roman colleague. In terms of qualifications, he employed Leviticus Although the Ezekiel passage is obviously derived from that in Leviticus the slight differences in wording make it clear that Siricius was referring to the latter. The question of the identification of the first extract is interesting. In the next sentence he wrote: In the later De mon. Dekkers offered Lev Leviticus forbade priests marrying widowed and

divorced women or prostitutes, but did not forbid a priest from remarrying after the death of his wife, if that second wife was also a virgin. We may note the presence of this argument in *Dominus inter*. On clerical sexual continence and its origins in ritual purity arguments in Ambrosiaster see Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy*. One presumes that the canon refers to someone already ordained and only in minor orders, since no cleric in major orders could get married after ordination. The next canon refers explicitly to someone prior to ordination. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, col. Presumably the argument put to Victricius by those in this condition seeking ordination was from restriction on the number of marriages applied not only to the wives but to the clerical husbands as well: This is not found in the earlier letters of Damasus or Siricius. The reference to 1 Timothy 3: After some more discussion about who was eligible for ordination, Innocent turned to the question of sexual continence for those ordained already. Innocent repeated much of what is found in *Directa* using the same scriptural passages directly or indirectly Lev In his letter *Consulenti tibi* of early to Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse Tolosa , Innocent dealt only with the issue of sexual continence, and repeated what he had written in his letter to Victricius on that particular topic. There is no discussion about qualifications for ordination. He repeated what is found in his letter to Victricius: How this is to be reconciled with the modern notion within the Catholic church that children born of putative marriages are to be regarded as legitimate Code of Canon Law, can. We find Luke 1: On this letter see G. On the Spanish churches at this time see K. Kulikowski eds , *Hispania in Late Antiquity: From the opening of a letter from Innocent to the bishops in Illyricum Orientale*, we discover that they had written to Innocent some time previously with questions, to which he had replied. Sometime later bishops from this area had written to Innocent repeating their enquiries. *Epistula 17* was his response. The five questions concern disciplinary matters affecting the lives and ministry of clerics. Underlying them are issues of sacramental theology to do with baptism, marriage, and ordination that are well worth considering afresh, but the first two questions, the ones that concern us here, deal with the marriage of clergy. The New Testament was relatively clear: The Illyrian bishops had informed Innocent that their custom was to allow all clergy to marry females who had been married previously. It would seem that divorced women were not the particular issue presented by the Illyrian bishops to Innocent. He replied that the divine authority of scripture trumped custom and that, since Leviticus Thus, the wife of a cleric, like her husband, was to be only once married. The custom in Illyricum was indefensible. The implication was that this was what the Illyrians should do as well. Now we move to the next question, which was about what counted as being once married for clergy. Since that it absurd, so too is the notion of the dissolution of marriage through baptism. In another letter, this time to Bruttian bishops, we see how concerned Innocent was about clergy who fathered children after ordination. Once-married clerics What distinguishes Innocent from Siricius and Damasus is his interest in three of the four relevant letters in the issue of how to define what it meant for a cleric to be once married. Can we identify anything between and that would account for this shift of emphasis? The challenge presented by the debate between Jerome and Ambrose on baptism and digamy as a disqualification for ordination offers such an explanation. One must disagree with Kelly that Siricius had already dealt with this particular argument about the effects of baptism on marriage, even though he is correct that Siricius did make comment upon digamy in general. It prohibited those who had been married twice after baptism or who had a concubine from being ordained. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, wrote in *De officiis ministrorum*, composed sometime before , of those who had married a second time before baptism as being ineligible for ordination. Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority*, , looks at how this question was addressed across the fifth and sixth centuries. His *Life, Writings and Controversies* London Canon 18 was about the wives of clerics, and was a canonical expression of Lev The law forbidding clerics to be married more than once presumably from the Pastoral Letters was not abolished in baptism. Jerome replied that Carterius was not alone in this and that he could list hundreds of bishops in a similar situation. The implication, of course, is that he considered marriage to be a fault, although he was clear, in the next section of the letter, to state that marriage is not sinful. Jerome argued that the list of requirements for a bishop in 1 Timothy and for a presbyter in Titus contained those things that a man needed to have at the time he was chosen or from his baptism, but whether or not they applied before his baptism did not matter. His position was that pre-baptismal marriages, because of their non-sacramental nature to use Augustinian concepts , which

is what Paul seems to have conceded in 1 Corinthians 7: To justify this he advocated that what 1 Timothy banned was simultaneous polygamy not sequential polygamy. Jerome was certainly interested in the question of clerical sexual continence after ordination, but not here with the question of whether marriages before baptism affected eligibility for ordination. The index in Heid, *Celibacy in the Early Church*, mistakenly lists Oceanus as a digamous bishop – he was neither. Marans San Francisco 93 and , made reference to Carterius being twice married, he does not delve into the implications of that reality. We have noticed how, even though he could call the marriage between two non-Christians *honestum matrimonium*, the fact that he could then call the wives of such unions concubines or mistresses could only have been on the basis of an understanding of the relevant passage of 1 Corinthians 7. But the principle would have been the same for Jerome: Why would Jerome be looking for a loophole? His evident misogyny does not quite explain this situation. It could well be that the three letters in the collection to Gaul, Spain, and Illyricum indicate that the same issue was presenting itself in various 79 Jerome, *Apol.*

Chapter 6 : Hilary - the Councils

Entry for 'Church Fathers' - The Jewish Encyclopedia - One of 8 Bible encyclopedias freely available, this encyclopedia is a descriptive record of the history, religion and customs of the Jewish people.

English] The panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Heresies, Christianâ€™Early works to Gnosticismâ€™Early works to No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Fees are subject to change. Modern titles are noted with an asterisk. Demand for it has been sufficient to warrant a second edition, which is offered here. The opportunity has been taken to review and revise the translation, edit and expand the notes and index and add indices of references. Epiphanius of Salamis, Selected Passages could be termed a modern epitome of the Panarion. Dechow translates excerpts from Epiphanius only incidentally but provides a penetrating study of his life, the anti-Origenist aspect of this thought, and the Origenist controversies of his last years. We translate these in the body of our work, marking them with an asterisk and providing a short appendix which gives the Greek alternatives. The enterprise ought now to be practicable. However, to revise this enormous text must be a long drawn out affair requiring the cooperation of many scholars. He concluded that the eleven extant manuscripts, none of them complete, all descend from a single poorly copied archetype, and that the text has been contaminated by atticizing scribes. His Greek has its peculiarities but he sets forth his aims and methods clearly at the outset, carries them through consistently, seldom digresses and returns to his point when he does, and provides the reader with every help he can. He sometimes emends, but more often restores a word or phrase, occasionally a longer unit. His restorations clear up many difficulties and usually appear to be the most logical choice. Now and then the text gives a good sense without restoration and the Panarion, partly written but mostly dictated and that under pressure of time, may not have been as smooth as Holl supposed. Nonetheless there can be little doubt that Holl has given us a fair approximation of what Epiphanius wrote. Early in the fourth century C. It has been suggested that his parents were Jewish converts to Christianity. In favor of this are the facts that he was bilingual in Greek and Syriac and knew a good deal about Jewish Christian sects; against it, that his attitude toward Jews was antagonistic and his knowledge of their customs meager. An important influence on him was his friend and mentor Hilarion, who is credited with bringing the monastic life to Palestine and who in his turn had been taught by Anthony of Egypt. Indoctrinated in childhood with Nicene Christianity, he was under monastic influence in his early years. His education, Christian and scriptural rather than classical, would have reinforced his childhood training. The homoousian version of Christianity was crucial to his identity from the first. Although we cannot know this, this episode, dangerous to his chastity and described by him, even years later, in an emotional manner, Cited in Nicephorus Adversus Epiphanium XIV, 61, Pitra, Spicilegium Solesmense, p. At the least it helps explain his detestation of anything gnostic, and his conviction that all Gnostics were immoral. His literary style, or lack of it, shows that he did not complete his rhetorical training. Instead he joined an Egyptian monastic community, where he remained for some years. Unfortunately we do not know which one. Given his avid reading it must have emphasized knowledge as well as praxis. On the other hand, his virulent anti-Origenism almost guarantees that it took the anti-Origenist side of the controversy then raging among the monks of Egypt. Returning to Palestine, probably nearer to the age of 30 than to the 20 the preface to the Ancoratus mentions, Epiphanius founded a monastery near Eleutheropolis and served as its abbot. His friendship with Hilarion, whose monastery was also near Gaza, continued. Jerome tells us Vita Hilarionis 1 that when Hilarion died Epiphanius circulated a short work in his praise. Of his years as an abbot we know only his efforts to foster and defend what he regarded as Christian orthodoxy. Panarion 40,1,6, his only personal reminiscence of his abbacy, shows him exposing and banishing a Gnostic monk. When in the bishop of Eleutheropolis, Euty chius, signed the evasive creed of the Council of Seleuceia Panarion 73,25,,8 and attempted to enforce the homoeousion on his diocese, Epiphanius was uncooperative. It was during this period that he visited the homoousian bishop Eusebius of Vercelli, in exile at Tiberias, and there met the converted Jew Josephus of

Tiberias who told him the colorful story he relates at Panarion 30,4,,9. The Panarion shows so much interest in the monastic life that we must visualize Epiphanius, once a bishop, as continuing his own austerity. For various alternatives see Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism. He allowed a degree of autonomy to the other bishops of his far flung province. Ancoratus shows us that he was missionary-minded, eager to convince pagans of their error and bring them into the fold. It may have been Epiphanius who began the construction of the great basilica, the ruins of which still stand near Famagusta. To interfere with him would presumably have risked an uproar. Epiphanius was respected not only for his piety and rectitude but for his learning. Churches far from Cyprus consulted him on doctrinal issues. The Ancoratus, of which we treat below, is his reply to inquiries from the church at Syedra in Pamphilia. His earliest surviving datable work is a fragment of a Letter to Eusebius, Marcellus, Bibianus and Carpus, preserved on pages and of Codex Ambrosianus This was written somewhere between the years and It defends the Antiochean dating of Easter, used by the church on Cyprus, on the Sunday after Nisan 14, rather than on the Sunday after the spring equinox, the Alexandrian observance. At 12,,8 we find the outline of what was to become the Panarion, showing that Epiphanius already had this work in mind. This was begun, in fact, in or and can be considered a sequel to the Ancoratus. We discuss it below. During this same period, about , Epiphanius attempted to resolve a scandalous schism in the important church of Antioch; he tells the story at Panarion 77,20,,2. Melitius had the allegiance of the majority but was in exile. The third, Paulinus, had the support of Damasus of Rome; he was a disciple of the former bishop of Antioch, Eustathius, staunch homoousian and participant in the Council of Nicaea who, however, had been exiled on a charge of Sabellianism. Epiphanius had already encountered distorted forms of this doctrine, brought to Cyprus about by young disciples of Apollinarius. Panarion 77,2, describes some of their ideas and speaks of the calling of a synod to condemn persons of this kind. Thus he could not enter into communion with Vitalius. Nor, for reasons we do not know, did he consider communion with Melitius. Nautin, however, doubts that Melitius was ever exiled. Epiphanius attempted to gain support for Paulinus from the influential Basil of Caesarea, but to no avail. Apollinarius in the meantime rejected both Epiphanius and Paulinus and consecrated new bishops. On the one hand, no one appears to have resented his intervention in a see not his own; but on the other, his word was by no means always taken as law. Whether Epiphanius attended the First Council of Constantinople in is very doubtful. During the winter following, however, in , he traveled to Rome with Paulinus and Jerome to attend a synod called by Damasus to discuss the relations between the western and eastern churches. If Epiphanius hoped that Damasus would affirm his earlier support of Paulinus he was disappointed; Damasus now suspected him of Sabellianism. During this time, however, Epiphanius boarded with the wealthy widow Paula and was instrumental in persuading her to abandon the luxurious life of a Roman aristocrat for the cloister. She journeyed east with Jerome as her chaplain and founded a convent at Bethlehem Jerome, Vita Paulae A few years later, perhaps in , we find Epiphanius visiting her on her sickbed and laboring, unsuccessfully, to convince her that drinking wine when ill is proper Jerome, Vita Paulae Seven years later, in , Epiphanius published his De Mensuris et Ponderibus, a manual of information for students of scripture In we find him on another visit to Palestine, traveling to Bethel to share a service with the bishop of Jerusalem, John. In a village church he found a curtain painted with the image of Christ or a saint, tore it down at once, and advised the parishioners to use it as a burial shroud for the poor. Most importantly, however, this Letter addressed to the convinced Origenist, John, is an antiOrigenist tract and was circulated as such. This had nothing to do with Origen himself, who was long dead. Panarion 64,3, and 5, , but considered his doctrine gnostic and the source of Arianism. From until Epiphanius fought against Origenism in Jerusalem and Palestine. His chief ally was Jerome. Rufinus, predictably, refused to see Atarbius. Either the festival of the Encaenia or the Holy Week of saw an ugly incident at Jerusalem. Invited to preach in the morning, Epiphanius delivered a denunciation of Origen which was plainly aimed at John. John retorted in the afternoon with a sermon against anthropomorphism, a view which some monks certainly held and with which Origenists often stigmatized their accusers. A few days later John published a confession of faith. Epiphanius could find no fault with it but, still unsatisfied, wrote in his Letter to John. This was circularized among the bishops and monks of Palestine, accompanied by another letter which urged them to break communion with John. Jerome also wrote a Contra Rufinum, although he and Rufinus made peace in

Next followed the crisis of the Origenist controversy in Egypt. Under heavy pressure from anti-Origenist monks, Theophilus abandoned his previous tolerance of Origenism and proceeded against the Origenist monks of Nitria, 40 miles from Alexandria. This was followed by a decree of exile for the Nitrian Origenists, accompanied by the wrecking of their cells and the burning of their books. Theophilus wrote for support to the churches of Palestine and Cyprus, and in particular urged Epiphanius to convene a similar synod on Cyprus. Meanwhile the exiles from Nitria had made their way to various Christian and monastic centers. He, however, held his own service outside the city and, uncanonically, ordained a deacon. According to the later Sozomen Epiphanius had an encounter with Ammonius which convinced him of his own injustice. Whatever the truth of the matter, Epiphanius left Constantinople without taking any public action. He died at sea on his way home to Cyprus. In his defense it may be urged that he was Palestinian, and had also lived for many years in Egypt. Was he not defending hearth and home against what he saw as a dangerous virus? As to his support of the rather unsavory Theophilus, Riggi has reminded us of his reverence for the see of Alexandria.

Rufinus, in his Apologia adversus Hieronymum, accused Jerome of supporting this "doctrine of perjury" (periurii dogma) in Jerome's Commentarii in iv epistulas Paulinas. 76 Jerome defends himself at Adversus Rufinum, but repeats that Origen and his followers were devoted to deceit, even under oath.

Doctrinal Importance of the Period. Influence of the Ancient Philosophy. The Nicene and Chalcedonian age is the period of the formation and ecclesiastical settlement of the ecumenical orthodoxy; that is, the doctrines of the holy trinity and of the incarnation and the divine-human person of Christ, in which the Greek, Latin, and evangelical churches to this day in their symbolical books agree, in opposition to the heresies of Arianism and Apollinarianism, Nestorianism and Eutychianism. Besides these trinitarian and christological doctrines, anthropology also, and soteriology, particularly the doctrines of sin and grace, in opposition to Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism were developed and brought to a relative settlement; only, however, in the Latin church, for the Greek took very little part in the Pelagian controversy. The fundamental nature of these doctrines, the greatness of the church fathers who were occupied with them, and the importance of the result, give this period the first place after the apostolic in the history of theology. In no period, excepting the Reformation of the sixteenth century, have there been so momentous and earnest controversies in doctrine, and so lively an interest in them. The church was now in possession of the ancient philosophy and learning of the Roman empire, and applied them to the unfolding and vindication of the Christian truth. In the lead of these controversies stood church teachers of imposing talents and energetic piety, not mere book men, but venerable theological characters, men all of a piece, as great in acting and suffering as in thinking. To them theology was a sacred business of heart and life, [1] and upon them we may pass the judgment of Eusebius respecting Origen: With the purest zeal for truth were mingled much of the odium and rabies theologorum, and the whole host of theological passions; which are the deepest and most bitter of passions, because religion is concerned with eternal interests. The leading personages in these controversies were of course bishops and priests. By their side fought the monks, as a standing army, with fanatical zeal for the victory of orthodoxy, or not seldom in behalf even of heresy. Emperors and civil officers also mixed in the business of theology, but for the most part to the prejudice of its free, internal development; for they imparted to all theological questions a political character, and entangled them with the cabals of court and the secular interests of the day. In Constantinople, during the Arian controversy, all classes, even mechanics, bankers, frippers, market women, and runaway slaves took lively part in the questions of Homousion and sub-ordination, of the begotten and the unbegotten. Gregory Nazianzen, who lived in Constantinople in the midst of the Arian wars, describes the division and hostility which this polemic spirit introduced between parents and children, husbands and wives, old and young, masters and slaves, priests and people. The history of the Nicene age shows clearly that the church of God carries the heavenly treasure in earthly vessels. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was likewise in fact an incessant war, in which impure personal and political motives of every kind had play, and even the best men often violated the apostolic injunction to speak the truth in love. But we must not forget that the passionate and intolerant dogmatism of that time was based upon deep moral earnestness and strong faith, and so far forth stands vastly above the tolerance of indifferentism, which lightly plays with the truth or not rarely strikes out in most vehement intolerance against the faith. Remember the first French revolution. The overruling of divine Providence in the midst of these wild conflicts is unmistakable, and the victory of the truth appears the greater for the violence of error. God uses all sorts of men for his instruments, and brings evil passions as well as good into his service. The Spirit of truth guided the church through the rush and the din of contending parties, and always triumphed over error in the end. The ecumenical councils were the open battle-fields, upon which the victory of orthodoxy was decided. The doctrinal decrees of these councils contain the results of the most profound discussions respecting the Trinity and the person of Christ; and the Church to this day has not gone essentially beyond those decisions. The Greek church wrought out Theology and Christology, while the Latin church devoted itself to Anthropology and Soteriology. The one, true to the genius of the Greek nationality, was predominantly speculative, dialectical, impulsive, and restless; the other,

in keeping with the Roman character, was practical, traditional, uniform, consistent, and steady. The former followed the stimulation of Origen and the Alexandrian school; the latter received its impulse from Tertullian and Cyprian, and reached its theological height in Jerome and Augustine. The speculative inclination of the Greek church appeared even in its sermons, which not rarely treated of the number of worlds, the idea of matter, the different classes of higher spirits, the relation of the three hypostases in the Godhead, and similar abstruse questions. The Latin church also, however, had a deep spirit of investigation as we see in Tertullian and Augustine, took an active part in the trinitarian and christological controversies of the East, and decided the victory of orthodoxy by the weight of its authority. The Greek church almost exhausted its productive force in those great struggles, proved indifferent to the deeper conception of sin and grace, as developed by Augustine, and after the council of Chalcedon degenerated theologically into scholastic formalism and idle refinements. The fourth and fifth centuries are the flourishing, classical period of the patristic theology and of the Christian Graeco-Roman civilization. In the second half of the fifth century the West Roman empire, with these literary treasures, went down amidst the storms of the great migration, to take a new and higher sweep in the Germano-Roman form under Charlemagne. In the Eastern empire scholarship was better maintained, and a certain connection with antiquity was preserved through the medium of the Greek language. But as the Greek church had no middle age, so it has had no Protestant Reformation. The prevailing philosophy of the fathers was the Platonic, so far as it was compatible with the Christian spirit. The speculative theologians of the East, especially those of the school of Origen, and in the West, Ambrose and pre-eminently Augustine, were moulded by the Platonic idealism. A remarkable combination of Platonism with Christianity, to the injury of the latter, appears in the system of mystic symbolism in the pseudo-Dionysian books, which cannot have been composed before the fifth century, though they were falsely ascribed to the Areopagite of the book of Acts xvii. The fundamental idea of these Dionysian writings on the celestial hierarchy; on the ecclesiastical hierarchy; on the divine names; on mystic theology; together with ten letters is a double hierarchy, one in heaven and one on earth, each consisting of three triads, which mediates between man and the ineffable, transcendent hyper-essential divinity. This idea is a remnant of the aristocratic spirit of ancient heathenism, and forms the connecting link with the hierarchical organization of the church, and explains the great importance and popularity which the pseudo-Dionysian system acquired, especially in the mystic theology of the middle ages. He was an enthusiastic pupil of Hypatia, the famous female philosopher at Alexandria, and in was called to the bishopric of Ptolemais, the capital of Pentapolis. Before taking orders he frankly declared that he could not forsake his philosophical opinions, although he would in public accommodate himself to the popular belief. Theophilus of Alexandria, the same who was one of the chief persecutors of the admirers of Origen, the father of Christian Platonism, accepted this doubtful theory of accommodation. The desire of the soul to be freed from the chains of matter, takes the place of the sorrow for sin and the longing after salvation. It was the philosophy of scholasticism, while mysticism sympathized rather with the Platonic system. The influence of the two great philosophies upon theology was beneficial or injurious, according as the principle of Christianity was the governing or the governed factor. Both systems are theistic at bottom monotheistic, and favorable to the spirit of earnest and profound speculation. Platonism, with its ideal, poetic views, stimulates, fertilizes, inspires and elevates the reason and imagination, but also easily leads into the errors of gnosticism and the twilight of mysticism. Aristotelianism, with its sober realism and sharp logical distinctions, is a good discipline for the understanding, a school of dialectic practice, and a help to logical, systematic, methodical treatment, but may also induce a barren formalism. The church view respecting the sources of Christian theology and the rule of faith and practice remains as it was in the previous period, except that it is further developed in particulars. Both are vehicles of the same substance: The relation of the two in the mind of the ancient church may be illustrated by the relation between the supreme law of a country such as the Roman law, the Code Napoleon, the common law of England, the Constitution of the United States and the courts which expound the law, and decide between conflicting interpretations. The catholic faith, says he, is that which the Lord gave, the apostles preached, and the fathers have preserved; upon this the church is founded, and he who departs from this faith can no longer be called a Christian. In the Greek church its place was supplied after the year by the Nicene Creed, which more fully expresses the doctrine of the deity of Christ.

Neither of these symbols goes beyond the substance of the teaching of the apostles; neither contains any doctrine specifically Greek or Roman. The old catholic doctrine of Scripture and tradition, therefore, nearly as it approaches the Roman, must not be entirely confounded with it. It makes the two identical as to substance, while the Roman church rests upon tradition for many doctrines and usages, like the doctrines of the seven sacraments, of the mass, of purgatory, of the papacy, and of the immaculate conception, which have no foundation in Scripture. Against this the evangelical church protests, and asserts the perfection and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the record of divine revelation; while it does not deny the value of tradition, or of the consciousness of the church, in the interpretation of Scripture, and regulates public teaching by symbolical books. In the Protestant view tradition is not coordinate with Scripture, but subordinate to it, and its value depends on its agreement with the Scriptures. The Scriptures alone are the *norma fidei*; the church doctrine is only the *norma doctrinae*. Protestantism gives much more play to private judgment and free investigation in the interpretation of the Scriptures, than the Roman or even the Nicene church. In respect to the Holy Scriptures: At the end of the fourth century views still differed in regard to the extent of the canon, or the number of the books which should be acknowledged as divine and authoritative. The Jewish canon, or the Hebrew Bible, was universally received, while the Apocrypha added to the Greek version of the Septuagint were only in a general way accounted as books suitable for church reading, [10] and thus as a middle class between canonical and strictly apocryphal pseudonymous writings. And justly; for those books, while they have great historical value, and fill the gap between the Old Testament and the New, all originated after the cessation of prophecy, and they cannot therefore be regarded as inspired, nor are they ever cited by Christ or the apostles. In the Western church the canon of both Testaments was closed at the end of the fourth century through the authority of Jerome who wavered, however, between critical doubts and the principle of tradition, and more especially of Augustine, who firmly followed the Alexandrian canon of the Septuagint, and the preponderant tradition in reference to the disputed Catholic Epistles and the Revelation; though he himself, in some places, inclines to consider the Old Testament Apocrypha as deuterocanonical books, bearing a subordinate authority. The council of Hippo in , and the third according to another reckoning the sixth council of Carthage in , under the influence of Augustine, who attended both, fixed the catholic canon of the Holy Scriptures, including the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and prohibited the reading of other books in the churches, excepting the Acts of the Martyrs on their memorial days. These two African councils, with Augustine, [14] give forty-four books as the canonical books of the Old Testament, in the following order: The New Testament canon is the same as ours. This decision of the transmarine church however, was subject to ratification; and the concurrence of the Roman see it received when Innocent I. This canon remained undisturbed till the sixteenth century, and was sanctioned by the council of Trent at its fourth session. Protestantism retained the New Testament canon of the Roman church, [15] but, in accordance with the orthodox Jewish and the primitive Christian view, excluded the Apocrypha from the Old. The want of general education, however, and the enormous cost of books, left the people for the most part dependent on the mere hearing of the word of God in public worship; and the free private study of the Bible was repressed by the prevailing Spirit of the hierarchy. No prohibition, indeed, was yet laid upon the reading of the Bible; but the presumption that it was a book of the priests and monks already existed. The oldest manuscripts of the Bible now extant date no further back than the fourth century, are very few, and abound in unessential errors and omissions of every kind; and the problem of a critical restoration of the original text is not yet satisfactorily solved, nor can it be more than approximately solved in the absence of the original writings of the apostles. The oldest and most important manuscripts in uncial letters are the Sinaitic first discovered by Tischendorf in , and published in , the Vatican in Rome, defective , the Alexandrian in London ; then the much mutilated codex of Ephraim Syrus in Paris, and the incomplete codex of Cambridge. From these and a few other uncial codices the oldest attainable text must be mainly gathered. Secondary sources are quotations in the fathers, the earliest versions, such as the Syriac Peshito and the Latin Vulgate, and the later manuscripts. The spread of the church among all the nations of the Roman empire, and even among the barbarians on its borders, brought with it the necessity of translating the Scriptures into various tongues. The most important of these versions, and the one most used, is the Latin Vulgate, which was made by the learned Jerome on the basis of the older

Itala, and which afterwards, notwithstanding its many errors, was placed by the Roman church on a level with the original itself. The knowledge of Hebrew among the fathers was very rare; the Septuagint was considered sufficient, and even the knowledge of Greek diminished steadily in the Latin church after the invasion of the barbarians and the schism with the East, so that the Bible in its original languages became a sealed book, and remained such until the revival of learning in the fifteenth century. In the interpretation of the Scriptures the system of allegorical exposition and imposition was in high repute, and often degenerated into the most arbitrary conceits, especially in the Alexandrian school, to which most of the great dogmatic theologians of the Nicene age belonged. Theodore thereby incurred the suspicion and subsequently even the condemnation of the Greek church. Among the Latin fathers a similar difference in the interpretation of Scripture appears between the discerning depth and lively play of Augustine and the grammatical and archaeological scholarship and dogmatical superficiality of Jerome. The Holy Scriptures were universally accepted as the supreme authority and infallible rule of faith. But as the Scriptures themselves were variously interpreted, and were claimed by the heretics for their views, the fathers of our period, like Irenaeus and Tertullian before them, had recourse at the same time to Tradition, as preserved from the apostles through the unbroken succession of the bishops. With them the Scriptures are the supreme law; the combined wisdom and piety of the catholic church, the organic body of the faithful, is the judge which decides the true sense of the law. For to be understood the Bible must be explained, either by private judgment or by the universal faith of Christendom. Strictly speaking, the Holy Ghost, who is the author, is also the only infallible interpreter of the Scriptures. But it was held that the Holy Ghost is given only to the orthodox church not to heretical and schismatic sects, and that he expresses himself through assembled orthodox bishops and universal councils in the clearest and most authoritative way. Even Augustine, who of all the fathers stands nearest to evangelical Protestantism, on this point advocates the catholic principle in the celebrated maxim which he urges against the Manichaeans: Hence the need of a criterion of true and false tradition. Catholicity of place, of time, and of number; or ubiquity, antiquity, and universal consent; [21] in other words, an article of faith must be traced up to the apostles, and be found in all Christian countries, and among all believers. But this principle can be applied only to a few fundamental articles of revealed religion, not to any of the specifically Romish dogmas, and, to have any reasonable meaning, must be reduced to a mere principle of majority. In regard to the consensus omnium, which properly includes both the others, Vincentius himself makes this limitation, by defining the condition as a concurrence of the majority of the clergy. In many important doctrines, however, there is not even a consensus patrum, as in the doctrine of free will, of predestination, of the atonement. A certain freedom of divergent private opinions is the indispensable condition of all progress of thought, and precedes the ecclesiastical settlement of every article of faith. Even Vincentius expressly asserts a steady advance of the church in the knowledge of the truth, though of course in harmony with the previous steps, as a man or a tree remains identical through the various stages of growth. But on the other hand he would have as little toleration for new dogmas. He wished to make tradition not an independent source of knowledge and rule of faith by the side of the Holy Scriptures, but only to have it acknowledged as the true interpreter of Scripture, and as a bar to heretical abuse.

Chapter 8 : Footnotes - Bible Study Tools

Abstract. Nearly all women writers known from late Antiquity and the Middle Ages have been preserved within the Christian tradition. During the last twenty years these church Mothers are focused by Women's Studies in religious and intellectual history.

Their Importance to Judaism. The early teachers and defenders of Christianity. The most important of the fathers lived and worked in a period when Christianity still had many points of contact with Judaism, and they found that the latter was a splendid support in the contest against paganism, although it had to be combated in the development of Christian doctrine. So the Fathers of the Church are seen at one time holding to a Jewish conception of the universe and making use of Jewish arguments, at another rejecting a part of such teaching and formulating a new one. In the contest of Christianity against paganism the Church Fathers employ the language of the Hellenistic literature as found in Philo, Josephus, the Apocrypha, and the Sibylline Books, all of which draw upon the Prophets of the Old Testament. Thus, practically, only the polemic features in the activity of the Church Fathers directed against Judaism can be considered as new and original. But in order to wage successful war against paganism, they, as well as Christians in general, had to acquaint themselves with the religious documents of Judaism; and this was possible only if they entered into personal relations with the Jews: The contemporaries and, in part, the coworkers of those men who are known from the Talmud and the Midrash as the depositaries of the Jewish doctrine, were the instructors who transmitted this doctrine to the Church Fathers also. Hence such a mass of haggadic material is found in the work of the fathers as to constitute an important part of Jewish theological lore. This article is primarily concerned with their interpretation of the texts of the Bible and of the Apocrypha, which differs in essential points from those of the Jews. Personal Relations with Jews: This dialogue, already mentioned by Celsus, may be wholly imaginary and without historical basis. The Jewish auditors are not only able to follow the intricate discussion intelligently, but their demeanor also is seemly; Tryphon especially proves himself a true disciple of Greek philosophy, and his scholarship is freely acknowledged by Justin *ib.* At the close of, the debate, Jew and Christian confess that they have learned much from each other, and part with expressions of mutual good-will *ib.* Justin was born and reared in proximity to Jews; for he calls himself a Samaritan *ib.* Of the relations of Clement of Alexandria to Judaism nothing positive is known. During the persecutions of the Christians of Alexandria, in or , Clement sought refuge for a short time in Syria Eusebius, *l.* Here he may have learned much at first hand from the Jews. A Jewish mother could readily have taught her son the Hebrew language, so that they might sing the Psalms together Jerome, "Epistola xxxix. Origen often mentions the views of Jews, meaning thereby not the teaching of certain individuals, but the method of exegesis prevalent among the Jews of his time. The Jews with whom he maintained personal intercourse were men of distinguished scientific attainments. Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus, Epiphanius. Eusebius, the celebrated Church historian, also learned from the Jews, as has already been mentioned, and was under the influence of Jewish tradition. Nevertheless he uses the word "Jew" as a term of reproach, calling his opponent, Marcellus, "a Jew" "De Ecclesiastica Theologia," *ii.* This last expression is also used regularly by Ephraem Syrus to designate Jews, "Opera Syriaca," *ii.* Ephraem distances all his ecclesiastical predecessors in his hatred of the Jews, displaying a bitterness that is explicable only on the ground that he at one time had personal relations with them, and had formed an adverse opinion of them. Epiphanius, too, shows his dependence on the Jews, especially in the book, perhaps wrongly ascribed to him, "De Prophetarum Vitis"; which contains, besides many extraneous inventions, numerous Jewish traditions of the lives of the Prophets. Jerome surpasses all other Church Fathers in his erudition as well as in his importance for Judaism. It must be emphasized, in spite of Christian assertions to the contrary *e.* He sought his information in many quarters, especially among the educated Jews Preface to Hosea; compare "Epistola lxxiii. Of only three of his Jewish teachers is anything known. Although he has much to say in praise of this man, Jerome will not admit that he learned much from him Preface to Job, designating him often as one who merely read the Scriptures to him "Onomastica Sacra," *xc.* Jerome lived about forty years in Palestine, apparently studying all the time under Jews commentary on Nahum *ii.* His

enemies severely censured him for his intercourse with the Jews, but he was proud of it. He asks how it could be held to impugn his faith in the Church, that he informs his readers in how many ways the Jews construe a single error. It is most useful to cross the threshold of the masters, and to learn the art directly from the artists" ib. When he questioned the Jews on Biblical matters, they often either did not answer at all, or, at least from the standpoint of the Church Fathers, "lied" Jerome, "Epistola cxii. An alleged letter from Jerome, probably forged by Rufinus, was sent to the Christian communities in Africa, in which Jerome professed to admit that, misled by the Jews, he had translated erroneously "Adversus Rufinum," book iii. It mortified Jerome that his translation of the Bible, the Vulgate, so famous later on, should be passed over in silence by all the Jews, and that there was no one who knew enough Hebrew to appreciate the merits of the new translation "Epistola cxii. He even believed that all the Jews of Africa had conspired to oppose him, as actually happened in one place. Augustini ad Hieronymum" "the new translation was read in the church, by order of the bishop. The bishop had to strike it out as "a lie," being in danger of losing his congregation. Before this, Tertullian of Carthage had spoken of the impertinence and derision shown by a Jew "Apologia," xvi. Chrysostom, Cyril, and Ambrose. Weiss, "Die Grossen Kappadocier Exegeten," p. Gregory of Nyssa c. The same maybe said of the other Church Fathers who lived in Europe; that is, in sections sparsely settled by Jews. In the paschal controversy he advocated separation from Judaism. This appears especially in the "Homilies" of Aphraates c. The Church Fathers adopted from the Jews a mass of interpolations, interpretations, and illustrative anecdotes, which may best be designated by the well-known term, "Haggadah," but which they themselves called variously. Goldfahn has counted in Justin Martyr "Dialogus cum Tryphone" twenty-six Hebrew traditions and six polemico-apologetic Haggadot. Among these may be mentioned: Clement is acquainted with the old Haggadah to Ex. Origen derives still more from the Haggadot. Eusebius makes a distinction between esoteric and exoteric exegesis; the Haggadot he often classes with the exoteric interpretation, contrary to Clement and others, who see therein a secret doctrine. Among his Haggadot may be mentioned the following: Abraham observed the precepts of the Torah before it had been revealed "Demonstratio Evangelica," i. The traitor Shebna was a high priest compare Lev. After the advent of Jesus, the three powerful estates, kings, priests, and prophets, disappeared from Israel "Demonstratio Evangelica," x. Something similar is found in Aphraates on Num. Aphraates gives the above as a self-evident exegesis without mentioning its Jewish origin. He does the same with his numerous other Haggadot, which were doubtless derived from the Jews. Ephraem Syrus likewise gives his Haggadot in the name of scholars, expounders, etc. The Haggadot, however, were so generally accepted, that their Jewish origin gradually came to be forgotten. Ephraem Syrus, for instance, says, on Gen. His explanation of Gen. On II Kings iv. But the one most conversant with Jewish traditions, and their greatest admirer, is Jerome. He says, for example, on Jer. He is also the only Church Father who is acquainted with the technical terms of the Hebrew tradition; for instance: The haggadic elements in Jerome are so numerous that they would fill volumes; some of the more noteworthy ones may be mentioned here. Akiba, which has come down only anonymously compare Eccl. The Church Fathers who lived after Jerome knew less and less about Judaism, so that, the history of the later periods is no longer of any interest in this connection. The dialogue between Justin and the Jew Tryphon is remarkable for the politeness with which Jews and Christians speak of one another; later on, however, examples are not wanting of passionate and bitter language used by Christians and Jews in their disputations. Origen complains of the stubbornness of the Jews Homily x. Ephraem Syrus assumes a very insulting tone toward the Jews; he calls them by opprobrious names, and sees in them the worthless vineyard that bears no good fruit. Like Eusebius, who used the misfortunes of the Jews for polemic purposes com. After Jerome has enumerated all the countries whither the Jews had been dispersed, he exclaims: What especially angered the Christians was the fact that the Jews persisted in their Messianic hopes. In his sermon against the Jews Ephraem says: Jerome, on the other hand, speaks with great eloquence of the Messianic hopes of the Jews. Many Messianic passages of the Bible were applied by the latter to the emperor Julian, others to the distant future, differences which resulted in interminable polemics. Disputations Between Jews and Christians. The writings of Jerome vividly portray the character of the polemics of that period. The Christian who should undertake to dispute with the Jews had to be learned in doctrine Preface to Psalms. But these disputations must be held lest the Jews should consider the Christians ignorant on Isa. The

proceedings were very lively. Reference is made, even if only figuratively, to the planting of the feet against each other, to the pulling of the rope, etc. It is incredible that the Jews were so frantic as to "scream with unbridled tongues, foaming at the mouth, and hoarse of voice" on the Epistle to Titus, iii. Nor is it probable that the Jews "regretted when they had no opportunity to slander and vilify the Christians" Preface to Joshua , although the Jews of that age show no diffidence in sustaining their part in these discussions. They were accused of avoiding questions that arose on the more difficult passages of the Bible on Isa. But the Jews had allies in their opinions; for pagans and Christian sectaries agreed with them on many points, drawing upon themselves the polemics of the Church Fathers. Avowed Attacks on Jews. Of the numerous polemical works directed against the Jews, only a few can be mentioned here. Corssen, Berlin, ; in the "Altercatio" the Jew is converted. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena," ed. Connected with these in time as well as in subject are the six sermons of John Chrysostom against the Jews "Homilies," i. In these he bitterly complains of the Christians for still clinging to Jewish customs, a circumstance mentioned by other Church Fathers as well. Jerome gives striking examples in his commentaries on Matt.

Chapter 9 : MLGB3 List of Medieval Catalogues

Jerome, Apol. adv. Rufinum, i, 2 says that the total length of the Commentaries on Job and the Psalms was about 40, lines, i.e. Virgilian hexameters. The latter, at a tough estimate, must be nearly 35, lines in its present state.

Recent debate has suggested forgery is implausible; yet the letter does include non-Clementine elements, including the proposal that Christians should perjure themselves rather than reveal the authorship of a non-canonical Markan gospel that the letter describes. Since the misattribution of ancient texts is not uncommon, it is prudent to wonder if the letter has likewise been misattributed, rather than forged. Letter to Theodore, discovered in by Morton Smith at the Mar Saba monastery, has been subject to much controversy, not only concerning its contents which include fragments of a non-canonical gospel, but also its authorship. Ignatii Martyris, includes an attribution to Clement of Alexandria, that some reject while accusing Smith of forging the letter. Statistically, its vocabulary may be too Clementine to be authentic, although this claim has been disputed. There are other forms of imitation, including homage and influence, and imitation of earlier authors was a key component of classical education. As Raffaella Cribiore explains: The stylistic similarities in the works of sophists and their students were sometimes so compelling that an audience had trouble attributing them. Clement, a priest in the church of Alexandria, in my judgment the most learned among men, wrote his Stromata in eight books and his Hypotyposes in just as many, still another book against the heathen, and the Paedagogus in three volumes. What is there in these that lacks erudition, or indeed that does not follow the road of philosophy? Imitating this hunc imitates, Origen wrote his own Stromateis in ten books, showing the parallels between Christian and philosophical thought. Origen was at least as talented a scholar of Greek and Christian literature as Smith, if not far more. Nearly any argument that Smith could have creatively imitated Clement will also apply to Origen, and much more readily. Nor does he ever become evasive, so as to speak falsely, even if tortured to death. This prohibition contradicts the letter under any reading, and any attempt to reconcile the prohibition with the letter must resort to special pleading. Although these translations are not taken as literal, they are generally well-regarded. Rufinus was skeptical that Origen had held these doctrines, but Jerome was insistent. They are indignant because I wrote that the Origenists were banded together by revelries of deceit mendaciorum. I mentioned the book where I read this statement written down, that is to say, the sixth book of the Stromateis of Origen where he compares our doctrine with the views of Plato. So when we bring to mind the maxim, Speak truth, everyone with his neighbor [Eph 4. He should mimic Esther. He teaches that a master may lie mentiendum, but disciples are to avoid lying mentiri. Thus, those who lie well bene mentitur, and without shame contrive for their comrades whatever comes out of their mouth, prove themselves to be the best master. Certain catenae fragments are presented when their authorship is reasonably secure, although most have been left out. Clement never refers to Jude 13, but Origen does in the Latin fragments of Commentary on Matthew amid a discussion of cadentibus stellis. The Latin Origen also includes the term libidini servias in Homilies on Leviticus, and the sequence qui peccati servus est simul et concupiscentiae malae is found in Commentary on Romans. For the first, we have First Principles 3. And in the Latin fragments of the Commentary on Matthew we read of the curtain surrounding the sanctuary that conceals the true ark veram arcam testamenti and the other true vessels and furniture of the sanctuary. The remaining metaphors are used repeatedly in Origen, often in combination [End Page 74] with each other and with those we have discussed. If the above comparisons and metaphors are Clementine, as Smith argued, they are also Origenian. That combination is Origenian. From Biblia Patristica we find that although Rev 2. Origen, after all, was not averse to ignoring apocryphal writings when they were inconvenient, but employing them when they were useful. It so happens Origen knew a Theodore: We also know that Origen took several journeys after relocating to Caesarea, including one or two to Nicomedia and Athens, around the time of the reign of Gordian III from to c. Theodore knew Origen would not return soon, yet was anxious to learn the truth about Secret Mark. Origen was happy to lie about the secret gospel in public, but not to Theodore, a pupil of his and perhaps eventually a bishop. This scenario strains credulity. Attribution to Origen explains the principal non-Clementine elements described above: It is consistent with a number of Origenian

characteristics: And a number of unusual characteristics single out Origen for attribution: Perhaps none of this absolutely proves Origen wrote the letter, but it does establish that the language, thought, style, and setting of the letter are at least as Origenian as they are Clementine, if not far more so. Anthologized in Tony Burke, ed. See also Timo S. As some argue it should: Brown and Allan J. See also Allan J. Edwin Mellon, , 7, , University of Harvard Press, , Smith, Clement, 77, 86; Theodore 1. University of Laval Press, , , at 37, 38 Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*: Princeton University Press, , This speculation is intriguing, but is unrelated to my thesis. This may be figurative: Brill, , 12 See also John A. Westminster John Knox, , Cambridge University Press, , ix. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Books 1-5, trans. Catholic University Press, , 4, Oxford University Press, , , 47, See for example Frederick Mosteller and David L. Wallace, *Applied Bayesian and Classical Inference: The Case of the Federalist Papers*, rev. The Federalist New York: Beauchesne, , English translations are my own, except where noted. Hinrichs,], 37-38, at Smith, Clement, 54, *Homilies on Luke*, trans. Images of the Church and its Members in Origen, trans. Peeters, , *Scholarship in the Service of the Church* New York: Oxford University Press, , Oxford University Press, , 7-9; Kelly, Jerome, 98, 23, Kelly, Jerome, , 39, 54 Opera, CCL 20 [Turnhout: Brepols,], 84-86; Heine, Origen and Jerome, 10 The whole passage is summarized in Heine, *Scholarship, Dogmatic and Polemical Works*, trans. Catholic University Press, , xiv. The Letters of St.