Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century

George Huntston Williams

Church History, Vol. 20, No. 3. (Sep., 1951), pp. 3-33.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-6407%28195109%2920%3A3%3C3%3ACACRIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S

Church History is currently published by American Society of Church History.

CHRISTOLOGY AND CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY*

GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS

Harvard Divinity School

INTRODUCTION

"Let whatsoever I will, be that esteemed a canon."[1] So retorted the Arianizing Emperor Constantius at the stormy council of Milan in 355 after he had become sole ruler of the Empire and was able to give full expression to his Arian sympathies. Whether Athanasius has accurately recorded his language is not certain; that he has captured the intention of Constantius in a vivid phrase is indisputable. It takes its place alongside James I's summary disposition of the Hampton Court Puritans, "No bishop, no king," to be set over against another series of resounding affirmations of a contrary significance: Ambrose of Milan's "the emperor is in the Church," and Andrew Melville's retort to the same James, "Sir, thair is *twa* Kings and *twa* Kingdoms in Scotland."[2]

It is clear that the conception one has of Christ and his several offices will affect one's view of Caesar and the legitimacy of his claims. For what the Christian is willing to render unto Caesar depends in part on his understanding of Christ as God and of Jesus' commandments as divine. Perhaps no dominical injunction has been rendered by christological elaboration more difficult in Christian practice, personal and corporate, than Jesus' supposedly simple distinction between the proper claims of Caesar and God. For even while denying his Kingdom to be of this world in the Gospel according to St. John, Jesus declared that the authority of Pilate was from God, and Christian theologians like Irenaeus[3] and Origen[4] soon placed the Roman Empire under the Eternal Logos even though the Kingdom of the Logos made flesh was expressly not of this world.

*Portions of this paper were presented at the December meeting of the American Society of Church History in Boston, 1949, and again, in March 1950, as the second in the annual Lowell Lectures on Religion. More recently the paper has been read by Prof. Glanville Downey of Dumbarton Oaks, currently lecturing in Cambridge, who has encouraged and stimulated me in the revision of the study for publication. As following footnotes will reveal, I am greatly indebted to him for his leads and insights and for generously placing at my disposal his translation of Themistius and the critical apparatus he has prepared for his forthcoming edition which will replace that of Wilhelm Dindorf (1832).

In the fourth century it was inevitable that the originally cosmo-political significance of the Logos along with the more obviously political titles of Christ (Messiah, Saviour, Shepherd King, King of Kings, Son of Man, Son of God, Son of David, Kyrios) would be recovered and re-examined in the face of the new situation created by Constantine's espousal of Christianity. Christians in the Ante-Nicene period had for the most part recognized the Roman State, even when it persecuted them, as an order of creation, but emphatically not an order of redemption.[5] Divinely ordained as a consequence of the Fall for the punishment of evil, the Roman Empire was at best the last of the Danielic empires holding back the final catastrophe and thus prolonging the time for the extension of the Gospel; and for this, of course, Christians prayed, commending the emperor in their liturgy.[6] But now in the fourth century with the emperor a Christian, the state would seem to have significance as an ally of the Church or indeed as itself a secondary instrument of salvation by fostering, indeed, in the end by enforcing Christianity. Fourth century Christians were thus understandably confused in distinguishing between what they should render unto the Christian Caesar of a Christianized kingdom under God and what they owed to Christ whom they worshipped as God and whose Kingdom, the Church, was becoming more and more of this world by reason of its political assignment consequent upon imperial recognition.

To be sure, Tertullian had once pronounced the notion of a Christian emperor to be a contradiction of terms. And even Constantine himself seems to have felt the incongruity of being at once a Christian and an emperor. He put off the cleansing rite of baptism until the very end, never thereafter donning his imperial garb, as though he could not be a Christian emperor, but rather first an emperor and then, after baptismal purification, a Christian. As yet there was no pattern worked out for the Christianization of the wielder of power. Esteeming the morally rigorist emphasis in Christianity, Constantine had a kind of Novatianist view of the Church. The asceticism of the Donatists and Arius at first appealed to him. Indeed it was only the ascertained fact that they were a divisive influence which at length dictated his policy against them. Contemporary scholarship tends to rehabilitate the religious sincerity of Constantine, although his understanding of the new religion was admittedly limited. Our ascription of sincerity to Constantine does not, of course, rule out religious expediency of the old Roman type: *Do ut des.* This indeed remains the *leitmotif* of the Constantinian ecclesiastical policy. Soldier and

statesman, he saw in the Christian God a surety for victory, a new and proven heavenly sanction for the renewed monarchy, and in the Christian religion itself the cultic mortar and the theological scaffolding by means of which he might succeed in rehabilitating the imperial structure. Nor did his sense of the impossibility of reconciling imperial power and responsibility with a personal embodiment of the full Christian life constrain him as *pontifex maximus* from thinking of himself as *tōn ektos episkopos,* which, whatever else the obscure phrase may mean,[7] embraced the bringing of the world to the worship of the One God with all the resources of imperial power.

Churchmen in the first flush of rejoicing at the quick succession of events which had made of the worst persecution a stormy prelude to unprecedented imperial favor, were perhaps less sensitive than their imperial patron to the difficulties attending the Christianization of government. Their uncritical acceptance of imperial patronage has indeed been called by many the Fall of Christianity, but the spectacle of over three hundred bishops, several of them confessors marked with the scars and mutilations of the recent fury of the Roman emperors, riding in imperial coaches to the first ecumenical council, could not but fill the participants themselves and the whole Christian Church with thoughts of the promised messianic age following the reign of Antichrist. The sumptuous repasts and splendid presents honoring the bishops and their ecclesiastical retinues in the palace could not but suggest the messianic banquet.[8] It is the purpose of the present study to examine briefly some of the reasons for the initially uncritical submission of the Church to imperial supervision and then to show how the Arian controversy, which originally necessitated the summoning of the Council of Nicaea, became in the course of the fourth century the religio-political occasion for and in part the theological means of clarifying the proper relationship between the Church and the Christianized magistracy. We shall observe that among the Arians the biblical and the early Christian ambivalence in respect to the State was easily converted into an uncritically positive evaluation of the imperial *polis* and that among them Hellenistic ideas of kingship recovered an important place in an outwardly Christian frame, for Arianism could accommodate itself more readily than Catholicism to the assimilation of pagan conceptions of kingship and more lavishly compensate the ruler for relinquishing purely pagan attributes and honors.

We turn then to the reasons why the bishops, under the spell of the imperial conversion, were so ill-prepared to exercise the

caution that we might in retrospect desire. How could they so palpably overstate the divine character of imperial power merely because it was now in the hands of a Christian convert? There are several answers.

I. The Quasi-Divinity of Even the Christian Emperor

If before the Edict of Galerius Christians could think of the higher powers as ordained of God, of the emperor as placed in authority by the Logos himself,[9] of the Empire as being sustained by the selfsame Logos to whom through prayers in the Holy Spirit they themselves commended the emperor,[10] how much clearer all this would seem once the emperor himself had become a praying Christian. As Erik Peterson has shown, a line of positive evaluation of the Empire despite persecution runs from Luke through Quadratus, Melito of Sardis, Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Orosius.[11] In a more recent study, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem,*[12] Peterson has gone on to interrelate the political implications of pagan and Christian monotheism, showing how the positive evaluation of the Empire in terms of the Logos and allied concepts in the Ante-Nicene period ill-prepared the Christian bishops for coping with the vastly enlarged risks and opportunities in the fourth century situation and betrayed them at first into an uncritical acceptance of political support, until at length a fully understood Trinitarianism proved itself capable of resisting the exploitation of Christian monotheism as a means of sanctioning political unity and securing social cohesion. But up until the maintenance of full Trinitarian orthodoxy was politically imperilled, its destined defenders like Athanasius and Hosius of Cordoba proved to be, no less than the Arianizers, perceptive of the needs of political order and its theological undergirding. For example, Athanasius, in the youthful *Contra Gentes,* vividly likening the Logos to a king giving manifold orders in the construction of a city, describes the Logos of the Father who governs as by a nod the whole cosmos, causing all things to fall simultaneously into order and to discharge their proper functions.[13]

If before the Edict of Galerius Christians could think of the emperor as the image of God, how much easier it was after Caesar had become a Christian. The Epistle of Barnabas is perhaps the earliest witness to the appropriation of this concept by Christians as applied to the ruler.[14] But since every Christian was thought to have recovered through rebirth in Christ the divine image destroyed or impaired by the first Adam, it was but natural that a Christian sov-

ereign be thought to have recovered in fullest measure the likeness of the Supreme Sovereign. An ancient pagan conception of the king as the image of God was now reinforced by the Christian view of salvation. It was a natural temptation to think of the Christian *basileus* as a more complete image of the King of kings than any ordinary Christian could hope to be. The enigmatic Ambrosiaster toward the end of the century will even republish the pagan doctrine of the subordination of religion to the needs of the *polis* in the lapidary formula: "The bishop has the image of Christ, the king the image of God."[15] We shall discuss the late Nicene refinements of this kind of theological royalism below.

Another temptation confronted Christians in interpreting the nature and function of a Christian Caesar. Before the conversion of Constantine, they had been unambiguous in rejecting the divine pretensions of the emperors and in refusing them any kind of worship. But since they themselves understood salvation as a kind of deification, they could not deny to a Christian emperor what every Christian claimed for himself. God became man, that man might become divine, that is, immortal. This was, for example, the leading conviction of Athanasius. Clement of Alexandria had spoken freely of Christians as *theoi.*[16] The Clementine *Recognitiones,* the third-century *Didascalia,* and the fourth-century revision thereof, the *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* describe the bishop as a god or after God, the earthly god of the dutiful and faithful Christian.[17] Firmicus Maternus in the *Mathesis* declares that the emperor is placed in the chief ranks of the gods.[18] Scriptures, moreover, had expressly declared that rulers are gods.[19] Louis Bréhier and Pierre Batiffol have traced the survivals of the imperial cult into the Christian period[20] and Arthur Nock has carried his discussion of the divine *comes* of the emperor through Constantius.[21] Although recent scholarship has tended to see less ambiguity in Constantine's policy towards Christianity and paganism than was once the case, the fact remains that the appeal of solar monotheism remained great, and the association of the emperor with the sun did not appear with Constantine's conversion. Theodor Preger's discussion of Constantine as Helios[22] may be brought into connection with Hugo Rahner's abundantly documented study of the widespread Patristic symbolism which perpetuated pagan imagery, identifying Christ with the sun and the Church with the waxing and waning moon.[23] Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, frees Christians from astral fatalism. The sun and the moon obey the command of the Logos, says the *Epistle to Diognetus,*[24] which also stands out

among the earlier Christian writings as a witness to the Christian concern for the Empire. Once the emperor, still surrounded with the solar aura, acknowledged by Christians as the instrument of the Logos, has become himself a Christian, it will have been a great temptation to understand the waxing and waning of the lunar Church as her responses to the will of the solar emperor.

Without himself drawing any political inferences from his material, Johannes Quasten, in a number of recent studies of the Logos as Shepherd,[25] has likewise furthered our understanding of the problem faced by fourth century Christians in relating Christ the Logos-Shepherd to Caesar, behind whose person and office shimmered the ancient notions of the Logos as Shepherd and the righteous ruler as a Shepherd King. The Logos was thought of as a cosmic Shepherd, pasturing the stars in their courses and holding together the cosmos as flock, checking also the wayward elements in society, warding off the demonic forces of destruction and distortion, likened to marauding beasts. The Logos-Shepherd was also felt to work through the conscience and reason of every man, holding in check his flock of passions, herding them into the pastures proper for their grazing. Quasten finds the Logos-Shepherd in Philo[26], for example, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius, particularly in the latter's Syrian *Theophania.*[27]

Having now reviewed some of the recent literature which throws light on how it was that the Christians in the early fourth century found it at first very difficult to distinguish between the proper functions of the Church and the reorganized Roman State unexpectedly headed by a Christian convert, I wish to show how the Arian controversy very soon became the occasion and also the means of clarifying those functions and of providing a theological definition of the proper relations between the episcopate and an increasingly Christian rulership of the Empire.

II. The Contribution of the Arian Controversy to the Gradual Clarification of the Proper Relation Between Church and State

F. W. Buckler has in the pages of this journal and elsewhere[28] pointed out the Barbarian ideas of kingship in the background of the Arian understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father. He has explained Arian subordinationism as the theological counterpart of the relationship between the Great King and his viceroy or satrap. Buckler understands the persistent outcropping of Arian

subordinationism in one form and another as the incursion or recrudescence of an originally "Barbarian" (i.e., Oriental) Christianity protesting against the assimilation of a primitively *political* Christological imagery to thoroughly uncongenial Greek philosophical categories. He suggests indeed a connection between the rise and imperial encouragement of Arianism and the assimilation of the court protocol and religio-political thought of the rival Sassanid Empire first appropriated by Aurelian and elaborated by Diocletian and Constantine in the interests of providing additional sanctions for the Roman Empire and its rulers. While I have been greatly stimulated by Prof. Buckler's several inquiries into political theology, my purpose in the present study is to suggest that it was precisely the biblical, and specifically the Old Testament undergirding of the later Nicene conviction that enabled the matured Athanasius, the bishops of Rome, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilary of Poitiers, the Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, among others, to resist Christian emperors, especially the Arianizing Constantius, in the attempt to consolidate political absolutism by means of Christianity. The Nicene bishop, holding high his apostolic credentials, fully possessed of the Spirit promised by Christ, was himself a satrap or viceroy of the King of kings, challenging the credentials of the Arianizing emperor who presumed to act the viceroy of the Supreme God in Christ's Kingdom, the Church.

Schematically we may call the two contending concepts of Christ dominating the dogmatic history of the fourth century, the Catholic and the Arian[29]. Over against the Catholic insistence on the consubstantiality of the Son, eventually made also explicit for the Holy Spirit, and the full deity and full manhood of Christ, are the various forms of subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit worked out among the different Arianizing parties of the fourth century. Roughly speaking these two Christologies gave rise to, or are at least associated with, two main views of the Empire and the relationship of the Church thereto. According to one view the emperor is bishop of bishops.[30] According to the other, the emperor is within the Church.[31]

The purpose then of the present study is to explore the political and ecclesio-political implications of the two contending Christologies. That Christology, in the broadest sense of the word, was a matter of political concern in the fourth century needs, of course, no demonstration. Obviously Constantine, Constantius, and Theodosius cannot be relegated to the background of fourth century dogmatic history. That Christological terms could become the banners and slo-

gans in controversies growing primarily out of personal enmities, political expediency, metropolitan and patriarchal rivalries, regional and class tensions also needs no further documentation. The present inquiry concerns, rather, the influence of the contending Christologies themselves upon the political behavior and the ecclesio-political thought of their protagonists; in brief, the possible connection (1) between the Catholic insistence upon the consubstantiality of the Son and the championship of the independence of the Church of which he is the Head and (2) between the Arian preference for Christological subordination and the Arian disposition to subordinate the Church to the State. Whatever correlation there may be is of course obscured by the fact that Christological orthodoxy was initially defined under the presidency of one emperor and after a half century of controversy established by another. Yet all who have worked through the fourth century have sensed some affinity between Arianism and Caesaropapism on the one hand and on the other between Nicene orthodoxy and the recovery of a measure of ecclesiastical independence.

Before going on to point out the correlation, there are four initial observations to be made. First, the political implications of the rival Christologies were not at once perceived. In the beginning, Catholic and Arian alike contended for the support of the State. It was only in the throes of controversy that the Catholic bishops began to rethink the role of the Christian State, sobered after the first flush of rejoicing in the new political atmosphere. As Constantine came more and more to favor the Arian position, the Nicene leaders became increasingly critical of the influence of imperial power within the Church, and in the course of the controversy with the Arianizing Constantius (337-361), Julian the Apostate (361-363), and thereafter, the Nicene leaders developed their distinctive position, neither hostile nor obsequious, regarding the proper relationship of the Church to the State. The primarily soteriological convictions of the Orthodox proved to have political implications which the Arian controversy brought to the fore. Arianism proved in contrast, as it was developed by the court bishops, to be much more amenable to imperial policy and became, therefore, the imperially favored Christology of the middle years of the fourth century.

Secondly, we must distinguish between the party names hurled back and forth in the heat of controversy and the same designations when applied with the care of modern historians. There could be, for example, a Sabellianism that insisted upon the *homoousion* of the Second Person of the Trinity while being Adoptionist or in any event

ambiguous in respect to the deity of Christ, and another Sabellianism which insisted on the oneness of God the Father and Christ the Son. Extremes met. The right wing of Catholicity, Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus, like the left wing of Arianism, Eunomius, collided in their very agreement, namely, in depreciating the significance of Jesus Christ. In the fourth century Sabellius and the Samosatene had in the persons of their most radical followers become one as regards the earthly Christ.

And this suggests the third point, which is simply a reminder of the abstract character of some of the principal terms of the fourth century controversy. In order of ascending abstraction, they are Jesus, Jesus Christ, the Son, the Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity. Roughly interchangeable as one moved back and forth from piety to exegesis, from liturgy to theology, from homiletics to philosophy, the terms were nevertheless distinguishable. Marcellus of Ancyra, a prominent figure in the Catholic camp, until his long delayed repudiation, claimed for the Logos what he long denied to the Son,[52] *"Christ."*

Marcellus and Arius, who obliged their defenders and exasperated their foes in signing orthodox creeds, are there to remind us of a fourth important consideration. Surviving creeds are not entirely reliable transcripts of Christological opinion. Arians could write, not to say sign, semi-Arian, indeed Nicene-sounding creeds, since as exponents of broadchurchly views they were characteristically intent upon composing conciliatory symbols, for the most part content if their own position could but be included in a formula agreeable to the Catholics. As Sozomen reports, many of the later Arian principals confessed to having acquiesced in the Nicene Creed originally, lest an unseemly extension of controversy prompt the Emperor in disgust to withdraw his support from the Church he had so recently espoused. We must therefore go beneath the official documents if we are to get a clearer picture of the Christological views on either side of the main dividing line in fourth century controversy.

Behind the credal platforms hammered together in the mid-fourth century, often to conceal rather than to expose party differences, we observe three levels of discord between the Catholics and the Arians: on the soteriological, the strictly theologico-philosophical, and the ecclesio-political levels.

On the *soteriological* level the problem, stated schematically, was this: Is the Logos-Son primarily a mediator between God and the world in a cosmological sense, ordering the cosmos, human society,

and human personality, or is the Logos-Son a mediator primarily between the righteous and eternal God and sinful, mortal man in an historical redemption? Both the Catholic and the Arian spoke of the Logos and the Son interchangeably, but the center of their piety and speculation was different. In the wide range of pre-Christian Logos speculation we distinguish that recurrent emphasis which connects the rational with truth and that other emphasis which connects the rational with order. The former concern is, roughly speaking, philosophical (cosmological, etc.); the latter political (legal, etc.). Christians, in interpreting Christ as the Logos incarnate, had introduced both an *ir*rational and a *dis*orderly element into Logos speculation. Speaking schematically, we may say that the Catholic of the fourth century preserved the apostolic sense of the disparity and tension between reason and revelation. In his primarily soteriological concern, he understood the Logos as Mediator between a righteous and eternal God and sinful, mortal man by virtue of the Crucifixion and, as he became more speculative, the Incarnation. The Arian, in contrast, endeavored to rehabilitate the rational and the orderly aspects of the tradition, to accommodate revelation to reason[33] in the bright new age full of promise, the somber pre-Galerian period well behind him. In contrast, the Arian, because of his primarily cosmological interest, understood the Logos as Mediator between the Supreme God and the created world. In a sense, the principal act of mediation was creation itself. The Incarnate Logos was, in his mind—we shall take Eusebius of Caesarea as an example—confined to the modest role of proclaiming afresh the oneness of God and of reminding men of their natural immortality. The Arian was attentive to the Sermon on the Mount. The Catholic emphasized Bethlehem and Calvary. Both the Catholic and the Arian used *Logos* and *Son* interchangeably, but for the Arian, the Son was pre-eminently the Creator Logos; for the Catholic, the Logos incarnate. And this brings us to another difference.

On the strictly *theological* level the problem was whether the Logos-Son was subordinate to the Supreme God, which was the philosophical, cosmological view, or co-eternal and co-essential with God, which was the Nicene conviction on the ground that only He who was fully divine could save. For the philosophically minded Arianizer, the usefulness of the Logos concept lay precisely in the fact that the Logos was an intermediate, subordinate, divine potency, plane, or person, between the Supreme Deity and the world. For the Catholic, on the other hand, whose primary concern was soteriological, it

was essential to uphold the full deity of the Logos, the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father. For the Catholic, any essential subordination of the Son-Logos completely impaired Christ's soteriological role. The theological difference between the Catholic and the Arian may be stated in another way: *Deus* or *theos* meant to the Catholic, with his Sabellian antecedents, Christ. On being pressed, he assented to the philosophical distinctions intended to preserve the unity of Godhead and a distinction of persons. But since his primary concern was redemption, he will have given psychological priority to Christ. To the Arian, in contrast, *deus* or *theos* meant the Supreme God, as he preferred to call him. On being pressed, he assented to the utter likeness of the Son and the Father, and in certain political situations he could even be prevailed upon to subscribe to the *homoousion,* but for the most part publicly he preferred the *homoiousion,* and privately he found *homoios* quite satisfactory; he even entertained the possibility that the Son and the Father were dissimilar. This composite Arian of the fourth century was in all his several phases consistent with himself in this fact, at least, that his primary concern was cosmological.

Orosius, who is not, of course, an authority for the events, is valuable as a witness to the general impression left in the West by the Arians. Constantius, he writes, supported the Arians "in seeking to find gods in God."[34] The Arians, for their part, were not entirely wrong in their general impression that many of their opponents were near Sabellians. The great Catholic leaders whose works have survived make more theological concessions in the interests of philosophical exactitude than the piety of the party would have in their day required. Though never so stated by either side in the controversy, the Arians were content to understand Christ as similar in essence or simply similar to the One God of the philosophical monotheism of the day. The Nicenes, in contrast, although they too accepted the philosophical definitions of God as impassible and transcendent, nevertheless preserved or recovered more of the biblical view of God as Creator, Lord of history, and final Judge and were intense in their conviction that Christ is one in every essential respect with the God of the Old Testament.

Herewith we are brought to the *ecclesio-political* level. In insisting that the God of Creation, of Redemption, and the Final Assize is essentially one God, the Catholics were contending that the Lord of Calvary is also the Lord of the Capitol. But for this very reason the typical Nicenes were unwilling to accommodate revelation

to reason purely in the interest of enhancing the cohesive value of Christianity for the Empire. In contrast, the Arians, having a comparatively low Christology were pleased to find in their emperor a divine epiphany or instrument or indeed a demigod like Christ himself. Thus the Arians were more disposed than the Nicenes to accept the will of an emperor as a canon and to defer to him as bishops, because the canons, tradition, and scriptural law centering in the *historical* Christ could not possibly in their eyes take precedence over the living law (*nomos empsuchos*) of the emperor ordained by the *eternal Logos*. The Nicenes, by reason of the crucial importance they attached to the historic Logos incarnate held fast to revealed and known laws against the will of the emperor however Christian. They put one in mind of the later Puritan hostility to the equity of the courts of Chancery based upon the royal prerogative as distinct from *known* common law. The Nicenes came in time to be much more alert than the Arians to the impropriety of fusing the two societies, the one the bearer of revelation, the extended body of the incarnate Logos, the other the Empire, the instrument of the eternal Logos for the maintenance of social order. Nor were Catholics averse to mingling a little dynamite[35] with the social cement they were expected to supply to the Empire in return for protection. The Christological issue fought out with mounting valor and increasing discernment by a handful of Nicene theologians was of momentous consequence for the religio-political history of the West.

One may distinguish today at least four sectors in which theologico-political combat in the fourth century was strategically crucial: A. The authority of the emperor in respect to creed and canon, B. The Eucharistic aspect of the problem, C. The prophetic office of the bishop, D. The headship and kingship of Christ. To the first of these four problems we now turn.

A. Is a Christian Caesar, Ruler by the Grace and Providence of God[36] and Divine Vicar, the Source of Ecclesiastical Law or Subject to It?

Eusebius, the Arianizing bishop of Caesarea, is clearly a point of confluence of all the Oriental, Hellenistic, and Ante-Nicene Christian conceptions of kingship and a key figure in determining the ways in which Christology will dispose its exponents to be positive or critical toward a Christian Caesar. By reason of the meagerness of materials surviving from the pens of outright Arians, the Father of Church history must be pressed into service as a representative subordinationist. Any analysis of Eusebius' political theology must

necessarily draw heavily on the *Vita Constantini.* The fact, therefore, that this "biography" has undergone revisions and received interpolations during the reign of Arianizing Constantius[37] or that it is the work of an Arian Pseudo-Eusebius (possibly Euzoius of Caesarea)[38] actually enhances its value as a basis for comparing Arian and Catholic theologies of the State.

Norman Baynes, prompted by the study of Erwin Goodenough on Hellenistic kingship,[39] has shown how the Hellenistic idea of the king as animate law lived on in the political thought of Eusebius of Caesarea.[40] He characterizes Eusebius' tricennalian oration as "the clearly stated . . . political philosophy of the Christian Empire." To be sure, the Logos is no longer, as with Ecphantus, for example (quoted by Strobaeus), held to be incarnate in the true king with power to benefit men. With Eusebius, however, the emperor is the interpreter and imitator of the Logos and as such no less than with Ecphantus a divine saviour. Baynes does not attempt to relate Eusebius' assimilation of Hellenistic political ideas to the bishop's Arianizing tendencies. His essay is completed in the identification or characterization of the efforts of Constantine and Eusebius to secure Christian sanctions for the New Monarchy as the imperial *mimēsis* of the Logos. It is my purpose to go on from here to distinguish between *Logomimēsis* and *Theomimēsis.* With both pagan philosophical and Old Testament variants of monotheism in mind Eusebius was never quite certain whether it was the rule of the Father-Creator (O. T.) or the Logos-Creator (pagan philosophy) upon which the Christian emperor modeled his reign. In any event the Christian emperor was thought of as coordinate with the Logos-Christ, dispersing the demonic forces of disorder by arms and laws as had Jesus by miracles and parables. Not until the Council of Chalcedon defined the Logos-Christ as fully man and fully God with Mary as *Theotokos* can the religio-political conduct and cosmology of the emperors be characterized as *Christomimēsis.*[41] The Iconoclastic controversy, for example, will be fought out between the Isaurians and the iconodules on precisely this issue, namely, whether it is the clergy within the Church with its altar and icons as the ongoing incarnation of Christ, his Body, or the emperor as *basileus kai hiereus* over Christ's Kingdom which is the *visible* bearer of the authority and glory of Christ on earth.[42] But in the pre-Chalcedonian epoch and especially before the clarification of the formula of 325 by the restatement of 381, the Christological orthodoxy *eventuelle* was inchoate or at least imperfectly articulated even in the most earnest of Nicene

circles. Eusebius of Caesarea, by the very expansiveness of his Christological ambiguity, helps us to understand how the Arians could think of the historic Christ as a demigod and of the emperor as the imitator of the Eternal Logos (humbled and obscured in the earthly Christ) or of the Father (= the Supreme God), while the authentic Nicenes held tenaciously to the historic Christ who, by his unique and paradoxical act of divine self-sacrifice at once secured the eternal salvation of mankind *and established the ecclesiastical law to which even the Christian sovereign is subject.* The Christological presuppositions of the ecclesio-political controversy of the middle of the fourth century are only in our day being gradually clarified.

Spurred on by Opitz' distinction between the cosmological and the soteriological interests in interpreting the Logos, the Dutch church historian, Hendrik Berkhof, undertook a full-length study of Eusebius,[43] explaining the ambiguities of Eusebius' Christology and political thought as a consequence of the metropolitan's twofold role as Origenist apologist and conscientious exegete. That Christianity was the oldest religion Eusebius endeavored to show by his several histories and chronologies, basic to which was the doctrine of the Eternal Logos, guiding directly or through angels the destinies of all peoples and preparing the philosophical mind of Greece for a final disclosure of Truth. That Christianity was the most rational religion he likewise demonstrated in appealing to the Logos, emphasizing the cosmological mediation between the Supreme God, well understood by Neoplatonists, and the creaturely or material world. To construe this Logos, as the Nicene divines insisted on doing, as consubstantial with the Supreme God, to efface theologically the essential philosophical subordination of the Logos to the Supreme God, was to undo the very value the Logos concept possessed for one whose philosophical background was an Origenistic Neoplatonism with its cascade of decreasingly divine potencies from the Supreme, impassible, transcendent One, through the Logos-Son and the Holy Spirit, the chief of spirits, to angels and men.[44] So, Eusebius, the philosophical apologist. But Eusebius, the biblical scholar, was obliged to recognize that the Supreme God was involved directly in creation. His fealty to Scripture pressed him to explain the voluntarist and irrational aspects of revelation as best he could. But following his master Origen, mostly by way of simplification and reduction, Eusebius understood the self-disclosure of the Logos incarnate to be little more than the reminder that man is immortal if he will but conform to the eternal law of the Logos, restated in a particularly winsome form in the

Sermon on the Mount. Historian and exegete though he was, Eusebius was unable to make either the Incarnation[45] or the Crucifixion central in his theology. He was philosophically unprepared to construe history as a primary vehicle of Eternal Truth. History was for him, rather, the area in which Eternal Truth had been confirmed and, to be sure, vindicated in the extraordinary expansion of the Church as the bearer of Truth.

In robbing Bethlehem and Calvary of their primacy, Eusebius greatly enhanced the relative significance of the Milvian Bridge and the New Rome for the salvation of mankind. Intent upon bringing reason and revelation into harmony, Eusebius was unable to make a clear distinction between the Church founded by the Incarnate Logos and the Empire—once its ruler had become Christian. To Eusebius the humane legislation and the general peace made the realm of Constantine appear to be the fulfillment of the ancient prophecies of the Kingdom of God. Nor does the Church founded by Christ seem to have the importance for him, church historian though he was, that it did for more Catholic divines. Eusebius was quite prepared, for example, to designate as a Church the household of the unbaptized Constantine assembled for instruction and worship in the palace.[46] He was pleased to think of his Emperor as an interpreter of Almighty God,[47] *isapostolos*[48] by reason of his vision on the road to Rome,[49] and was delighted in the role of Constantine as the bishop of those outside the Church.[50] With a comparatively low doctrine of the Church, a consequence of his earnest, but withal limited conception of the earthly ministry of the Incarnate Logos, Eusebius (or the fully Arian Pseudo-Eusebius) was understandably tempted into comparing Christ and Constantine (or, by implication, Constantius) as alike instruments or manifestations of the one Eternal Logos, the former to preach monotheism, to exorcise demons, and to proclaim God's Kingdom; the latter to establish monotheism and by routing the lesser gods around which the demonic forces of nationalism and dissension centered,[51] to usher in the long promised peace of the messianic age.[52] In thus enthusiastically comparing Caesar and Christ it was indeed hard for Eusebius not to leave the impression that the work of a Christian Caesar was of more importance than the work of Christ.[53] In any event Constantine was for Eusebius a kind of second saviour. Just as "the universal Saviour opens the gates of his Father's Kingdom to those whose course is thitherward from this world," so the "Emperor, emulous of his divine example, having purged his earthly dominion from every strain of impious error, invites each holy and pious

worshiper within his imperial mansions, earnestly desiring to save with all its crew the mighty vessel of which he is the appointed pilot."[54] Having dedicated to the universal Sovereign that most acceptable sacrifice, even his own imperial soul,[55] the Emperor in the manner of "a wise instructor"[56] or again of "a good shepherd,"[57] "imitating the divine philanthropy,"[58] leads the souls of his imperial flock to the knowledge of the Sovereign Lord of all. Eusebius can scarcely decide whether Constantine is more like the Logos incarnate (*Christomimēsis*) or the cosmic Logos (*Logomimēsis*) or like the Supreme God himself (*Theomimēsis*). He moves eloquently from one comparison to the other. In any event, "appointed by, and the representative of the one Almighty Sovereign,"[59] Constantine ("The only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed"[60]) "directs his gaze above, and frames his earthly government according to the pattern of that divine original, feeling strength in its conformity to the monarchy of God."[61] In short, the ancient oracles and predictions of the prophets seemed in him fulfilled.[62]

The facility with which Eusebius could assimilate the Constantinian with the Messianic peace is connected, as we have already noted, with the fact that for Eusebius the Logos was a subordinate *deuteros theos,* a mediator primarily in the cosmological rather than in the religious sense. Hence salvation was understood as coming through the might of a godly ruler. It was the recovery of truth and order. In contrast, for an Athanasius, to take a representative Nicene, salvation was, as it were, through the mouth, the recovery of immortality through participation in the historic Eucharistic fellowship. Eusebius of Caesarea was only a semi-Arian but the Christological difference between him and the typical Catholic of his time was great. And the emphasis was such that it was natural for him and other Arianizers to think of the emperor as the image or the instrument of either the Eternal Logos *or* of the Supreme God. In establishing order and harmony, the emperor was performing on earth what Eusebius regarded as the principal function of the Logos in and over the cosmos. Christ and the Christian emperor are in the thought of Eusebius almost coordinate in honor, each under the Supreme God, each in his special way leading men to the knowledge and worship of God, each complementing the other in bringing order and peace to mankind.

Eusebius, like his master Origen, held in effect that man is immortal by nature rather than by the grace of Christ. Having thus toned down irruptive and paradoxical aspects of revelation, having shared Helen's enthusiasm for the Cross without really being able

to assimilate it into his system, Eusebius instinctively felt that the Christian *basileus* on the throne was a fuller image of the *Pambasileus* than the apostolic *hiereus* at the Christian altar. There was no place in the thought of Eusebius (or the Arian Reviser) for two related but distinct societies, the Church and the Christianized State, each with its special task under Christ as *Basileus kai Hiereus,* but rather one God, one emperor, one religion, and a single-minded dutiful episcopate.[63] For such was the religio-political conviction and program of Eusebius, earning for him the title of herald of Byzantinism[64] in proclaiming the Empire as the primary image and reflection of the heavenly Kingdom, the Kingdom of God in time.

The connection between a subordinationist Christology and a weak ecclesiology in Eusebius (and the Arian Reviser of the *Vita*) is fairly clear. It would be desirable to examine the thought of other fourth century court bishops with even more marked Arian leanings but the sources, of course, are wanting. Eusebius' namesake and fellow-Lucianist, bishop successively of Berytus, Nicomedia, and Constantinople, is known more by his acts than by his recorded political theory. He has left us a very clear statement of his Arian convictions, which indeed at first brought him into disfavor with Constantine at Nicaea, who at all costs desired unity without understanding the fine points of theological controversy. But Eusebius soon contrived to rehabilitate himself and then Arius and gain tremendous influence over the Post-Nicene Constantine whom he baptized and over Constantius by whom[65] he was translated in 328[66] from the old capital (Nicomedia) to the new capital (Constantinople). Related by blood to the Constantinian family,[67] Eusebius wielded great influence at court, linked as he was with Constantia and with Helen, the latter devoted like himself to his teacher, Lucian of Antioch.[68] Bishop of the old Diocletianic and the Constantinian capital, Eusebius pursued with energy and cunning, as head of the large party named after him, a policy of strengthening imperial authority over the Church and of undercutting the rival proto-patriarchal sees of Rome, Antioch, and notably, of course, Alexandria. It is significant that he emphasized political insubordination among the charges he brought against his ecclesiastical rivals and theological foes: against Marcellus, disobedience; against Paul whom he supplanted in Constantinople, disorder; against Eustathius of Antioch, disrespect of the Empress-Mother; against Athanasius, fomenting Egyptian opposition to imperial sway.[69]

Cyril of Jerusalem[70] who was more than deferential to Constantius and recounted the spectacle of a luminous Cross over Jerusa-

lem in divine approbation of the Arian's victory over Magnentius[71] was just a good semi-Arian and adds no more to the argument than Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eunomius, the full Arian bishop of Cyzicus (d. 393), has the distinction of being represented in the surviving literature by a complete writing from his own hand, but this does not provide us with sufficient material for a christological analysis of Arian political theory and practice.[72] What can be gleaned from Catholic refutations of his theological position will be discussed in another connection.[73] On Acacius and Asterius the material is even scantier. The appendix to Athanasius' Letter LVI to Jovian[74] reproduces the petitions of a number of Arians led by Lucius of Alexandria, but they are the words of suppliants, no longer filled with a sense of imperial mission as in the days of Constantius. They merely seek authorization as a tolerated sect in Alexandria. Significantly, however, they speak of Julian the Apostate as most religious and philosophical, and characteristically, even in their extremity seek episcopal appointment from the Catholic Emperor. Arians, even when not favored by the State, show no disposition to carry on organizationally without imperial approbation.

The Arianizing Syrian "Constitutor"[75] of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*[76] provides us with a good but small specimen of his political thinking when, appealing to Daniel 2:34, he speaks of Christ as "the stone cut out of the mountains . . . , dashing to pieces the many governments of the smaller countries, and the polytheism of gods, but preaching the one God and ordaining the monarchy of the Romans."[77] Both the third century *Didascalia* and the Arian expansion contain a section in which the bishop is to be honored as a father, as a king and indeed as God (ii, 34). At first glance the survival of this material in the Arian revision would seem to weaken the thesis of the present study. On close inspection of the emendations, however, it becomes clear that the Arian has no intention of exalting episcopal authority above that of kings which was, indeed, the purport of the original section. The Arian "Constitutor," for example, omits the long quotation of I Sam. 8:10-17 in which the anti-Solomonic editor describes the servitude and wretchedness to be expected from kingship. While he strengthens the authority of the bishop and increases the emoluments of his office, the Arian reviser is equally concerned to soften or entirely efface the anti-imperial element in the section of the Ante-Nicene *Didascalia* he emends. The Arian "Constitutor" shows the same interest in kingship in his revision of vi, 1-3. The *Didascalia* at this point was interested only in schism and separation, that seem-

ingly of the rigorists. The *Constitutiones,* using some of the materials, is concerned to demonstrate biblically the wickedness of rising up against both bishops and kings. And while the "Constitutor" does mention King Uzziah, who ventured to usurp the priesthood, he devotes a whole chapter to Moses as both high priest *and* king, and deplores the sedition raised up by schismatics against the administrator of divine things.[78] The "Constitutor" displays a concern for political order as well as internal ecclesiastical order in other emendations and expansions of his material, insisting at several points that Christians must fear the king, knowing that his appointment is of the Lord (*Kyrios*)[79] and that the law of righteousness shines by means of the Romans. "For these Romans, believing in the Lord, left off their polytheism and injustice, and entertain the good and punish the bad."[80] Here the thought of Eusebius of Caesarea is restated. We cannot, of course, press the Arian character of the compilation, but we are fortunate in being able to cite its emendations and expansions to supplement the meagre material we possess from the hands of the Arian divines.

From the Arianizing clerics we may turn to the most important of Arian emperors, Constantius,[81] with a view to gaining some further insight into the bearing of Christological convictions upon the relationship between the Church and the Empire. It is clear that Constantius was personally moral and religious to the point of being superstitious[82] and that like his father he was concerned to employ Christianity as a unitive force in the Empire.[83] According to Theodoret, Constantius, the better to fight the usurper Magnentius, mustered the whole of his army, counseled them to receive the baptismal robe, and dismissed all who declined baptism, declaring that he chose not to fight with men who had no part or lot in Christian rites.[84] While this speech as it stands can scarcely be genuine, since the Emperor himself was unbaptized at the time, it may nevertheless attest to a general recognition of a broadly Christian piety. Moreover, unlike his father, Constantius was unambiguous in his hostility to the gross forms of paganism,[85] eventually persecuting its devotees with cruelty.

At the same time he was greatly impressed by the political philosophy of the pagan monotheist Themistius (c. 317-88)[86] whose panegyrical portrayals of the ideal ruler may well have exercised an influence upon Constantius' political theology.[87] Several of them were addressed to him, one (I) in Ancyra in 350 delivered on the occasion of the Emperor's return from the Persian front (Singara), another (III) on the occasion of Constantius' triumphal entry into Rome in

357, another one (II) before the Constantinopolitan Senate (Nov. 355) in response to his imperial appointment as senator (Sept. 1, 355). We possess Constantius' long letter which honors the orator publicist by this appointment and reveals the personal esteem of the Emperor for the political philosopher and his learned father.[88] Constantius therein declares that the true philosophy does not separate one from the life of the community. Philosophy is in fact dedicated to the task of forming good citizens. Eventually Constantius was to honor Themistius still further with the erection of a bronze statue in Constantinople,[89] and there are many other instances of the Emperor's high esteem for the orator-*philosophe*.[90]

It so happens that a copy of the Constantinopolitan oration (II) reached Milan where Constantius had only recently faced his Nicene opponents with his plans for an imperially enforced theological union. At the stormy council of 355, which he had peremptorily reconvened in the palace, Constantius tried to cajole Pope Liberius into condemning Athanasius,[91] demanded that the Church take his imperial word for a canon,[92] and indeed played the part of a philosopher king as idealized by Themistius, Libanius, and Synesius of Cyrene.[93]

The true king, according to Themistius (especially in I) is a born king. Through his inborn royal virtue and reason he subdues not only his own passions—and in this Constantius had succeeded in contrast to Constans—but also the dissensions of society. The true king prefers persuasion to force and in this we are reminded of Constantius' efforts to persuade Liberius in the celebrated interview[94] in which the Emperor stands out as at least more considerate than the ill-informed eunuchs and court bishops who heckled the Pope. Constantius resorted to the expedient of exile only when Liberius proved to be obdurate. The Emperor was also uncommonly patient in responding to the invective of Lucifer of Cagliari.

The true king, to continue with Themistius, is not the ruler of one people, class or religion; he is the just ruler and saviour of all. The emperor is to be like God in all respects,[95] a heavenly being,[96] but his chief virtue, wherein he is most like God, is his *philanthropia*.[97] His mind intent upon heaven, he strives to be the image of God, constructing his earthly empire on the model of that above.[98] This imitation (*homoiōsis*) is the imitation of God's fatherhood, from which stems brotherhood throughout the Empire.[99] God in his paternal concern for mankind sends kings and philosophers, the latter to teach, the former to govern in accordance with philosophical precepts. The authority of the emperor stems not from the people or the army but from God.[100] The

emperor is personified law (*nomos empsuchos*)[101] and thus his word may be taken for a canon, since the order of the cosmos is the model for his righteous rule. He may overturn apostolic law and tradition. The whole authority of Sacred Scriptures may be dissolved by imperial authority.[102] Themistius, the pagan monotheist, thrice quotes to give universal cogency to his argument, what he calls "Assyrian Scriptures,"[103] namely Prov. 21:1: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord."[104]

If it is running ahead of the established facts to say that Themistius contributed to Constantius' philosophy of kingship,[105] at least we may take Themistius as representative of the cultured pagan thought which Constantius found congenial. And we may suppose that his Arian bishops read and quoted Themistius, their contemporary, with as much satisfaction as did the cultured classes of Byzantine society generations after them. Moreover, Ammianus Marcellinus' portrait of Constantius comports well with this view. Ammianus, for example, describes the hieratic rigidity of Constantius approaching Rome for the *vincennalia,* as though he were imitating the impassible ruler of heaven, turning "his eyes neither to the right nor to the left, as if he had been a statue: nor when the carriage shook him did he nod his head . . . , nor was he ever seen to move a hand."[106] The same historian says that Constantius, elated by courtly adulation, at times, spoke of his own *aeternitas* and "in writing letters in his own hand, would style himself lord of the whole world."[107] Ammianus remarks bitterly that the imperial successes had so strengthened Constantius' confidence in the divine rightness of his course that he thought himself raised to an equality with heaven (*caelo contiguus*), while his soldiers, interrupting his speech naming Julian a Caesar, hailed his decision as an *arbitrium summi numinis.*[108] In his harangue before the soldiers on the Persian front at the end of his reign, Constantius, as reported by Ammianus, confidently appealed to the present help of the most high Deity (*favore numinis summi praesente*).[109] It is just possible that this monotheistic but not specifically Christian phrasing is an authentic transcript, not attributable to the pagan annalist's own theological preferences. In any event evidence is sufficient to make it probable that for Constantius, God was the Supreme God without distinctively Christian attributes. That Christ was like God, *homoios,* was the most that he could understand and personally accept. But after all, he too, as an emperor, was in the process of becoming or acting like God, *homoiōsis.*[110] Moreover, it was probably of God as Father that he more commonly felt himself to be the earthly image of

the divine. Arian that he was, Constantius will have more easily imagined himself imitating the Father of heaven,[111] Jovian in features and attributes, than the suffering Son of Calvary. And as an Arian, he will have thought of his imperial acts as coordinate with, rather than imitative of, those of Christ.

Ancient conceptions of the relationship of the emperor to Deity were very much alive in Constantius. As death approached, he reported that he felt his familiar spirit (*genius*) departing from himself.[112] This disclosure, when expanded in the light of comparative religion, connects Constantius with a whole cycle of religio-political thought which Arthur Nock has brought together under the heading of the divine companion (*comes, genius*).[113]

Yet for all the pagan survivals, Constantius was undoubtedly sincere and earnest, personally and politically[114] in his espousal of Christianity in the form he preferred. His predeliction for Arianism becomes increasingly clear, especially when the death of Constans freed him from the political and military necessity of theological compromise.[115] Although he was intent upon a theological reunion, his personal Christological views dictated a pro-Arian policy regardless of political expediency, for he had at length become convinced that his political successes were to be viewed as the divine approbation of his ecclesiastical policy.[116] Had expediency alone determined his strategies, Constantius would have become more conciliatory toward the Nicenes rather than less after taking over the more Catholic West on the death of Constans. But Arianism had already commended itself as the more rational form of Christian monotheism, and Arians had proved to be better court bishops than the puzzlingly unaccommodating and seemingly wilful Nicenes.[117] When Constantius insisted in 355 at Milan that his will be esteemed a canon, he went on: The bishops of Syria let me thus speak. Either then obey or go into banishment.[118] And to the bishops at the Synod of Rimini in 359 he wrote firmly, enjoining them to take no action against the Oriental bishops and stating emphatically that any decision reached at Rimini would have no force without his express approbation.[119]

It is indeed possible that Constantius regarded himself as the divinely appointed head of the episcopate. Lucifer mocks the Arian bishops for considering him *episcopus episcoporum,*[120] and there may be still another allusion to Constantius' conception of himself as the chief of the apostolate in Lucifer's excoriation of him as a *pseudoapostolus,*[121] who as a *pseudochristianus* presumes to be transformed into an *apostolus Christi,* qualified to depose and exile Catholic bishops

and install—he actually says, "ordain"[122]—Arians in their places.[123] Athanasius is likewise spirited in denouncing Constantius' invention of a new kind of episcopal appointment.[124]

We may set down this increasingly explicit Catholic criticism of imperial authority by recalling some of their more familiar declarations. Eustathius of Antioch, for example, after his deposition at the hands of the Eusebians, denounced his calumniators as Ariomaniacs, atheists,[125] and sycophants.[126] Arianizers were atheists because they denied the full deity of the Son and were sycophants in their excessive devotion to the emperor, his agents and informers. Athanasius makes a similar charge. After he had himself finally come to a clear understanding of the proper limits of the power of the emperor,[127] Athanasius declared angrily that the Arians had no other king but Caesar.[128] In denying the full Deity of Christ, the Arians were Judaizers, Athanasius was contending, for like the chief priests of Israel, they failed to honor Christ as *Pambasileus*. In this wrathful ejaculation, Athanasius scored Arianism for tolerating, indeed facilitating the preservation of the ancient notions of the divine presence or likeness of the ruler in a Christian guise. He gives additional color to his charge in describing the connivance of Arians and pagans in the tumults and pillaging in Alexandria in 339[129] and 356.[130] Athanasius pointed out in contempt that they who at Sirmium in 359 denied the Son to be eternal were quite prepared to introduce their dated creed with a reference to its publication in the presence of the *eternal* emperor, that they who pretended to be writing about the Lord willingly nominated another master of themselves, namely, Constantius.

To sum up, then, the Arianizing view of the divine authority of the Christian emperor, as we have been able to reconstruct it from the meagre and disparate remains: The emperor is either the imitator or the interpreter of either the Logos or the Supreme God (in Arian Christian terms, the Father), himself a kind of god coordinate in function with the demigod Christ, and as such the living law in a monolithic, monotheistic Church-Empire opposed alike to divisive polytheism and disruptive Nicene Trinitarianism.

Over against this trend abetted by Constantius, the high Nicene view of the ruler became increasingly distinct, especially after Julian's apostasy made clear that the Christianized Empire was not the prophetically foretold millenial realm which Eusebius once imagined.[131] Over against the claims of divine likeness made by and for the emperor on the Arian side were the repeated efforts of the Nicenes, for example at Sardica, to insist that Christ is the Son of God in a way quite dif-

ferent from Christians in general. What Christians may be by grace, he is by nature. The political implications of their defense of the full deity of Christ could not be in doubt. Gregory Nazianzen, though he acknowledged that the emperor and also the lesser imperial officials ruled along with Christ and were indeed the image of God, reminded these rulers that it was also over the image of Christ that they ruled.[132] Ambrose of Milan vigorously denounced the impiety of the Arians who in saying that "Christ is distinct from the only and true God," failed to place him before other men, making of him but one of the gods or God-possessed holy men of the kind mentioned in the Bible, i.e. Psalm 82, "Ye are gods." Ambrose, like many other Nicene divines, was anxious to distinguish between the deity of Christ and the mere divinization and godlikeness which an emperor might claim to be his as a Christian. Ambrose of Milan, in the oversimplification of holy intolerance, suggested how the low Christology of the Arians encouraged the accommodation of Christianity to religio-political necessities in remarking that the Arian, who calls Christ a creature, can very well come to terms with pagan and Jew because therein also they are agreed.[133]

The Nicenes, like Chrysostom,[134] were at length pushed to distinguish the power of the office as divine from the incumbent of the office. Moreover, there lingered in the Nicene view of the State the conception of its being sustained by angelic power under Christ.[135] The Nicenes were therefore the more alert to the possibility of an angelic power becoming demonic through wilfulness. In any event, Athanasius, Lucifer of Cagliari,[136] and Hilary of Poitiers were at length prompted to rehabilitate the language of Daniel and Revelation when occasion demanded, denouncing the emperor as the forerunner of Antichrist or as Antichrist himself.

All this the Nicenes could see more or less clearly by the middle of the century. The proper relationship between the episcopate and the Christianized rulership could not be so clear at the beginning of the controversy, either to the Arians or to the Catholics—even Athanasius.

One of the sources of Nicene conviction and solidarity was the confidence that the Christ who ruled indirectly through the emperor ruled immediately through the Church in which He was ever present. We next turn to an examination of the political significance of the Nicene faith in the Eucharistic Christ and the accompanying sense of the divine immediacy within the liturgical community.

(To be concluded.)

1 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.

2 Melville continues: "Chryst Jesus the King, and his kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is; and of whase kingdome nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, but a member!"

3 Below, n. 9.

4 Below, n. 10.

5 This it was, of course, for pagans offering sacrifice to their imperial *sōtēr, dominus et deus.*

6 The practice is monographically traced by Ludwig Biehl, *Das liturgische Gebet für Kaiser und Reich: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat,* Görres-Gesellschaft, Heft 75 (Paderborn, 1937).

7 On this see n. 50.

8 Cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii, 15.

9 For example, Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, v. 24, 1.

10 Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii, 75. Origen countered the religio-political argument of Celsus that Christian monotheism was at once a cosmic and a political rebellion by insisting that the Logos is destined to achieve through the rational in man the universal recognition and observance of the divine *nomos. Ibid*, 72.
Origen also laid the bases for the later monastic and ascetic view of the State according to which he who lives not in the world need not pay tribute to Caesar. *Comment. in Rom.* 9:25; Migne, *P. G.*, XIV, coll. 1180 ff. The significance of Origen at this point is brought out by Wilfred Parsons. "The Influence of Romans XIII on Pre-Augustinian Christian Political Thought," *Theological Studies*, I (1940), p. 337.

11 "Kaiser Augustus im Urteil des antiken Christentums," *Hochland*, XXX (1933), pp. 289 ff. The date is significant. Peterson was wide awake to the spurious character of the Nazi appeal for a "positive Christianity." He had previously published "Göttliche Monarchie," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CXII (1931), pp. 537 ff. The fact that religion today has been given a political assignment comparable to that which it was expected to acquit itself of in the fourth century, gives a special relevance to the studies of Peterson and similar inquiries. The appeal to positive Christianity in Nazi Germany, to Orthodoxy behind the Iron Curtain, to Shinto in Japan, and to Protestantism in democracy—often in the diffuse hope and confidence that God will even further bless America—are all contemporary ways in which religion has been asked to provide tonus, sanctions, and cohesiveness. It is commonly overlooked now as in the fourth century that Christianity, if it be true to its divine commission, judiciously mingles a prophetic explosive with the social cement it is asked to supply.

12 Leipzig, 1935. This book is a reworking and rich documentation of the two foregoing articles. Peterson borrows the term "political theology" from Carl Schmitt who first introduced it in the present sense in *Politische Theologie* (Munich, 1922). The views of Schmitt and Peterson are compared and criticized by Andreas Marxen, *Das Problem der Analogie zwischen der Seinsstrukturen der grossen Gemeinschaften* (Würzburg, 1937).

13 Op. cit., 43. In *Apologia ad Constantium*, ii, he writes: "Search into the matter, as though Truth were the partner of your throne, for she is the defense of emperors and especially of Christian emperors, and she will make your reign secure."

14 "Be subject to the Lord and also to your lords as to the image of God, in modesty and fear." *Barnabas*, 19, 7.

15 The most recent study of this and allied concepts is that of C. Martini, *Ambrosiaster: de auctore, operibus, theologia*, Spicilegium pontifice athenaea Antoniana, IV (Rome, 1944).

16 Friedrich Andres, "Die Engel und Dämonenlehre des Klemens von Alexandrien" (Fortsetzung), *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXIV (1926) pp. 131 ff.; cf. Otto Weinreich, *Antikes Gottmenschentum* (1926); L. Bieler, *Theios anēr: Das Bild des göttlichen Menschen im Frühchristentum* (Vienna, 1939); J. Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'apres des Pères grecs: Contribution historique à la doctrine de la grâce* (Paris, 1938); F. Taeger, "Zur Vergottung des Menschen im Altertum," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXI (1942), p. 3.

17 Ed. F. X. Funk, ii, 26. The deacon holds the place of Christ, the deaconess that of the Holy Spirit.

18 Firmicus was not yet a Christian when he wrote the *Mathesis*, but he probably felt no need of revising his basic views after his conversion. As Kenneth Setton remarks, he was obsessed with the divinity of the emperor in the *Mathesis* and in the *De errore* with his sanctity.

19 Exodus 22:28 and Psalm 82:6.

20 *Les survivances du culte impérial romain: A propos des rites shintoïstes* (Paris, 1921). Mention is made of such terms as *adoratio, despotes* (replacing *kurios*), *aeternitas, numen, sacer*, etc.

21 "The Emperor's Divine *Comes*." *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1947), pp. 102ff. See also Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, American Philological Association Monographs, No. 1 (Middletown, Conn., 1931). She has shown the extent to which Eastern ideas of the royal soul and glory mingled with indigenous Italian concepts to contribute to the belief in the divinity of the Roman Emperor even during the Principate.

22 "Konstantin-Helios," *Hermes*, XXXVI (1901), pp. 457 ff. For a more recent

discussion see Franz Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, I (Halle Saale, 1948), esp. pp. 138-144 construing Constantine as a continuator of Aurelian's solar political theology. Eusebius likens Constantine to the sun, *De laude, iii*, 4. For the most recent exploration of the Emperor's exchange of the *Sol invictus* for the *Sol justitiae* (Christ) as celestial patron and antitype, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Dante's 'Two Suns'," *Semitic and Oriental Studies*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, XI, (1951), 217.

23 "Mysterium lunae: Ein Beitrag zur Kirchentheologie der Väterzeit," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXIII (1939), "I: Die sterbende Kirche," p. 311, p. 428; "II: Die gebärende Kirche," *ibid.*, LXIV (1940), p. 61; "III: Die strahlende Kirche," *ibid.*, p. 121. Rahner himself does not mention the possible religio-political implications of the imagery. Eventually, of course, the imagery is papalized, the sun being the Papacy and the Empire the moon.

24 *Op. cit.*, vii, 3; as edited by Henry G. Meecham (Manchester, 1949), p. 82; discussed by H. Rahner, *op. cit.*, LXIV, p. 126. Firmicus Maternus declared that no astrologer could determine an emperor's fate, for the emperor alone is not subject to the motions of the stars. *Mathesis*, ii, 30, 5.

25 "Der Gute Hirte in hellenistischer und frühchristlicher Logostheologie," *Heilige Überlieferungen . . . Ildefons Herwegen dargeboten* (=Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens: Supplementband), (Münster, 1938). "Das Bild des Guten Hirten in den altchristlichen Baptisterien und in den Taufliturgien des Ostens and Westens: Das Siegel der Gottesherde," *Pisciculi: Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums Franz Dölger . . . dargeboten* (=Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband, I), (Münster, 1939), pp. 220 ff. "Der Gute Hirte in Frühchristlicher Totenliturgie und Grabeskunst," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Vol. I. (=Studi e Testi, 121) (Vatican City, 1946), pp. 373 ff.

26 Mention may be made here of Hans Leisegang's clear and fascinating demonstration of the relationship between Augustine and Philo by way of Ambrose. "Der Ursprung der Lehre Augustins von der *civitas Dei*," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XVI (1926), p. 127. Leisegang indirectly illuminates our field of inquiry in showing the connection between the Logos (=*noētē polis*) of Philo and the *civitas Dei* (= Bride of Christ, also Body of Christ) in Augustine. The Logos concept, as a rational, orderly, and soteriological principle, being also both *personal* and *corporate* in its implications and attendant imagery, not only encouraged speculation on the relationship between religion and politics but also facilitated the assimilation of the body ecclesiastical to the body politic.

27 Hugo Gressmann, the author of *Der Messias* (Göttingen, 1927) in which the Shepherd King is given prominence, brings out the messianic significance of the Logos in his critical edition of the *Theophania, Eusebius' Werke*, III (Leipzig, 1904).

28 "The Re-emergence of the Arian Controversy," *Anglican Theological Review*, X (1927/8), p. 11. Related to this is Buckler's presidential address before the American Society of Church History, "Barbarian and Greek, and Church History," *Church History*, XI (1942), p. 3.

29 For Catholic we could say Orthodox, but we risk confusion with later Greek Orthodoxy. We could say Nicene, but this would be to overlook shifts and accommodations within the Catholic position between Nicaea and Constantinople. We could say Athanasian, but this would be to associate Catholicity too closely with one man, his clerical, regional, and temperamental peculiarities. To be sure, in preferring the designation "Catholic" we risk identification with the Roman West, but since catholicity is most valiantly defended in the fourth century by Rome, certain Western bishops, and Athanasius, supported by Rome, we can afford to err on this side.

30 So, Lucifer of Cagliari, pillorying the obsequious Arian bishops in respect to Constantius, *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula*, ed. by Wilhelm Hartel, *C.S.E.L.*, XIV (Vienna, 1886), 311, 25. Hereafter cited by *opusculum*, page, and line.
The basic study of Lucifer upon which we shall draw in this study is that of Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer, Bishop von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig, 1886); the most recent pertinent study appears to be that of Pietro Maria Marcello, *La posizione di Lucifero di Cagliari nelle lotte antiariane del IV secolo*, (Nuoro, 1940), wherein it is maintained that Lucifer did not end up a schismatic with those who assumed his name.

31 So, Ambrose of Milan. Altogether there were four possible positions worked out by Christians within the framework of the Empire which had recently been their persecutor. At the beginning of the fourth century the Donatist Puritans, whose schism had also a nationalist source, asked angrily (1): What has the Emperor to do with the Church? In response, Optatus of North Africa replied toward the middle of the century (2): The Church is in the Empire. At the end of the century Ambrose wrote of Theodosius (3): The Emperor is in the Church. At the end of the next century (496) Pope Gelasius, writing when large sections of

the Western Empire had succumbed to the onslaughts of the Barbarians, addressed himself to the Emperor in Constantinople thus (4): There are two things by which this world is chiefly ruled: the sacred authority and the royal power. Each of these four famous phrases might provide us with a slogan or formula for the major positions assumed by Christians after the conversion of Constantine and before the final destruction of the Empire in the West and its complete transformation as the Byzantine Empire in the East. Interestingly the rigoristic Donatist preserves the common Ante-Nicene reserve toward the state, a feeling which survives also among the monastics. In this paper we are chiefly concerned with (2) and (3).

32 Marcellus accommodated himself to the Nicene formulation at the Roman synod of 340, but he remained the target of numerous attacks from all sides. The most recent analysis of his position is that of Wolfgang Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra: Der Logos Christologe und Biblizist, sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie and zum Neuen Testament,* Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, X (Halle, 1940).

33 First suggested as a key to the ecclesio-political struggle of the fourth century by Hans-Georg Opitz, "Euseb von Caesarea als Theologe", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche,* XXXIV (1935), p. 1, especially at the end of the paper.

34 *Historiarum adversus paganos libri septem,* vii, 29.

35 Hendrik Berkhof states well the relationship between Christology and political behavior in the fourth century, contrasting the East and West:

> Im Westen bedeutete Stellungnahme im arianischen Konflikt zugleich: Stellungnahme gegen den Kaiser, also, Bruch mit der byzantinischen Haltung der Kirche gegenüber dem Kaiser. Wer dort anfing, theologisch zu denken, musste notgedrungen anfangen, politisch zu denken. Darum wurden nicht im Osten, sondern im Westen die neuen theologisch-politischen Begriffe geformt, welche wie *Dynamit* [italics mine] unter dem von Konstantin geschaffenen Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche wirken sollte.

Kerk en Kaiser (Amsterdam, 1946); translated by Gottfried Locher as *Kirche und Kaiser: Eine Untersuchung der Entstehung der byzantinischen und der theokratischen Staatsauffassung im vierten Jahrhundert* (Zollikon-Zürich, 1947), p. 195. This book, written for the Church and not for the academic community alone, deals with the political implications of the Trinitarian position. Composed after the author had "dived under" during the Nazi occupation of his native land, it concerns the relation of the Church to the would-be monolithic State, Arian, Aryan, or Asiatic. The present writer is much indebted to Berkhof, though the main lines of his own research had been laid down before Berkhof's book could be procured. Less concerned with the theological dimension of the problem, Kenneth Setton states the ecclesio-political theme of the fourth century in a similar fashion:

> In Constantius' insistence . . . upon asserting his authority over the Church *de iure,* seems to me to lie the chief cause of the change in the attitude of Christian churchmen towards Emperor and imperial State after the sixth decade of the fourth century.—

Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor, Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, no. 482 (New York, 1941), p. 54.

36 W. Ensslin has recently traced the development of *Dei gratia* in our period without, however, touching upon our theme. "Das Gottesgnadentum des autokratischen Kaisertums der frühbyzantinischen Zeit," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici,* V (1939), 154.

37 The extent of the revision to meet the needs of Constantius' policy against both Nicene Orthodoxy and paganism in the interests of an Arian peace is discussed by J. Maurice in *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France,* 1913, esp. pp. 388, 395 f.

38 For this more radical critique of the *Vita,* see Henri Grégoire, "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la *Vita Constantini* dans sa forme actuelle et Constantin n'est pas converti en 312," *Byzantion, XIII* (1938), 561. According to him Euzoius reworked the papers of Eusebius inherited by him as bishop of Caesarea (p. 583). For a more moderate view taking into consideration the long history of *Vita*-criticism, we await the forthcoming publication among the Dumbarton Oak Papers of Glanville Downer's exhaustive study based upon fresh MSS and archaeological evidence.

39 "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies,* I (1928), 55. Goodenough himself went on to show the adaption of Hellenistic ideas in *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven, 1940), ch. iii.

40 "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* (=Mélanges Bidez), II (1934), 13. Baynes once again emphasizes the survival of Hellenistic ideas of kingship in his long critique of K. Setton, *op. cit.,* in *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXXIV (1944), 135, and in his

Bryce Lecture of 1945, *The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome* (Oxford, 1946).

41 *Christomimēsis* is the key concept in a forthcoming publication on Byzantine political theology by my revered teacher Ernst Kantorowicz, now of Princeton, who has valiantly upheld the principle of academic liberty in recently resisting at the University of California the policy of unwitting *echthromimēsis!* Something of his general theory is brought out in connection with his study of the sources of Dante's Two Suns, *loc. cit.*, esp. p. 222 and n. 14.

42. Admirably developed by Gerhard Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Medieval Studies,* II (1940), 127.

43 *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Amsterdam, 1939).

44 The Anomean creed preserved in the *Historia acephala,* ix, is a good specimen of this strand of thought clearly exposed to view as a result of the unraveling of Arianism after 360.

45 Opitz contrasts Athanasius' *De incarnatione* and *Contra Gentes* with Eusebius' Syrian Theophania and draws attention also to the opposing interests of the two bishops as represented by the famous biographies from the pen of each: Athanasius' *Vita Antoni* with its glorification of ascetic withdrawal from the world and Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* with its sanctification of civil society.

46 Eusebius, *Vita,* i, 17.

47 Eusebius, *De laude,* x: *hupophētēs toû pambasileōs theoû.* As N. Baynes remarks, pagan emperors had resorted to divination (and he might have added divinization). Now, as a Christian, Constantine might himself be an interpreter by inspiration. "Eusebius and the Empire," p. 15, Cf. Opitz, *op. cit.,* p. 113.

48 Eusebius implies a comparison with Paul (as earlier the victory of Constantine at Saxa Rubra makes him a new Moses leading his people through the Red Sea), but the term *isapostolos* is later. The commemoration of Constantine and Helen as saints (the parallel to Christ and Mary suggests itself) falls in the Eastern calendar on May 21. Cf. *Acta SS Maii,* V:2, 17ff. The adoration of Constantine must have reached extraordinary proportions, perhaps climatically under Constantius. In any event Photius appears to have been particularly horrified as he epitomizes Arian Philostorgius, *H. E.,* ii. 17, describing the vows and supplications offered up, *as to God,* to an image of Constantine upon a porphyry column amidst many lamps and much incense. Cf. also the *Chronicon paschale, anno* 330, *P. G,* XCII, 709f. See further the commentary of J. Gothofredus, ed., on the law concerning imperial images in the Theodosian Code, *lib.* xv, *tit.* 4, 1, (vol. v, pp. 390 ff.).

49 In view of the extensive research on the alleged vision of Constantine, it seems quite probable that we have here the effort of Pseudo-Eusebius to legitimize imperial control over the Church. See Jacques Zeiller, who strives to retain at least the authenticity of Lactantius' account of a dream, "Quelques remarques sur la 'vision' de Constantin," *Byzantion,* XIV (1939), 329 and H. Grégoire's reply, "La vision de Constantin 'liquidée'," *ibid.,* p. 341. If then large sections of the *Vita* are to be ascribed to Gregoire's Arian Pseudo-Eusebius or to Maurice's Arian Reviser under Constantius, we have merely to read "emperor" or "Constantius" to get the religio-political force of the eulogy.

50 The modern controversy as to whether Constantine claimed to be bishop of the external affairs of the Church or merely "bishop" of those outside the Church is reviewed by William Seston, "Constantine as a 'Bishop'," *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXXVII (1947), 131. He fails to cite Hendrik Berkhof, "*Ton ektos episkopos.*" *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis,* XXXIV (1943), 24.

51 *De laude,* vi, 21.

52 *Ibid,* xvi,17.

53 In the *Vita* (iv, 48), Eusebius mentions a divine, present at the Arianizing Council of Jerusalem, who in excessive praise of the Emperor declared that Constantine was destined to share the empire of the Son of God in the world to come. Although Constantine rebuked the unnamed ecclesiastic, the latter's words and the scarcely less adulatory phrases of Eusebius' tricennalian oration delivered before an assembly of the very divines who had reconvened after deposing Athanasius at Tyre and now at Jerusalem readmitted Arius to communion, must be regarded as representative of the political thought and atmosphere of the Arianizing camp.

54 *De laude,* ii. 5.

55 *Ibid.,* ii, 6.

56 *Ibid.,* v. 8.

57 *Ibid.,* ii. 6.

58 *Ibid.*

59 *Ibid.,* vii, 12.

60. *Vita,* i, 24. "[All] others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow men . . . "

61 *De Laude,* iii, 5.

62 *Ibid.,* xvi, 7.

63 W. Seston has stated the connection between Arianism and the political convictions of both Constantine and Eusebius: "Je croirais volontiers que, le catholicisme nicéen n'ayant pas réussi sous son règne à ramener à l'unité de la foi les donatistes et les ariens, il [Constantine] lui a très délibérément préféré la théologie d'Arius. Dans le Christ des ariens l'oint du Seigneur, première créature de

Dieu et modérateur du monde, son panégyriste des *Tricennalia* voit une image de l'empereur de Byzance, dont relèvent tous les hommes et toutes choses." In "Chroniques des études anciennes," *Revue des études anciennes,* XL (1938) pp. 106 f.

64. H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser,* p. 200.

65 Socrates, *H. E.,* ii, 7.

66 Adolf Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomedien: Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Führerschaft im arianischen Streit* (Halle, 1903), pp. 87-89.

67 Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum,* 22, 9.

68 In the most recent study of Lucian, some advances over Lichtenstein are made in respect to Eusebius but there is nothing further on his political theory. Gustave Bardy, *Recherches sur saint Lucien d' Antioche et son école* (Paris, 1936), livre ii. ch. iii„—"Eusèbe de Nicomédie."

69 Needless to say, Eusebius had to disguise the extremity of his views and make out that he was more or less faithful to Nicaea in leading the Eastern conservatives.

70 Discussed by K. Setton, *op. cit.,* pp. 68-70.

71 Migne, *P. G.,* XXXIII, 1165, Scholarship is not certain whether the recounting of this meteoric spectacle is *a*) an effort to enhance the status of Constantius by linking him by means of a second heavenly portent with his father or *b*) a proof that up to 351, at least, the vision of Constantine was unknown and a possible spur to the reading of such an episode into the Arian revision of the *Vita.* Cf. J. Zeiller, *op. cit.,* p. 331.

72 *Liber apologeticus,* Migne, *P. G.* XXX, Coll. 835 ff. But cf. M. Albertz concerning Church and State materials assembled in the unpublished portion of his dissertation cited in his *Untersuchungen über die Schriften des Eunomius* (Wittenberg, 1908). *These* 12, p. 56.

73 See below, p. 63.

74 *Historia acephala,* viii. Jovian is only Catholic by policy. In demanding the worship of "the Most High God and Christ," Julian betrays no acquaintance with the fundamental issues of the controversy.

75 Shown to be Arian by C. F. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies,* XIII (1911/12), pp 506 f., against Franz Xavier Funk. *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen: Eine litterar-historische Untersuchung* (Rotterdam, 1891), pp. 97 ff.

76 Edited by F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1905).

77 *Ibid.,* I, p. 207 (V, 20). This is an expansion of the "Constitutor" not found in the third century *Didascalia.*

78 II Chron. 26. In ii, 27, iii, 10 and viii, 46 Uzziah is cited as a layman presuming to exercise priestly functions. From the context it is clear that the interest of the "Constitutor" is intra-ecclesiastical. He is guarding against unauthorized acts of lay people and the lower clergy to perform "liturgies" not proper to them.

79 *Ibid.,* iv, 13, vii, 16.

80 *Ibid.,* vi. 24.

81 There is unfortunately no full length study of Constantius, to say nothing of a systematic presentation of his ecclesio-political views. Father Francis Dvornik promises a whole chapter devoted to Constantius in his forthcoming comprehensive study of Eastern political theory.

82 Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum,* xxi, 16, 18.

83 His concern for the reunion of the strife-racked churches for the sake of imperial peace and prosperity comes out very strongly in the words ascribed to him by Lucifer of Cagliari in refuting him. While these phrases cannot be direct quotations in all cases, they are surely a good transcript of his general point of view.

84 Theodoret, *H. E.,* iii, 3. Theodoret is willing to accept Constantius as a Catholic at heart despite his opposition to the *homoousion,* but this evaluation comports ill with what we know of Constantius, even from Theodoret.

85 His policy toward paganism is summarized by André Piganiol, *L'Empire chrétien* (Paris, 1947), pp. 96 f.

86 The fullest account of this philosopher and orator is by Willy Stegemann, "Themistius," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-encyclopädie,* A V:2 (1934), coll. 1642-80. See also Wilhelm von Christ, *et. al., Geschichte der griechischen Literatur,* 6th ed., II; 2 (Munich, 1934), No. 802 and Johannes Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike, Forschungen zur Kirchen-und Geistesgeschichte,* LXXX (Stuttgart, 1939), pp. 160-175. Glanville Downey has generously allowed me to consult his critical texts and translations.

87 The best text of the *Orationes* is that of Wilhelm Dindorf (Leipzig, 1832), soon however, to be replaced by the critical edition of Prof. Downey. The orations are systematically discussed by Vladimir Valdenberg, "Discours politiques de Themistius dans leur rapport avec l' antiquité," translated from the Russian by H. Grégoire, *Byzantion,* I (1924), p. 36.

88 Dindorf, *op. cit.,* pp. 21-7. A direct reference to Constantius' appreciation of *Oratio* II and his high estimate of Themistius therefore are found in *Oratio* IV, 65, 18 f.

89 Otto Seeck, *Brief des Libanius* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 296. A later Emperor, possibly Julian, erected a second statue in Themistius' honor.

90 For example, Constantius, in response to Themistius' entreaty, returned to Con-

stantinople its full quota of grain which had been withdrawn in punishment for the lynching of Hermogenes. Constantius made Themistius proconsul in 358/9 and later urged him to become *praefectus urbis*. In 359 he invited Themistius to dine at the imperial table and overwhelmed him with favors up to the very end of his reign. Stegemann, *loc. cit.*, coll. 1647f. The Arian Valens appointed him as tutor of his son Valentinian Galates and Theodosius made him guardian of Arcadius.

91 Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii, 13.

92 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.

93 K. Setton discusses the views of certain publicists and panegyrists in the fourth century, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-31 and chap. vi. "Philosophy before the Throne [Synesius]". See also C. H. Coster, "Synesius, a *Curialis* in the Time of the Emperor Arcadius," *Byzantion, XVI* (1940/1), 10.

94 Theodoret, *H. E.*, *ii.* 13.

95 *Oratio* VI.

96 *Oratio* I, 3, 12 ff.

97 Especially *Oratio* VI, delivered in Constantinople in 364 apropos of Valentinian's taking Valens as co-ruler, but the idea is present in the earlier orations. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 6.

98 *Oratio* XVIII, pp. 267, 7f. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 9.

99 *Oratio* VI, pp. 93 f.

100 *Oratio* VI, p. 87, 15ff. Cf. the speech of Aurelian to his soldiers noted by Ensslin, *op. cit.*, p. 156, n. 7. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 8.

101 *Oratio* V, 16, 17. Though pagan in origin the phrase is absorbed into a novel of Justinian, CV, 2, 4. Pointed out by K. Setton, op. cit. p. 26.

102 See sequel to this article.

103 "Assyrians" normally means "Jews." Pauly-Wissowa, *s. v.*

104 *Oratio* VII 89D, p. 167; XI 147C, p. 175; XIX 229 A, p. 278.

105 That Themistius directly influenced the Arian Valens is attested by Socrates, *H. E.*, iv, 32 and Sozomen, *H. E.* vi, 36. Here, however, it was the liberty of conscience that was defended by Themistius and thus the effect of the oration was to bring relief to the hard pressed Nicenes. It is Glanville Downey's view that Themistius' revival of pagan cosmo-political theories was induced by and to a certain extent modelled on the political theologies of Eusebius and other court bishops in an effort to show that pagan philosophy could provide the resources for a comprehensive, tolerant (especially in *Oratio* VI, 80ff.) imperial theology.

106 *Op. cit.*, xvi, 10, 9ff. Cf. Themistius, speaking of the good emperor as the statue (*agalma*), the same on earth as God in heaven, *Oratio* I, 10, 3f. The significance of Constantius' god-like demeanor outside Rome and within is discussed by J. Straub, *op. cit.*, iv, "Dominus-Princeps."

107 *Op. cit.*, xv, 1, 3; cf. official letter to Lucifer ascribing *aeternitas* to Constantius, *C. S. E. L.*, XIV, 321, 22.

108 *Op. cit.*, xv, 8, 9.

109 *Ibid.*, xxi, 13, 14.

110 The ancient idea of the ruler as *sōtēr* (and as Shepherd of the people *poimēn laōn*, e. g., Themistius, *Oratio* I) undoubtedly facilitated Constantius' assimilation of his role to that of the Christ-Logos.

111 *Oratio* XVIII, 263, 6f: The good emperor is a father to the fatherless; *Oratio* III, 51, 2, Constantius is a *theos* on earth like patriarchal Zeus above, the one illuminated by the other; *Oratio* II, 41, 16 and 25, Constantius is likened to "that great leader in heaven" of the gods (Zeus).

112 Amminaus, xxi, 14, 2.

113 *Op. cit.*, p. 102.

114 Ammianus (xxi, 16, 18) mentions with impatience the Emperor's great zeal in calling councils and his participation in the discussion, all unworthy of him from the annalist's point of view.

115 One may cite his conduct at Arles, 353, and at Milan, 354, his choice of Euzoïus, at the time bishop of Antioch, to baptize him as he lay *in extremis*. Euzoïus' recent synod had just promulgated an Anomoean creed frankly calling the Son a creature.

116 This is especially clear from the words imputed to him by Lucifer in *De non conveniendo cum haereticis* and from the imperial arguments, based on the old Roman principle of *do ut des*, refuted by Lucifer in *De regibus apostaticis*.

117 One is reminded of a modern parallel: Opposition in Nazi Germany to the formation of a *Reichskirche* under the former barracks chaplain, Reichsbischof Müller, came from the conservatives. In war-time Japan the opposition to the Tojo-enforced United Church was from the ecclesiological and christological conservatives.

118 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.

119 *C. S. E. L.*, LX, 94: "non enim ullas vires habere poterit definitio, cui nostra dogmatis tuae episcopi *episcopum* te copiam denegari."

120 *Moriendum esse pro Dei filio*, 311, 24 ff.: "Quid ad haec respondes, Constanti, cui crebro sunt adclamantes Arianae dogmatis tuae episcopi *episcopum* te esse *episcoporum*, morientes propter deum unicum filium credis an non credis regnum possesuros caelorum?"

121 *De non parcendo in Deum deliquentibus*, 267, 19-268, 28.

122 *Ibid.*, 268, 13; cf. 62, 17; 80, 5; 143, 30; 160, 26; 162, 3; 201, 17; 220, 16; also 265, 16 f.: "libros scriptos dedisti et praedicatores benigni noti tui omni loco constituisti;" 268, 13.

123 It is quite possible that it was Constan-

tius rather than Constantine who considered himself the Thirteenth Apostle, thus combining pagan and Christian motifs in gaining control as *pontifex maximus* over the episcopate. Especially pertinent here is the paper of Glanville Downey, the substance of which was presented at the Annual Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, given over in 1949 to the problem of the Church of the Apostles. As a consequence of Downey's research based on fresh MSS and archaeological evidence, considerable alteration will be necessary in the theory advanced by Otto Weinreich, "Konstantin der Grosse als Dreizehnter Apostel und die religionsgeschichtliche Tendenz seiner Grabeskirche," *Triskaidekadische Studien* (Giessen, 1916). But it will at the same time release what is valid in Weinreich's study for application to Arian Constantius and his attempt to control the episcopate from Constantinople. Significantly the translation of the relics of St. Andrew *et al.* to Constantinople took place during the reign of Constantius, Philostorgius, *H. E.* iii, 2. and the ascertained date of the translation has considerable bearing on our problem as the forthcoming publication of Downey's paper will show.

124 See sequel to this article.

125 Migne, *P. G.*, XVIII, col. 676D.

126 *Ibid.*, col. 680B. Noted by R. V. Sellars, *Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 36. Athanasius says that the Arian *episcopoi* might rather be called *kataskopoi* (spies). *Historia Arianorum*, 48 and 75.

127 Karl Friedrich Hagel traces the development of Athanasius' religio-political thought in *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius* (Leipzig, 1933). Hagel shows how Athanasius passes from a willing acceptance of the authority of Constantine to ever clearer pronouncements in favor of the independence of the Church. Nor does the accession of the Nicene Jovian cause him to reverse his views matured under the persecution of Constantius. The phases distinguished are (i) to 335; (ii) 335 to Sardica, (iii) from the return from the second to the third exile, (iv) the phase following the third exile. Most of the material in the present study concerning the views of Athanasius will be taken from writings or strata therein distinguished by Hagel as belonging to the final phase.

128 *Historia Arianorum*, 33; Migne, *P. G.*, XXV, col. 732. Cf. John 19:15.

129 *Epistola encyclica.*

130 *Historia Arianorum*, 55 ff.; in 74 in summarizing the events of 356 he says that the Arians and Gentiles offered sacrifices in the Great Church and uttered blasphemies against Christ.

131 Julian's attempt to erect a philosophically monotheistic church was only the *frankly* pagan analogue of Constantius' unsuccessfully Arianized *Reichskirche*. Themistius in his plea for toleration in *Oratio* VI delivered before the successor of Julian indicates that there was quite a bit of religious accommodation on the part of Christians (Arians?) during Julian's reign.

132 *Oratio* XVII, 9; Migne, *P. G.*, XXXV, col. 975. But on the whole it must be admitted that Gregory Nazianzen was, compared to Basil of Caesarea, quite uncritical of the emperor. In his declamations against Julian he was prepared to rehabilitate Constantius as the most divine of emperors and most loving of Christ. *Oratio* IV, 34; Migne, *P. G.*, XXV, col. 560 D. Gregory's position is discussed by K. Setton, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-106.

133 Ep. xxi, 13; Migne, *P. L.* XVI. Cf. Hendrik Berkhof, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 195. The presupposition of Ambrose is that only orthodox worship is pleasing to God, securing his favor for the Empire. Berkhof criticizes him for his intolerance and notes with regret the survival in the Saint of the essentially pagan principles of *do ut des* but rejoices in Ambrose's spokesmanship for the freedom of the Church over against even a Catholic emperor.

134 W. Parsons, *op. cit.*, 354.

135 Heinrich Schlier, "Mächte und Gewalten im Neuen Testament," *Theologische Blätter*, 1930, col. 289; "Die Beuteilung des Staates im Neuen Testament," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1932, p. 312; "Vom Antichrist: Zum 13. Kapitel der Offenbarung Johannis," *Theologische Aufsätze: Festschrift zu Karl Barths 50. Geburtstag.* (1936), p. 110; Günther Dehn, "Engel und Obrigkeit: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Röm. 13, 1-7," *ibid.*, p. 90; Karl Barth, *Evangelische Theologie*, III (1936), p. 413; Karl Ludwig Schmidt, with qualifications, "Das Gegenüber von Kirche and Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments," especially Excursus II: "Die Kirche als Beisassenschaft," *Theologische Blätter*, XVI (1937), p. 2; enlarged in *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt: Eine lexikographische und exegetische Studie* (Basel, 1939). The whole theory is opposed by Gerhard Kittel, *Christus und Imperator: Das Urteil der ersten Christenheit über den Staat* (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1939) in "Beilage: Die 'dämonistische' Deutung von *exousia* in Röm. 13, 1ff."

136 Lucifer was particularly savage in his epithets, calling Constantius variously *dux et praecursor Antichristi*, 113, 210; 138, 10; 168, 15; etc.; *Antichristus*, 106, 8; 238, 14; 276, 2; *adversarius Dei*, 9, 13; 75, 18; *procurator diaboli*, 174, 6.