



Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century (concluded)

George Huntston Williams

Church History, Vol. 20, No. 4. (Dec., 1951), pp. 3-26.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-6407%28195112%2920%3A4%3C3%3ACACRIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

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

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://uk.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://uk.jstor.org/journals/asch.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHRISTOLOGY AND CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY*

GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS

Harvard Divinity School

B. THE EUCHARISTIC ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM

If we are correct in saying that for the Arians the relationship of the Logos-Son to the Father was primarily a cosmological problem and for the Catholics primarily a soteriological problem, we should be able to go on and point to corresponding differences in the liturgical ethos of the rival parties and more specifically to divergent conceptions and practices connected with the Eucharist, resulting from differing conceptions of the role of Logos-Son. We do find, despite the meagre materials on the Arian side, divergent emphases that will be seen to bear on the behavior of the two parties in the ecclesio-political struggle of the fourth century.

Communion, communication, and excommunication are conspicuous in all accounts of the Arian controversy. All parties esteemed the Eucharist as the center of the liturgical life, but the Catholics tended to emphasize the Eucharistic community wherein the members of the Body were sustained and held together, while their opponents stressed the reasonable sacrifice. Certain that a defective Christology made for an invalid Eucharist, the Catholics occasionally displayed a fierce contempt for the Arian Eucharist, not only refusing communion with Arians to whom they sometimes denied the name "Christians," but also on several occasions desecrating their altars with holy indignation. The Arians for their part were conspicuous in their efforts to re-establish communion in order that the Church could be reunited, and the emperors from Constantine to Theodosius were alike concerned that behind the military front an abundance of incense mount heavenward from all Christian altars toward the Supreme God insuring their victory.

The Arians emphasize the Eucharist as an unbloody substitute for the pagan sacrifices.¹ They seek *koinōnia* with the Orthodox and are assiduous in the despatch of episcopal communications, all with a view to holding the churches together² and thus securing a greater usefulness on the part of the new religion for the Empire. The Semi-Arian, Eusebius of Caesarea, may be typical of the Arian party in giving promi-

* (concluded from the September issue)

nence to prayer and devotional acts apart from the Eucharist.³ The Nicenes are at once more intense and more exclusive in this matter than the Arians. Communion of like-believing members is so important for them that they consider it sacrilegious to be in communion with those who deny the full Deity of the Christ. Only unequivocal believers in Christ's Deity can derive from Calvary, and its liturgical analogue, the Eucharist, the heavenly nutriment that secures their immortality and constitutes them members of the Resurrection Body. The fierceness of the Old Testament envenoms their retorts to the Arians as *Gentiles*. Lucifer of Cagliari, for example, denounces the Arians as worshippers of Baal, in sacrificing the only begotten Son to the Moloch of rationalism.⁴ Basil at Caesarea, seriously threatened by Valens' program of brutally enforcing Arianism, not only refused to swerve from his position when hard pressed by the prefect Modestus, but also stood fast against Valens personally, after the Emperor had reduced his program to the simple demand that the Nicenes receive the Arians in communion. Basil admitted Valens to the holy place behind the veil, courageously importuning him to change his faith but steadfastly refusing him communion.⁵ Quite significantly the Catholics do not seem to have regarded the Eucharist of the Arians as valid. Athanasius inveighs against the Arians so wrought up about the broken Meletian chalice when they themselves dishonor the God of the cup. "Whence comes it that Christ's cup is known to them who know not Christ?" he asks indignantly.⁶ Some color is given the charge against Athanasius for being implicated in the breaking of the Meletian chalice by the conduct of the Nicene bishops returning from exile in 337. Marcellus of Ancyra, for example, ordered the vestments torn from the Arian clergy and the Host tied around their necks. So attired the Arians were driven into the market place. Asclepas smashed the altar in Gaza and Lucius threw the consecrated bread to the dogs in Adrianople as though to show how in his opinion the denial of Christ's full deity was tantamount to being without the Law, to being undeserving indeed even of the crumbs from the Lord's table. The source of these accounts is Arian, but confirmed by Hilary of Poitiers in his very willingness to reproduce them without shame.⁷ The Arians were *Christomachoi* in the eyes of the Catholics, because as *negatores unici dei filii*,⁸ they were therefore *dei adversarii*⁹ and as such *servi diaboli* and hence *antichristi*.¹⁰

The Nicenes regard their own Eucharist, of course, as sacrosanct. Hilary shudders at the blasphemy of Constantius in desecrating the body and the blood of Christ at Arles. At least this must be his allusion when he adds that the initiates well understand the nature of the blasphemy.¹¹ Hilary enjoins daily communion that Christ may dwell daily in the faithful.¹² The bishops of Sardica in their letter to their Emperors express great anxiety for the freedom to celebrate the mysteries without threat, terrors, and violence from the Arians.¹³ Ambrose, who so dramatically

exercised his ancient episcopal prerogative, holding back from communion even an orthodox emperor unworthy of Christ, was the first to write systematically on the sacrament of the altar in the later sense. And he expressly attributes to Christ (rather than to the Holy Spirit, as in the East) the transformation of the elements at the repetition of his historic word.¹⁴ "This body which we make is that which was born of the Virgin," he declared; "it is the true flesh of Christ which was crucified and buried."¹⁵ And, of course, not only an impanation but a veritable on-going incarnation of Christ was taught by Ambrose: "Christ . . . feeds his Church," indeed, "there is no doubt that he himself eats and drinks in us."¹⁶ Ambrose' conviction that the Christ of the altar, the Christ whose Body is by extension the Church, is also one with the Father imparted courage to the Bishop of Milan as he withstood the soldiers of Valentinian II under the guidance of the Empress Mother when they sought to gain a basilica for the Arians and to legitimize the creed of Rimini of 359.¹⁷ Barricaded in the basilica threatened with sequestration, Ambrose justified his resistance to the Emperor by appealing to the Dominical injunction to render unto God the things of God. He eloquently declared that the Church—and he carefully distinguished the Church from its property—bearing as it did the image of God, could not be turned over to Caesar. His argument may include an allusion to the Eucharist, as well as to the people of God recreated through Christ, for after taunting the Arians for denying not only Christ, like the Jews, but for giving nothing at all to God, he goes on to say that he knows of only one image in the church, that of the unseen God, present pre-eminently in the Eucharistic elements and by extension in the recovered image of all those who believe in the Son consubstantial with the Father.¹⁸ The "*pataria*" of Milan responded to their Bishop's exhortation with enthusiasm, occupying themselves with the singing of sacred songs. Through his efforts they had become fully conscious of themselves as a liturgical community. Confident that the God in their midst was also the Lord of all, they drew strength from their faith and in turn strengthened Ambrose in his resistance to Arianizing Valentinian.

Athanasius had earlier made a similar allusion when describing the brutality of the combined Arian and pagan pillage of the new Great Church in Alexandria in 356, in which the episcopal throne and the communion table were desecrated. In carrying off the throne, one assailant was pierced by a splinter therefrom and perished, while another who mocked the holiness of the place was struck blind. The condign punishment was compared by Athanasius to that meted out to the inhabitants of Ashdod who had presumed to touch the ark: "But divine justice reprov'd their iniquity [that of the Arians and the pagans] thereby showing to all men, that in their impiety [Arianism] they had dared to attack none other but the Lord, so in these proceedings [against

episcopal throne and Eucharistic table] also they were again attempting to do dishonor unto him."¹⁹ It will be noted that the numinous presence in the ark of the Old Covenant is here associated with the Eucharistic table of the New Covenant and the episcopal throne connected therewith.

From a consciousness of participating together in the Body of Christ through the Eucharist, the Nicenes were at all times aware of a superior power energizing them in opposing the foes of Christ's full Deity. The corporal imagery is vivid, particularly in Lucifer of Cagliari's *De non conveniendo cum haereticis* which vigorously defends the Catholic refusal to go along with Constantius' policy of intercommunion in the interests of secular peace. The rude bishop of Sardinia acquainted the would-be philosopher king that Christianity was more than a school of philosophical monotheism, indeed that it was a peculiar cultic community with a sense of solidarity tenaciously uniting all like-minded believers in time and space, defiant of all efforts to derogate from the honor due their jealous Deity. Paganism had for some time been moving toward a philosophical monotheism, assimilating the local and national deities to the Supreme God, symbolized by the sun. This solar monotheism was tolerant of the local cultic practices, reinvigorating them by ascribing to them a universal significance and making it possible for the simple and the sophisticated to be reunited in a common religious life. Arianism was the Christian analogue of this trend, eager to discharge what it regarded as the political and social assignment of religion. But Nicene Christianity was exclusive and intolerant on the cultic no less than on the theological level. The liturgical counterpart of the Nicene defense of the full deity of the Son was the Nicene exclusion of Arians from communion. The Arianizers for the most part strove for intercommunion.²⁰ The *sōma tēs basileias*²¹ was of greater moment than the Body of Christ. From the Eucharistic solidarity of the Nicenes we pass to other forms of ecclesiastical solidarity which were christologically sustained and defended.

C. THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE PRIESTLY AND THE PROPHETIC ROLE OF THE BISHOP

Within their own churches and before the emperors and the great officers of State, the Catholic and the Arian bishops demeaned themselves differently. The Catholic bishops seemed to have preserved more of the Ante-Nicene organic relationship to the local church and its tradition than the Arians. In undergirding their episcopal authority, the Catholic bishops traced their spiritual lineage to the *earthly* Christ through the Apostles and to the *eternal* Christ through the priests and significantly also through the prophets of the Old Covenant whom He had raised up. The Nicenes were history-minded.²² The Arians, in contrast, seeing in the emperor an instrument of the Eternal Logos, were

disposed to regard imperial appointments or the imperial approval of their elections as the necessary validation of their episcopal authority.²³ The historical succession from the historical Christ was less important for the Arian bishops than for the more conservative Catholics, who constantly emphasized apostolic tradition and apostolic law.²⁴ Here too, then, in the matter of polity and order, the distinction between the cosmological and soteriological emphases in the two main christological positions has relevance for the relation between *imperium* and *sacerdotium*.

Lucifer of Cagliari, for example, in *De non conveniundo haereticis* excoriates Constantius for tearing limbs, i.e. bishops, from the body of Christ. The Emperor himself is addressed as a member cut off from the body of the blessed Church now that, from being a Christian, he has turned Arian.²⁵ For the moment, Lucifer seems to forget that the unbaptized Emperor could not be a member in either case. But it is quite possible that Lucifer is thinking of all Arians, especially the Arian bishops, whom he calls *pseudoepiscopi*,²⁶ personified in their imperial spokesman, as cut off from the Body. Association with these Gentiles²⁷ or again, in another context, these Jews,²⁸ is for Catholics impossible and least of all in the fellowship of the Eucharistic elements. Lucifer, an extremist in the Nicene camp to be sure, identifying Christ (= Logos) with the theophanies of the Old Testament, proceeds to treat as "Gentiles" without the Law the Arians, who are at the same time "Judaizers" for denying the full deity of Christ! Lucifer's biblicism, notable in its predilection for the more rugged parts of the Old Testament, is never confused or refined by overmuch philosophical speculation, with the result that for him Christ is God. Only as legate of the Pope would this peasant bishop²⁹ make the philosophical accommodations³⁰ deemed necessary in polite theological circles, Nicene and Arian. In his unsophisticated espousal of the *homoousion*, Lucifer had, exegetically and devotionally, if not philosophically, read, said, and sung *Christ* where the Old Testament has *Lord* or *God*.³¹ And in this he was probably more representative of the less tutored Western bishops than the more philosophically schooled divines whose writings have survived. Whereas the Arians by 344 (the Macrostich) were content to understand the Son as simply similar to God (*homoios*) and the God they meant was, in effect, the Supreme God of pagan eclectic piety, the extreme Nicene Lucifer was insisting upon the oneness of the Eternal Christ and the jealous God of the Old Testament. On being pressed, to be sure, the Arians will have quickly pointed to their transcendent God in the Old Testament, and Lucifer, for his part, will have assented to a philosophical definition of the Godhead, but the forced acknowledgments on either side will not have obscured the fact that the Arians had another spirit from the Nicenes. Through the Eucharistic Christ, Lucifer felt himself cove-

nanted with God's ongoing Israel who, as such, constituted theologically, culturally and organizationally an unassimilable body in the Empire. The history which this resentful provincial pored over, reliving vicariously, was not to be found in the annals of the *populus Romanus* but in the epic of the *populus electus*.

Lucifer felt himself standing stalwartly in the ancient prophetic succession. Athanasius called him the Elijah "temporibus nostris."³³ Lucifer could summon to his pen with alacrity and cunning the great passages depicting the prophetic rebuke of kings. Constantius, for example, had reminded Lucifer of the many scriptural verses enjoining obedience to those in authority. Lucifer responded with a cascade of texts proving that a king must be righteous if he is to be obeyed and pointed out the many passages overlooked by Constantius bidding the ruler to obey the priests of the Lord.³³ Moreover, while Lucifer insists on doctrinal and moral purity in a ruler as a precondition of Christian obedience, even then he guards against any improper interference of a Christian, however orthodox, in the affairs of the Church. Constantius may claim to have divine authority and to be superior to bishops,³⁴ bishop of bishops, Lucifer adds contemptuously, but let him be reminded that the very Christ whom he denies has given all bishops the power of the keys, that whatsoever they should bind on earth will be bound in heaven, that therefore even a profane emperor is subject to the bishops.³⁶ Here, be it noted that all bishops share in the power of the keys, not merely the bishop of Rome.³⁷ Also that the derivation of episcopal authority from the historic Christ and the experiential Holy Spirit, both consubstantial with the Supreme God, imparted confidence and courage to Lucifer and his fellow bishops. The Arians could at best derive their apostolic authority from a demigod and were in consequence inclined to yield to the will of the God-ordained ruler. In the eyes of Lucifer they were pseudobishops because where two or three of them gathered, Christ, fully God, was not among them.³⁸ Also, in their denial of the full Deity of the Holy Spirit, they could not be channels of the Spirit and on this count also they were false bishops.

Hilary of Poitiers calls his Arian adversary a "lying bishop of the new apostolate," who in making Christ a creature would deprive the Church, his kingdom, of those keys which the episcopate obtained through Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ fully God.³⁹ Athanasius calls the Arians "pretended bishops."⁴⁰ It was Ambrose of Milan, however, who clearly developed the Nicene conception of a true bishop by tracing episcopal authority to the historic Christ of the New Testament and the Eternal Christ functioning through the prophets of the Old. At the same time, Ambrose was more respectful of Roman rulers than was Lucifer. He was, indeed, emphatic in his recognition of the divinely ordained role of the Roman Empire; and, of course, much of

his skill and courage as a churchman can be traced to his previous experience as a civil servant.⁴¹

Early in the Ante-Nicene period the bishop had assimilated prophecy to the episcopal office of teaching. From the charismatic *foretelling* it had become, as a result of the Gnostic crisis, authoritative *retelling*. Now in the religio-political crisis attending the Arian controversy, prophecy becomes once again a *forthtelling* as it was, so often, in the Old Testament. The *episcopus* is both a *sacerdos* and a *propheta*. Ambrose in a letter to his sister clearly sets forth his conviction that both the stern, prophetic rebuke and the healing, priestly ministry are combined in the episcopal office. Referring to the rod of the almond tree in Jeremiah 1:11, he observes that the priest and the prophet must proclaim things, bitter and hard like the almond husk, but inside is the sweetness of the nut; the rod itself is straight and harsh, yet after a time, like Aaron's rod, it will blossom.⁴² The authority of the *sacerdos* is derived by apostolic succession from the earthly Christ, the authority of the episcopal *propheta* stems from the Eternal Christ. In Elijah, who worsted the priests of Baal on Mt. Carmel, Ambrose beholds the union of the two vocations. In the calling down of fire to consume the sacrifice, Ambrose sees the Old Covenant counterpart of his own act as *sacerdos* in summoning the Holy Spirit to the Christian altar.⁴³ In the rebuke of Ahab and Jezebel he finds a parallel for his denunciation of Valentinian II and his Arian mother.⁴⁴ The authority of the bishop, while greatly enhanced by personal rectitude does not, according to Ambrose, depend upon his own merits, but upon the merits of the priest Elijah and the merits of Peter also and of Paul and ultimately of Christ, for "where his mysteries are, does he vouchsafe to impart his presence."⁴⁵ One may make a further observation. Elijah was concerned to demonstrate that Yahweh was the lord not only of the hosts of Israel but also of nature, the latter hitherto regarded as solely within the special competence of the local agricultural deity. Ambrose, his successor, struggled with the priests of Arianism to proclaim that Christ is Lord not only of Salvation but also of the State, the Lord not only of Calvary but also of the Capitol.⁴⁶ If it is as Elijah that Ambrose rebukes a Valentinian II, it is commonly in the mantle of Nathan that he rebukes an orthodox emperor like Theodosius. Or again, he identifies himself with Naboth and the Church of Christ with Naboth's vineyard. In defending his patrimony against Valentinian's efforts to procure a single basilica for the Arians, Ambrose appeals to his predecessors in Milan, especially Bishop Dionysius⁴⁷ who died in exile after the Arian bishop Valens had taken from his hand the pen with which he was about to sign, contrary to the strategy of Constantius, a Nicene declaration during the Arianizing council of Milan in 355.⁴⁸ Ambrose sums up his prophetic conviction very well in a letter to the Orthodox Theodosius: And there is nothing in a priest so full of peril

as regards God, or so base in the opinion of men, as not freely to declare what he thinks.⁴⁹

The calm self-confidence of the Nicene episcopate comes out again clearly in Basil of Caesarea's retort to the prefect Modestus, who had been despatched by the Emperor Valens to force the Bishop of Caesarea into a program of Arianization: "Perhaps you have not met a bishop before."⁵⁰

All these bishops felt a solidarity with their own local church and tradition, in contrast to the Arians. The Western bishops, it should be noted, continued to be elected by their own churches. They resisted the practice of translation. The Arians were more commonly the appointees of the emperor⁵¹ and were not reluctant to be translated to larger sees. Arian councils attenuated the bonds between the bishop and his people by restricting the role of the local church in episcopal election in favor of the provincial synod.⁵² In adapting Church organization to the political divisions of the Empire, the Arians seemed ever ready to give the emperor the right of the Church.⁵³ Arian bishops also seem to have been quite happy away from their sees at councils, at court, or at the front.⁵⁴ The Nicenes, for their part, understandably developed a great dislike of councils and visits to court and often importuned the emperor to permit them to rejoin their sees. They were unsettled by the frequent councils which obliged them to decide matters of faith, order, and discipline without the support of their local councils of presbyters.⁵⁵ Eusebius of Vercelli had to be especially summoned to the nearby council in Milan in 355. The bishops of Rome preferred to be represented even at nearby councils by legates.

The Nicene bishops frequently emerge as heroes of their own peoples (*laoi*).⁵⁶ The Roman populace rallied to the defense of Liberius⁵⁷ and after he was spirited away would have nothing to do with the Arian appointee, Felix,⁵⁸ demanding from Constantius the return of their rightful bishop, as the Emperor entered the Colosseum for the vicennial games. Ambrose was supported by the "*pataria*" of Milan as was Hildebrand centuries later when a not dissimilar issue was to the fore in the investiture controversy. Ambrose himself declared before his parish that though he was in the place of a father to them individually, collectively they were his parents.⁵⁹ From the day of his inspired election to the end of his episcopate Ambrose was a spokesman for, and a defender of, his people. Conscious of this solidarity with them (and his fellow bishops), Ambrose told Valentinian that his people would not allow him in the imperial consistory, declaring that matters of faith ought to be treated in the church and in their presence.⁶⁰ Athanasius was likewise a popular hero with at least an important section of the population of Alexandria on the occasion of his triumphal returns to his episcopal throne.⁶¹ The election of successors to Athanasius by Arian synods sitting

outside Alexandria represented a serious break in the older tradition which closely connected the bishop with his people "according to the ecclesiastical canons and the direction of Paul."⁶² Athanasius charges Constantius with inventing a new kind of appointment, sending "from strange places, distant a fifty days' journey, bishops attended by soldiers to people unwilling to receive them."⁶³ In Constantinople, sedition arose from the people in their eagerness to defend their bishop, the Nicene Paul, banished for the fourth time in 350.⁶⁴ In Milan, when during the council of 355, Valens as the executor of the imperial policy humiliated the local bishop, Dionysius, the people (*plebes, populi*) arose in protest, necessitating the transference of the synod from the church (*e domini-co*) to the palace.⁶⁵

As Gregory Dix has brilliantly demonstrated,⁶⁶ the fourth century was seeing the breakup of the old solidarity between the bishop and his people. The Ante-Nicene view that the bishop, the deacon, and the collegiate presbyterate each had its special liturgy within the organic whole was being greatly altered as the Church faced the greatly enlarged responsibilities of the new age. With the formation of new parishes in a city and the assignment of a presbyter to represent the bishop therein, the collegiate character of the presbyterate was gradually lost to view, the presbyter becoming by delegation in effect a *sacerdos*, while the bishop, with the greatly extended administrative responsibilities, was in danger of losing something of his originally sacerdotal character. The Arian bishops with their concern for the new political assignment of the Church were interested in administration. They were perhaps more alert than the Nicenes to the urgency of adapting the ecclesiastical machinery to the enlarged political opportunities and responsibilities.⁶⁷ It is understandable that with their apologetic concern to win fresh converts from paganism, theological discussion commended itself to their attention more than the liturgical ordinances. Lucifer, in contrast, represents the Nicene feeling when he declares that the mystery of faith may only be known in the fellowship of the church, and Ambrose is against mere discussions, especially in a palace.⁶⁸ The Eucharist would in any event mean less to the Arians than to the Nicenes, given the relative importance each side assigned to the historic Christ.

Assembled data do not yet warrant the generalization, but I should like to suggest that further inquiry will disclose a much greater ecclesiological conservatism on the part of the Nicenes, who in holding fast to an at times almost modalist Christo-centric theism, were fortified in their faith by that older organic Eucharistic fellowship which could regard the *local* church as at once the Body of Christ, the reassembled Israel, and Jerusalem descending.

Moreover, as the Christian *laos* imperceptibly coalesced with the *dēmos* of each town, in consequence of the rapid enlargement of church

membership from the populace (the aristocratic remnants cherished the older religion longest) the bishop came to feel himself to be the spokesman of the entire city or municipality whose liberties and corporate life were more and more threatened by the increasing imperial bureaucracy. Significantly, the Nicene bishops at Sardica appealed to Constantius not only for the liberty of the Church from the pressure of Arianizing imperial officials but also for the freedom of all citizens.⁶⁹ The ancient *civitas* had found in the elected *sacerdos-propheta* of the local *ecclesia* its inspired *defensor* over against the vast imperial *Polis*.¹⁰ The support given their elective bishops by the city populace and their sullen and occasionally tumultuous resistance to the imperially intruded Arian appointees are an indication of the extent to which Nicene convictions may have been intertwined with local and nationalist sentiment as against the cosmopolitanism of the Arian parties.

As the pre-Galerian distinction between the Christian *laos* (*theou*) and the city *dēmos* was gradually obliterated by the phenomenal growth in church membership, it fell almost entirely to the conservative bishops (and the monks) to witness to the older conviction about the separateness of the Church and the world. The Arian bishops, in contrast, were at once more responsive than the often obstinate Nicenes to the social and cultural assignment laid upon the Church by imperial recognition to accommodate the faith to the needs of an enlightened world and hence more exposed than many of the Nicenes to the still partly pagan influences of the court. In the course of the fourth century divergent conceptions of the nature and mission of the Church and more particularly of the episcopate found expression in divergent conceptions, only half-articulated, of the proper composition and competence of councils.

The fourth century resounded with the clamor of conciliar debate over the relation of the Son to the Father, but scarcely less important, behind the scenes, was the mounting concern over the proper relation of these very councils themselves to the Christian emperor⁷¹ as creed and canon were more and more seen to be the dogmatic transcripts of imperial opinion. On the authority of the episcopate assembled in council the Nicenes were demonstrably more conservative than the Arians. In their view, the Christian laity (the faithful and the catechumens), to say nothing of heretics and pagans, lacked that fulness of the apostolic Spirit in which the magisterium of the episcopate resided. Athanasius, through his Egyptian synod, denounced the Council of Tyre in 335 as invalid because it was held under lay auspices. He repeatedly criticized Arians for using external power to force their views. He rejoiced in the prospect of a Roman council free from imperial interference,⁷² and at length declared, as if forgetting the role of Constantine at Nicaea:

When did a judgment of the Church receive its validity from the em-

peror: or rather when was his decree ever recognized by the Church? There have been many councils held heretofore; and many judgments passed by the Church; but the Fathers never sought the consent of the emperor thereto, nor did the emperor busy himself with the affairs of the Church.⁷³

As Hagel has shown,⁷⁴ Athanasius moved all the way from the original Nicene acceptance of the Christian emperor's right to call an ecumenical council, to judge in matters of faith and discipline, and to interfere in local affairs of the Church—through an intermediate “theory” of a free Church protected by the State—to an insistence, as above, upon the complete independence of a council from the emperor (more particularly his commissaries), the only real function remaining to him being to summon the council. Moreover, Athanasius had come to feel that a synod need not be ecumenical to be authoritative and he vigorously opposed the Arian view that faith could be decided ever anew by majority decisions.

Pope Julius in his council of 340/1, as Erich Caspar has shown,⁷⁵ tried abortively to establish the principle of ecumenicity under purely ecclesiastical auspices. Julius reminded the Arians that general acceptance by the local church or at least the representative churches like Rome was a time-honored way in which canons were validated and that if any problem arose beyond the competence of a local church (Alexandria), by custom (reference to the Dionysii) the matter should be referred to Rome, surely not to an imperially coerced synod.⁷⁶ But overconfident of a Nicene success at Sardica under the protection of Constans, enough of the Nicenes were eventually constrained to go along with a doubly imperial council to force the abandonment of Julius' resuscitated principle of ecclesiastical autonomy. Moreover, Athanasius, though hard-pressed, was jealous of Roman prestige and preferred a conciliar to a Roman synodal decision. Pope Liberius, however, gave voice once again to the principle of purely ecclesiastical ecumenicity in his famous colloquy with Constantius. The Pope had been demanding the reinstatement of all exiled bishops in their sees and a general reaffirmation of the faith of Nicaea before assenting to a new council sitting in judgment on Athanasius. When the court bishop, Epictetus, retorted that there would not be sufficient imperial carriages for such an assembly, Liberius replied that ecclesiastical affairs could be very well transacted without government aid.⁷⁷

Lucifer of Cagliari, for his part, denied the right of an emperor to undo accepted canons and tradition, to dissolve on his authority the authority of Scriptures which it was rather for the bishops, tracing their credentials back to Christ, to interpret.⁷⁸ Lucifer makes specific, moreover, the derivation of his authority from the Holy Spirit⁷⁹ by virtue of which he, as a bishop, must “speak, exhort, and rebuke with all authority” (Titus 2:15) the wilful Emperor, demanding that he heed

the *sacerdos Dei* (= *episcopus*) and live according to the precepts of sacred law (=the Bible).⁸⁰ Lucifer's fellow resisters at Milan, stretching forth their hands to God, threatened Constantius with the day of Christ's judgment and warned him against infringing ecclesiastical order and mingling Roman sovereignty with the constitution of the Church.⁸¹ As Hagel remarks, the whole *Historia Arianorum* is one long indictment of Constantius and the Arians for despising the apostolic *kanones* and the *paradosis*.⁸² Constantius is Antichrist,^{83a} a giant^{83b} setting himself up against the Most High by transgressing the ordinances of the Lord given the episcopate through his Apostles,^{83c} by presiding in ecclesiastical causes—"the abomination of desolation,"^{83d} by changing laws, by altering the customs of the Church, and by inventing a new kind of appointment (*katastasis*).⁸⁴ Ambrose later reminded Auxentius and his imperial patrons that "in the consistory Christ is not wont to be the accused but the judge" and that "the cause of faith should be pleaded in the church."⁸⁵ He appears to have called a small council of bishops in his church during the basilica controversy and in several places vigorously defended the autonomy of church councils.⁸⁶ The orthodox, threatened by one imperial council after another, were hard put to it to preserve the Nicene formula without at the same time granting the legitimacy of repeated imperial councils, intent upon restatements or, in Nicene eyes, perilous simplifications of dogma. W. Seston has suggested indeed that the much discussed title of "bishop of those outside" represents an adaptation of the Eusebian account in the interest of toning down the influence of Constantine at Nicaea in the face of Constantius' claims to authority over the Church.⁸⁷ In defending the independence of the Church, the later Nicenes idealized Nicaea and stressed the presidency of the Holy Spirit during its sessions.⁸⁸ It is possible that the growing Catholic concern to insist upon the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, in the Arian controversy, is to be connected with the Catholic concern to dissociate orthodoxy from its imperial connections. As the official conduits of the Holy Spirit, assembled bishops were obviously enhanced in their collective authority over against the emperor or his representatives by further defining the full deity of the Spirit.

To sum up this section on ecclesiastical solidarity: By attaching more importance than the Arians to the historic Christ and the Eucharist instituted in commemoration of his death, the Nicenes preserved something of the Ante-Nicene sense of the solidarity of the local Eucharistic fellowship and the organic relationship of the bishop to his people as all together a royal priesthood and a priestly kingdom,⁸⁹ the local embodiment of Christ and as such the ongoing Israel of God through the New Covenant in Christ's Blood. Conscious, moreover, that their apostolic and prophetic authority derived from Christ whom they held to be fully God, the bishops on the Nicene side displayed consider-

able courage in opposing Arianizing emperors and their Arian court bishops. In the end it was precisely the high Nicene conception of the priestly office that made the bishop prophetic.

In insisting on the consubstantiality of the Head of which they were the Body, the Nicenes were also defending the inviolability of the Church. That the Head of the Church is also the King of kings is the next christological aspect of fourth century ecclesio-political relations to be developed.

D. THE HEADSHIP AND THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST

Two interrelated points of contention between the Catholics and the Arians remain for discussion:

All parties accepted Christ as Head of the Church, but the Catholics, in insisting on the full deity of the Head, were at the same time procuring the immunity of his ecclesiastical Body to infiltrations of any improper influence from the imperial *pontifex maximus*, however Christian his professions. Consubstantial with God, very God of very God, their Head was also the King of kings and effectual Protector of the Church.⁹⁰ The Arians for their part in denying the full deity of Christ were more inclined to emphasize the fact that while Christ is the head of man, God is the head of Christ, and that in consequence the God-enthroned ruler is superior to the bishops instituted by Christ.

And another closely allied theologico-political correlation is faintly discernible in the surviving controversial literature. For all parties the Church is the fellowship of those who by rebirth in Christ are by anticipation subjects of Christ's Kingdom. But the Arians were disposed to see in the Christian Empire the earthly counterpart or image of the Heavenly Kingdom of the Supreme God. The Catholics, contending for the full deity of Christ, in one way or another insisted on the identity of the Kingdom of God and Christ's Kingdom in such a way as to enhance the significance of the Church as the primary bearer or reflection of the Eternal Kingdom.

To restate the positions schematically: The Catholics held that the Head of their Church was also the Lord of the Empire and that his Kingdom, of which the Church is the earthly apanage, is eternal, since it is one with the Kingdom of the Father. The Arians held that the emperor, as the instrument of (the Supreme) God, is the head of the Church founded by the Logos incarnate, Christ, for the Empire is the earthly transcript of the Kingdom of the God unto whom Christ will deliver up his own (I Cor. 15, 24ff.) As we have seen the Arianizers were for the most part pleased to derive the authority of the emperor from (the Supreme) God or the Eternal Logos. The Nicenes tended to be more historic and specified Christ, the Logos incarnate. They were not satisfied, it would appear, with a vague divine sanction of the imperial authority. This very vagueness it was which encouraged the Arianizers

in the perpetuation of pagan notions of royal absolutism. The Nicenes, by personalizing, historicizing, biblicizing, in other words by defining royal authority in expressly Christian terms, contrived to hold the emperor under a specifically Christian judgment. It was a corollary of their position that Christ's spokesmen, the bishops, who could trace their divine credentials back to the historic Christ, were his chosen prophets to remind, to exhort, and, on occasion, to rebuke the God-ordained rulers in the New Covenant, to judge Christian rulers on the basis of apostolic tradition and biblical law—*known* law as distinguished from imperial fiat. For the Catholics, the emperor was not the fountainhead of religious authority. He was not the *lex animata* for the Church.

Lucifer of Cagliari, for example, fiercely contrasts the *divina lex, iura . . . tradita nobis* [the episcopate] and the *auctoritas regalis*.⁹¹ Lucifer's courage is reinforced by a further conviction shared by the Catholics that the Arians will be one day judged by the very Christ whose plenary authority over the Church and the State they currently deny.⁹² Lucifer is likewise spirited in his insistence on the eternity of Christ's kingdom.⁹³ Athanasius had once written of the Empire as under the Word but then more concretely as under Christ.⁹⁴ St. Anthony, the hermit supporter of Athanasius—after first declining even to respond to the courteous inquiries of the three imperial sons of Constantine—was at length persuaded to give answer and thereupon asserted that Christ alone is the true eternal King, enjoining the rulers therefore to be merciful, to give heed to justice, and to the poor.⁹⁵ Ambrose elaborated, as we shall presently see, this common Nicene contention that the Empire stood specifically under Christ. Hence his great pronouncement that the emperor is in the Church and subject to its moral discipline as administered by Christ's prophet-priests; for, as he says in another connection: "The City of God is the Church and the Church is the Body of Christ; whosoever despises the laws of the Celestial City, sins against heaven and violates the sanctity of the immaculate Body by the filth of their vices."⁹⁶ And since the Church is at once Christ's Kingdom and his Body, it is clearly appropriate to insist upon the consubstantiality of the Divine Head.

From the abundance of the later Nicene literature refuting the Arian interpretation of the texts concerning the Headship of Christ, it seems likely that the Arians had used them in support not only of the inferiority of Christ to the Father but also of the inferiority of Christ's Body, the Church, to the Empire. For a fundamental question, though seldom distinctly articulated, had long pressed for an answer. Was it primarily of the Church as *sōma* or of the Empire as *sōma* or of the whole of creation as the cosmic *bōdy* that the Logos-Christ was the Head, the King, and the animating *dunamis*? Was Christ the Redeemer Head both of the redeemed and of the *natural* order? There may be al-

ready a trace of this concern in Athanasius' *In illud* "*Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre*"⁹⁷ and in *Contra gentes*.⁹⁸ Basil of Caesarea comes nearer to the ecclesio-political implications of the texts when he argues that the emperor can at best claim to be an image of the heavenly King by grace, whereas Christ is the image of God by identity of nature. Moreover Christ, the divine Head of the Church, is King over all, for the Father has subjected all things under him in making him Head over the Church (Eph. 1:22).⁹⁹ In refuting the Arian Eunomius in connection with Col. 1:15-18, Basil insisted that Christ is consubstantial with God and that it is as God, not as Man, that he is Head of the Church.¹⁰⁰ Eunomius had contended in his *Liber apologeticus* for the preeminence of God the Father and the unity of his monarchy, citing I Cor. 15:28 on the eventual delivery of Christ's Kingdom to God.¹⁰¹ Hilary of Poitiers suggests the extent and the nature of the Arian exploitation of I Cor. 15 and allied texts¹⁰² and with great exegetical skill argues that Christ will not deliver up "*suum regnum*" in the sense of his Rule but rather the Kingdom in the sense of "*us* who have been made the Kingdom by the glorifying of his body"¹⁰³ "in that community [*ea communione*," the Church] by which he [in his manhood and in his role as a slave] is our brother."¹⁰⁴

Ambrose of Milan amply documents the later Nicene concern for maintaining, in the interest of ecclesiastical independence, both the consubstantial deity of the Head of the Church and the eternity of his Kingdom. Ambrose attacked what he regarded as the Arian misuse of I Cor. 11:3 which seems to subordinate Christ to God, as man to Christ, and woman to man. The Christ, he retorts, who comes to the true believer in baptismal and Eucharistic faith, the Christ for whom the gates of faith are lifted up, is a royal Christ, "not such a Christ as the Arians take him to be—petty, and weak, and menial—but Christ in the form of God."¹⁰⁵ Only in respect to Christ's manhood is God the Head of Christ and furthermore, it is God and not more specifically the Father whom Paul describes as the Head of Christ. And "by this account of him we do not take aught from his sovereignty, but attribute compassion to him."¹⁰⁶ Through his taking our flesh, and through his ascension, Christians are suffered in his Person to sit at the right hand of the Father. "For he is the Head of the Church, in whom our common nature according to the flesh has merited the right to the heavenly throne."¹⁰⁷ In this confidence we can well understand the sources of Ambrose' courage when he declared: "I feared the Lord of the universe more than an earthly emperor."¹⁰⁸

In another place¹⁰⁹ Ambrose is concerned to refute the implications of the exegetical point made by the Arians that Stephen in his vision saw Christ standing as his advocate before the heavenly throne.¹¹⁰ In this role of Advocate he would clearly appear to be inferior to the Fa-

ther sitting on the throne. Ambrose cites other passages depicting Christ as likewise sitting and concludes: "He sits as Judge of the quick and the dead; he stands as his people's Advocate. He stood, then, as a Priest, whilst he was offering to his Father the sacrifice of a good martyr."¹¹¹ Elsewhere Ambrose writes: "Let him then be standing for you, that you may not be afraid of him sitting; for when sitting he judges . . ."¹¹² Back of these allusions is the ancient imagery according to which the emperors and gods sit in the exercise of *justicia*.¹¹³ Ambrose is contending for the principle that Christ is both Judge and Advocate, both King and Priest. Ambrose and the Nicenes continually warn the emperor that the priestly Church will be one day associated with the judicial King at the Last Assize. There are indications that it is as Judge primarily that Christ guides the Christian emperors, while it is as Intercessor and Advocate that he fulfills his function of eternal High Priest, Advocate of mankind, the Head of the renewed humanity, which is the Church.

The consubstantiality of Christ as the Judge of the Empire is the point Ambrose is arguing in the following passage:

Howbeit, if our adversaries [the Arians] cannot be turned by kindness, let us summon them before the Judge. To what Judge, then shall we go? Surely to him who hath the Judgment. To the Father, then? Nay, but 'the Father judgeth no man, for he hath given all judgment to the Son.' He hath given, that is to say, not as of largess, but in the act of generation.¹¹⁴

Christ is Judge not by the formal bestowal of that prerogative as from a superior, but by his very nature. Judgeship is the Son's as much as is his filial status within the Godhead. Judgeship and Sonship alike are coincident with his generation which is according to Nicaea, eternal. Ambrose continues with the argument that judgment is no inferior office of the Godhead.¹¹⁵ The command or invitation to be seated at the right hand can be understood as implying the inferiority of the *Body* of the glorified God-Man and not at all the eternal *Son*.

It is with regard, then, to Christ's Body [Ambrose continues] that the Father saith: 'Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'¹¹⁶

That this whole discussion of the "standing" and the "seated" Christ is connected in the Bishop's mind with Christ's Headship of the Church and his sovereignty over the Empire, both being related to his Kingdom, is revealed in a paragraph shortly preceding the foregoing selection. Ambrose has been contending with the Arians about their falsely construed subordination of the Son in the Incarnation and Passion and says:

Even in the very hour of mockery and insult, acknowledge his Godhead [thou Arian]. He hung upon the Cross, and all the elements did him homage. The sun withdrew its rays, the daylight vanished, darkness came down and covered the land, the earth trembled; yet he who hung there trembled not. What was it that these signs betokened, but rever-

ence for the Creator? That he hangs upon the Cross—this, thou Arian, thou regardest; that he gives the Kingdom of God—this thou regardest not. That he tasted of death, thou readest, but that he also invited the robber into paradise, to this thou givest no heed.¹¹⁷

Ambrose is particularly resourceful in refuting the implications of I Cor. 15:24 ff. (Christ's redelivery of his Kingdom), exploited by the Arians to subordinate the Son to the Father and presumably, also, to subordinate the Church to the Empire. Ambrose argues that the Kingdom which Christ has received and will one day deliver to the Father is that which he has acquired as the incarnate Son, i.e., as the Son of Man¹¹⁸—"a kingdom from us, to whom he says: 'The kingdom of God is within you.'"¹¹⁹ Christ in his humanity, in his role of Servant, is, of course, subordinate to God.¹²⁰ As a Servant, he established the Church. Christians are therefore fellow servants with Christ, by his aid perfecting themselves while on earth:

Therefore we are now under Christ's rule, whilst we are in the body not yet stripped of the form of a servant . . . But when we shall see his glory, which he had before the world was, we shall be in the Kingdom of God . . .¹²¹

Nevertheless, there is essentially only one Kingdom. How can the Arians, he asks angrily,

suppose the Kingdom of the Father and the Son [in his divinity] to be divided, when the Lord [himself] hath said . . . : 'Every kingdom divided against itself shall be speedily overthrown'?²²

In this Kingdom God (the Father) and Christ (as the eternal Son of God) co-rule. "It is not the same thing to rule as to serve; but Christ is both a King and a son of a King. The Son of God therefore is not a servant."¹²³ Christ in his deity is not subordinate to the Father, while the *perfected* Kingdom of the Son of Man i.e., the Church Triumphant, becomes coterminous with the Kingdom of God:

In the Kingdom of the Son the Father also reigns; and in the Kingdom of the Father the Son also reigns; for the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father . . . Thus as there is one dwelling, so also there is one Kingdom. Yea, and so far is the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son one, that the Father receives what the Son delivers, and the Son does not lose what the Father receives. Thus in the one Kingdom there is a unity of power. Let no one therefore sever the Godhead between the Father and the Son.¹²⁴

Ambrose acknowledges, then, the subordination of the earthly Church to the Kingdom of God as the body of the imperfect Christians to the heavenly assembly of already perfected saints. But this is only a temporary subordination consequent upon the nature of redemption and the God-Man's dual role therein. Christ as self-sacrificial Servant and as heavenly Advocate struggling along with and for his own on earth and Christ as God glorying in the fully redeemed saints above is at once the cosmic psychopomp and, with the Father, coruler of the universe.

Ambrose is angered and alarmed lest the Arian's low esteem of this august Christ and their failure to glimpse his sovereignty should effect the ruin of the Empire in the West as their impiety had already brought disaster upon the Empire of the East under the Arian Valens, so wretchedly defeated at Adrianople.

After applying the vision of Ezekiel concerning the descent of God to the gods, Ambrose expressly attributes the collapse of Rome in the East to this affront to the Majesty of Christ in the Emperor's espousal of Arianism.¹²⁵ At this point Ambrose clearly expresses his sense of Christian and Imperial solidarity and the community of sinfulness when in prophetic tones, he interprets the debacle at Adrianople as the collective chastisement of the new imperial Israel for unfaithfulness to the Lord. He entreats the eternal Christ in prayer :

Enough, yea, more than enough, Almighty God, have we now atoned for the deaths of confessors [perpetrated by the Arians], the banishments of priests, and the guilt of wickedness so overweening, by our own blood, our own banishment—sufficiently plain is it that they, who have broken faith, cannot be safe. Turn again, O Lord, and set up the banners of thy faith. No military eagles, no flight of birds, here lead the van of our army, but thy Name, Lord Jesus, and thy worship.¹²⁶

Then the thoughts of the Nicene Bishop merge with those of the Italian patriot, as he thinks of his beloved and grievously imperilled homeland :

Show forth now a plain sign of thy Majesty [he implores], that he [Gratian] who believes thee to be the true Lord of Hosts, and Captain of the armies of heaven, he who believes that thou art the true Power and Wisdom of God, no Being of time nor of creation, but even as it is written, the Eternal Power and Divinity of God, may, upheld by the aid of thy might supreme, win the prize of victory for his faith.¹²⁷

Here the military and political power of Christ's consubstantiality with the Supreme God is stated emphatically, but all too prudentially.

In his *De obitu Theodosii*, Ambrose gives particularly florid expression to the Nicene view that the emperor is under Christ and subject to Christian restraints. I refer to his famous elaboration of the political significance of Helen's discovery of the Cross under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and her inspired insertion of a nail therefrom into the diadem of the Emperor and her fashioning of a bridle, both symbols of Christian restraint :

Helen has done wisely who has placed such a diadem on the head of sovereigns, in order that the Cross of Christ may be adored among kings. That is not presumption but piety, since it was consecrated to our holy redemption. Therefore, honorable is the nail of the Roman Empire which rules the whole world and adorns the forehead of princes, in order that they may be preachers who were accustomed to be persecutors. Rightly is the nail on the head, that where the intelligence is, there a guard may be. On the forehead a crown; in the hands reins. A crown made from the Cross, that power may rule, and that there may be just moderation, not unjust caprice.¹²⁸

By the end of the fourth century a prophet-bishop is able to assert—rhetorically but not inaccurately, mindful as he was of several successfully administered rebukes of the Emperor—to assert confidently that the Nicene (-Constantinopolitan) Theodosius was a *subject* of *Christ*. Earlier in the century court bishop Eusebius had somewhat more rhetorically hailed the “Nicene” Constantine, (whom no bishop openly dared reprove despite his egregious transgressions of Christian law) as the *instrument* of the *Supreme God*, raised above men, the imperial counterpart of the cosmic Logos. By this contrast we may measure the progression of the ecclesio-political thought in the course of the momentous struggle over the nature and authority of Christ, the Logos incarnate.

* * *

We may bring to a close this study of the political implications of the Arian controversy by making reference to three coordinate terms distinguished by Hendrik Berkhof in *Kerk en Kaiser*.¹²⁹ Confirmed in his intuitions on the political significance of Christology by his earlier study of Eusebius alone, the Dutch historical theologian Berkhof points out that throughout the fourth century there were three main areas of ecclesio-political concern: theocracy, tolerance, and freedom. Theocracy is the ideal under the compulsion of which the Church¹³⁰ seeks to bring all aspects of society under the sway of the Gospel. Tolerance embraces the attitudes and practices that should result from the recognition by the Church, when truest to its divine mandate, of the spiritual fact that the profession of saving faith must come from inner conviction, not exterior compulsion.¹³¹ Freedom is the independence of the Church from the State, however divine the authority and however orthodox the convictions of the ruler or rulers. The Church of the fourth century was all too easily betrayed by imperial favor—and this proclivity unfortunately reappears in the Western Nicene hero Ambrose—into depreciating the proper claims of tolerance in a disproportionate concern for theocracy. It was only in the course of the Arian controversy that the Church, particularly in the West, regained a sense of the importance of freedom as a safeguard of saving truth. A politically reinforced dogmatic formula which from the Catholic point of view nullified the significance of baptism and the Eucharist, required the Catholics to dissociate the Church from the Empire. More alert to the seriousness of man’s plight than the Arianizers, the Catholics could not be satisfied with a demigod, insisting rather on Christ’s full deity as the only possible basis for redemption from sin and death. As a consequence of their high Christology, the Catholics could not so easily see in the emperor a kind of temporal saviour, coordinate with Christ, nor could they yield to the God-ordained emperor as to a source of authority in matters of faith and order superior to the earthly Christ. Caesar, merely for being a Chris-

tian, could not usurp the place of God. The primary loyalty of the Nicene Christian could be to no other than to the historic *and* eternal Christ, fully God, to the tradition embodied in his Church, and to the consubstantial Holy Spirit suffusing this Church with grace, peculiarly present in the apostolic bishops.¹³² The sense of disparateness between the Christ-founded Church and the God-ordained Empire, recovered in the course of the Arian controversy under Constantius, became a permanent feature of Western Christianity¹³³ even after the reestablishment of Nicene Orthodoxy to imperial favor under Theodosius, as the resounding words of Ambrose testify: "The Emperor is in the Church, not above it."¹³⁴

1 Hendrik Berkhof sees clearly the importance of the cultus for both Constantine and Constantius and observes that Athanasius' theological recalcitrance imperilling the cultic unity was one of the basic reasons for the struggle between him and Constantine:

Für den Kaiser war die Kirche vor allem die Gemeinschaft, welche Gott mit dem richtigen Kult verehrt. Wer den Kult stört, wie es nach Konstantins Auffassung die Donatisten taten, welche die Gültigkeit der kirchlichen Handlungen von der moralischen Qualität des Priesters abhängig machten, ist radikal in seine Schranken zu weisen. Aber aller Streit um ausserhalb des Kultes liegende Dinge ist als ein Streit um Nichtigkeiten so rasch wie möglich abzubrechen.

Kirche und Kaiser, p. 76; cf. also p. 116: "Das Abendmahl war zu einem Opfer entartet . . ."

2 Cf. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, 19.

I have found an exception in the *Decretum* of the Oriental Synod of Sardica, 342/3, preserved among the *Excerpta ex opere historico s. Hilarii deperdito, libris tribus, ut videtur, adversum Valentem et Ursacium*, ed. A. Feder, *C.S.E.L.*, (Vienna, 1916), 48 ff., esp. 58 f. (Hereafter cited as *Fragmenta historica*.) Herein the Easterners are manifestly offended at the thought of Eucharistic fellowship with Marcellus of Ancyra and Athanasius. The two most recent studies of the *Decretum* make no attempt to dispute or even evaluate the facts recounted therein but are concerned solely with the identification of the recipients thereof, among others Donatus of Carthage: M. Achelis, "Eine donatistische Fälschung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLVIII (1929), 344 and Jacques Zeiller, "Donatisme et arianisme des documents du concile arien de Sardique," *Comptes rendus, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres*, 1939, p. 65.

3 Unfortunately Ludwig Biehl, *op.cit.*, in his otherwise important study is unable to throw light on the way in which Arianism may have adapted the liturgy. Eduard Schwartz notes, however, that the monkish Diodorus and Flavian (later bishops of Tarsus and Antioch) surreptitiously introduced into the liturgy of Antioch during the schism a number of phrases making emphatic the consubstantiality of the Son. "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIV (1935), p. 161.

4 *De regibus apostaticis*, 51, 3ff., 58, 13ff

5 Migne, *P. G.*, XLV, col. 273

6 *Apologia contra Arianos*, 11 and 17.

7 Hilary, *Fragmenta historica*, p. 55, 10-25; cf. 53, 15; 60, 20 ff.; 61, 11. In Ancyra, Marcellus replaced Basil, destined to be the leader of the moderate group named after him, the Basilians. The people in this case seem to have sided with Basil. Socrates mentions tumults attending his eviction. Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 23.

8 Lucifer, *De non conveniendo*, 4, 31; 11, 7f; 12, 10; 20, 15, etc.

9 *Ibid.*, 9, 31.

10 *Ibid.*, 17, 20.

11 It may be that Constantius, the unbaptized, demanded the right of communion.

12 *Fragmenta minora, C.S.E.L.*, LXV, 231; cf. also "De Adam" in *Tractatus mysteriorum*, which is a treatise on the Church as Eve (sinful) taking her flesh from Christ (Adam), especially p. 5, 19.

13 *Fragmenta historica*, 183, 4.

14 See the discussion by Holmes Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935), II, 644 ff.

15 *De mysteriis*, ix, 53 f.

16 *Ibid.*, 55, 57. Ambrose recommends daily communion, *Explanatio psalorum, C.E.S.L.*, LXIV, p. 289, 2.

17 Some have supposed that the law envisaged a complete changeover in the West from the decision of 380/1. But Jean-Rémy Palanque and Hans von Campenhausen are in accord that the

- edict was local in its intent and application, being directed almost expressly against Ambrose and his refusal to yield a single building to the Illyrian and Gothic soldiers and officials of Arian persuasion. *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain: contribution à l'histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État à la fin du quatrième siècle* (Paris, 1933), pp. 146 f.; *Ambrosius von Mailand als Kirchenpolitiker*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, XII (Berlin-Leipzig, 1929), p. 260.
- 18 *Contra Auxentium*, 31 f. Cf. ep. xxii, 13, wherein Ambrose speaks of Christ on the altar, the recently translated saints beneath it, and especially *De officiis*, i, 48 (248): . . . here the image; there the truth. . . the image in the Gospel, the truth in heaven. In old times a lamb, a calf was offered. But he is offered as man and as enduring suffering. And he offers himself as a priest to take away our sins, here in an image, there in truth . . . Here, then we walk in an image . . .
- 19 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 56 f.
- 20 To be sure we have examples of excommunication on the Arian side (cf. above, p. 3, n. 2), but on the whole they were the latitudinarians of their time. The demand of Mercurinus-Auxentius that Catholics be rebaptized is atypical. It is an indication that Arianism has entered the sectarian phase, consequent upon the re-establishment of Orthodoxy in 380.
- 21 Cf. Themistius, *Oratio VIII*, 139, 28 ff.
- 22 Cf. George Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History*, XIX (1950), 77. Herein is shown that the Iconoclasts revived for polemical purposes the famous letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to Constantia Augusta, wherein the bishop declares that since the Resurrection no picture of Jesus can have divine significance. The historical Jesus is eclipsed by the eternal Christ, made manifest in each generation, according to the Iconoclasts, in imperial power. On this last point, see G. Ladner, *op.cit.*
- 23 Semi-Arian Eusebius of Caesarea, interestingly, claimed appointment to the episcopate from the Eternal Logos directly.
- 24 Cf. Lucifer, 160, 19: "possetis [Constantius] apostolicam traditionem destruere"; 265, 19; 329, 19: "et numquam mea statuta sed apostolica," defending his action against Constantius. Cf. below, p. 16, n. 91.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 17, 19.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 6, 20; 20, 15.
- 27 The revulsion from the Arians is so intense in *De non conveniendo cum haereticis* that Lucifer tends to identify the heretics led by Constantius as the *ethnici*, *par excellence*, quite overlooking the outright pagans.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 12, 7; 13, 8, etc.
- 29 He scorns the Arians' delight in rhetorical polish (*scientia ethncialium literarum*), 386, 20 and 23.
- 30 It will be recalled that Lucifer and his followers eventually disassociated themselves from the principal Nicenes by rejecting the compromise with the conservative Homoiousians. An intensification of the separatist, puritan tendency of Lucifer's conception of the Church as the remnant of Israel comes out in Jerome's attack on his followers, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*,—11. Cf. G. Krüger, *op. cit.*, 66 ff. We have several times noted the close connection between the rigorist posture and prophetic criticism of the Christian State: i.e. on Origen, *Church History*, Sept. 1951, p. 6, n. 10.
- 31 In connection with II Cor. 6:16 Lucifer asks indignantly: "Quomodo poteris portare deum, Constanti, in corpore tuo, cum apostolicam fidem reiiciendo haereticamque suscipiendo non te illius esse dixeris, cuius se dixerunt patres nostri Abraham Isaac et Iacob, sed et cuncti prophetae apostoli ac martyres?" *De non conveniendo cum haereticis*, 25, 17ff.; cf. 160, 29 f.; 267, 1; 316, 1 f.
- 32 Ep. II, *Ad Luciferum*, C.S.E.L., XIV, 325, 29. The testimony of this letter to contemporary evaluation of Lucifer is only shifted if we accept L. Saltet's thesis that it was a forgery of the Luciferians, "Fraudes littéraires des schismatiques lucifériens," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 1905, 222.
- 33 *De non parcendo in Deum deliquentibus*, 279, 5 ff
- 34 *Ibid.*, 277, 17 ff
- 35 *Moriendum esse pro dei filio*, 311, 25
- 36 *Ibid.*, 316, 2-10; 27-32:
Non eris, Constanti, illa evasurus supplicia, nisi primo in loco unicum Dei filium verum esse Dei filium credideris, deinde, ut crebro dictum est, quod semper cum patre regnaverit ac sit regnans, hoc est sine initio ac fine confessus fueris atque te ad catholicam ecclesiam de nefando Arrianorum coetu transtuleris, de morte scilicet ad vitam, et confessus fueris ut nos confitemur catholici patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum perfectam esse trinitatem et unam habere deitatem . . . Nobis episcopis igitur scias magis datam divinitus potestatem, ut tu, dum damnare nos putas, damnemus, dum punire nos posse praesumis, te Constantium sacrilegum puniamus, siquidem ille quem negas dare nobis episcopis suis fuit dignatus auctoritatem, ut quae ligaverimus in terris sint ligata et in caelis.
- 37 Pointed out by J. Straub, *op. cit.* Lucifer is discussed at pp. 136-9. Straub indicates that to both priest and bishop is ascribed the power of the keys, but from all that Lucifer writes it seems clear that he means by *sacerdos*, bishop and not priest. *Sacerdos* was first used of priest by Optatus in 369. Cf. G. Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 282, n. 1.
- 38 *De non conveniendo*, 5, 20; 6, 20; 20, 15;

- etc. Ambrose, without having the Arians specifically in mind, makes, however the same point in *De poenitentia*, i, ii, 8: "Munus Spiritus sancti est officium sacerdotis, jus autem Spiritus sancti in solvendis ligandisque criminibus est; quomodo igitur munus eius vindicant, de cuius diffidunt jure et potestate?"
- 39 *De Trinitate*, vi, 37f. "This is the Father's revelation [to Peter], this the foundation of the Church, this the assurance of her permanence. Hence has she the keys of the kingdom of heaven, hence judgment in heaven and judgment on earth."
- 40 *Historia Arianorum*, 77, etc.
- 41 As Palanque points out, Ambrose, unlike Augustine, for example, was anti-Barbarian and his opposition to Arianism was sustained in part by his Roman pride. *Op. cit.*
- 42 *Ep.* xli, 2-3.
- 43 *De mysteriis*, v, 26.
- 44 Ambrose is exceedingly fond of citing Elijah. Many of his acts were clearly patterned on the ancient model. Paulinus, his biographer, recounts several examples of such parallelism with Elijah or Elisha, including the resuscitation of a child by lying upon it, by virtue of his possession of the Spirit and hence of Life. Paulinus, *Vita*, 28 and 47; *De officiis*, 2, 14, 14; 3, 1, 4; *De Nab.* 12, 150; 15, 64; 17, 70; *In Luc.* 1, 36; 8, 96; 1, 3; 3, 14; *De Eia* 2 and 3; *De fide* i, 13, 81; iii, 14 30; *ep.* lxiii, 67-78. We have already noted that Athanasius calls Lucifer the Elijah of his times. Above, p. 8, n. 32.
- 45 *De mysteriis*, v, 27
- 46 Ambrose' intolerant demands (*Contra Symmachum*) that the State not countenance the presence of the statue of Victory in Rome fits in here very well as also his rebuke of Theodosius for indemnifying the Jewish synagogue for its losses at the hands of Christians (*ep.* xl).
- 47 *Contra Auxentium*, 17 f.
- 48 The courageous and saintly Nicene Eusebius of Vercelli had insisted on a reaffirmation of *sacerdotalis fides*, i.e., the faith of authentic bishops. *Fragmenta historica*, 187.
- 49 *Ep.* xl, 2.
- 50 *Oratio* 43, 50; quoted by Gerald F. Reilly, *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil the Great*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, VII (Washington, 1945), p. 57.
- 51 Gregory Dix has assembled the numerous references to imperial interference in episcopal elections. *Op. cit.*, p. 278, n. 1.
- 52 Dix cites the canons, *ibid.* As Campenhausen observes, Arianism is to the rise of the metropolitanates as, before it, the Gnostic crisis to the monarchical episcopate, and, after it, the christological controversies to the rise of patriarchates.
- 53 Ambrose, *Contra Auxentium*, 31: "isti imperatori volunt dare ius ecclesiae."
- 54 Athanasius chides the Arians who claim they cannot attend Pope Julius' council because of their duty on the Persian front: But "what have bishops to do with war?" *Historia Arianorum*, ii.
- 55 G. Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 279.
- 56 For the Greek, cf. Constantine's addressing his edict of 333 concerning Arius (Socrates, *H. E.*, i, 9) "to bishops and laos." Later in the century it will be more difficult to distinguish (Christian) laity from (the still pagan) populace or citizenry of a town. Cf. two Latin versions of this address in the edict rendering the key word *plebibus* (undated, but probably preserving an earlier usage) and *populis* (787) in Hans-Georg Opitz, *Athanasius' Werke*, III:1 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1935), 66f. Cf. above, p. 9, n.48.
- 57 Cf. the quite impartial pagan Ammianus, *op. cit.*, xv, 7, 10.
- 58 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 75; Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 37; Sozomen, *H. E.*, iv, 11; Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii, 17. The whole Liberius-Felix episode is succinctly handled by Alfred Feder, "Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers, I," *S. B.*, Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., CLXII (1909/10), p. 174.
- 59 *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucan*, xviii, 73.
- 60 *Ep.* xxi, 17.
- 61 Among them, the poor. Cf. *Historia Arianorum*, 61 f.
- 62 *Epistola encyclica*, 2.
- 63 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 74. Here and in 75 he enumerates the imperial appointments, among them that of Felix chosen to succeed Liberius. Athanasius says that Epictetus, bishop of Civitavecchia, a favorite of Constantius, summoned three "kataskopoi"—he is unwilling to call them *episcopoi*—to ordain Felix in the palace instead of the church, while court eunuchs took the part of the people in the ceremony.
- 64 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 7; Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 13.
- 65 *Fragmenta historica*, 187. Lucifer says that Constantius "ordained" his Arian successor, Auxentius. *De sancto Athanasio*, 162, 3.
- 66 *Op. cit.*, part iv.
- 67 As Dix remarks, "When the Church entered into an alliance with the State under Constantine, its old cellular organization with its self-sufficiency and intense local vitality was an anachronism . . ." *Op. cit.*, p. 276.
- 68 *Ep.* xxi, 15.
- 69 *Iccirco laboratis . . . ut omnes, quibus imperatis, dulcissima libertate potiantur. Non alia ratione, quae turbata sunt, componi, quae divulsa sunt, coherceri, nisi unusquisque nulla servitutis necessitate astrietus integrum habeat vivendi arbitrium. Fragmenta historica*, 182, 6 ff. It was A. Wilmart who showed that the whole piece was written by the Ni-

- cene bishops at Sardica. "L'Ad Constantinum liber I de Saint Hilaire de Poitiers et les fragments historiques." *Revue Bénédictine*, XXIV (1907), 149. Cf., on the liberty of clergy as bulwark of civil liberty, H. von Campenhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 271.
- 70 Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 278: "When at the end of the century the bishops were given by imperial constitutions the office of *defensores* of their see cities, practically replacing the old elected local magistrates as the bulwark of local liberty against the oppression of the elected bureaucracy, it was a natural step. They were virtually the only *elected* representatives of the cities who had survived the flood of officialdom." But on St. Augustine as a rather indifferent *defensor* of Hippo and further literature see Gustave Combès, *La doctrine politique de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1927), pp. 320 ff.
- 71 For a recent discussion of the problem, see Francis Dvornik, "The Authority of the State in Ecumenical Councils," *The Christian East*, XIV (1933), p. 98: "... in convoking the Ecumenical Councils the Emperors judged themselves not to be exercising a power delegated to them, but a power which was an attribute of and, as it were, emanating from their office as Emperor."
- 72 *Apologia contra Arianos*, 3, 7 and 11, 19.
- 73 *Historia Arianorum*, 52.
- 74 Hagel, *op. cit.*, section 13 and pp. 65, 69. Athanasius objects against the Meletians allied with the Arians that they consider the Church as a civil senate. *Historia Arianorum*, 78.
- 75 *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft, I, Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen, 1930), ch. iv.
- 76 See his well-conceived letter to the Eusebians in Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, 21 ff.
- 77 Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii, 13. We pass over the less valourous sequel.
- 78 J. Straub has connected a number of examples of Lucifer's setting *divina lex* (=the Bible) over against the *auctoritas regalis*. *Op. cit.*, 249, n. 303.
- 79 *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*, 273, 18ff.: "Videmus vos lupos [the Roman emperors, in allusion to Acts 20:29 in Paul's charge to the elders of Ephesus] quos praesostendere est dignatus spiritus sanctus per vas electionis apostolum omnem comprehendere conatos dei gregem; et nos, episcopos quos spiritus sanctus ad regendam dei ecclesiam constituerit, quod dicit beatus apostolus, debemus tibi lupo parcere, debemus vereri regni tui diademam, in aurem etiam et dextrocheria, debemus insignes quas esse censes vestes tuas honorare et despiciere rerum creatorem atque rectorem?"
- 80 *Ibid.*, 278, 25 f. Cf. *De non conveniendo cum haereticis*, 12, 13 f.
- 81 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 34
- 82 *Op. cit.*, p. 68, n. 31
- 83a *Historia Arianorum*, 74
- 83b *Gigas*. Cf. Athanasius, *De decretis*, 32; *Oratio II*, 32
- 83c *Historia Arianorum*, 36, 74, etc.
- 83d *Ibid.*, 77
- 84 *Ibid.*, 74. Cf. Lucifer on Constantius' ordinations, *Church History*, Sept. 1951, p. 248, n. 122.
- 85 *Contra Auxentium*, 3; cf. also ep. xxi, 17
- 86 Epp. ii, 15 and xii, 6. Cf. H. von Campenhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
- 87 *Op. cit.*, p. 131.
- 88 On the way in which the authority of the Holy Spirit passes from the whole church at Pentecost, to the episcopate, then to the councils (and finally the Bishop of Rome) see Albert M. Koeniger, "Prima sedes a nemine judicatur," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur*: Festgabe Albert Ehrhard (Bonn and Leipzig, 1922), 273.
- 89 Cf. L. Cerfaux, "Regale sacerdotium," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, xxviii (1939), p. 5.
- 90 So the Council of Sardica. Socrates, *H. E.*
- 91 *De sancto Athanasio*, 6.6. Cf. above p. 7, n. 24. (Lucifer) and p. 14 (Athanasius).
- 92 *De non conveniendo cum haereticis*, 14, 21 ff.
- 93 *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*, 262.
- 94 *Apologia ad Constantium*, xi, xii.
- 95 *Vita sancti Antoni*, liii.
- 96 *Expositio in psalmum cxviii, sermo xv*, 35
- 97 Migne, *P.G.*, XXX, esp. 5.
- 98 Esp. 41. A. Gaudel touches upon the problem in "La théologie du Logos chez saint Athanasie: Une synthèse christologique à la veille de l'arianisme," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XI (1931), esp. 6-9.
- 99 *De Spiritu sancto*, v, 9 and xviii, 45; Migne, *P.G.*, XXXII, coll. 84 and 149.
- 100 *Adversus Eunomium*, 4; Migne, *P.G.*, XXIX, col. 700. Noted by G. Reilly, who devotes a whole chapter to Christ's Headship of the Church, *op. cit.*, ch. ii.
- 101 Migne, *P.G.*, XXX, col. 865. Eunomius is briefly discussed at this point by E. Peterson, *Monotheismus*, p. 94.
- 102 *De Trinitate*, xi, 4, 21, and 25. It should be remarked here that the altogether ambiguous Marcellus of Ancyra, from whom Athanasius was slow to dissociate himself, attached a very special importance to I Cor. 15 and was in consequence charged with denying the eternity of Christ's Kingdom by the Easterners themselves in their separate council of Sardica. *Fragmenta historica*, 49, 25 ff. and 63, 15. But for the specialized sense Marcellus gave the text in support of biblical monotheism, see W. Gericke, *op. cit.*, pp. 142 ff.
- 103 *De Trinitate*, xi, 39. Migne, *P. L.*, X, 424. The whole of *liber xi* is devoted to our problem with mention of prin-

- cipalities and powers, 32 and *passim*. For a recent pertinent discussion of Hilary, see Pierre Smulders, *La doctrine trinitaire de S. Hilaire de Poitiers*, *Analecta Gregoriana*, XXXII, series theologica, Sectio B (n. 14) (Rome, 1944), esp. p. 29.
- 104 *Ibid.*, 20.
- 105 *De fide*, iv, 2 (24).
- 106 *Ibid.*, iv, 3 (33).
- 107 *Ibid.*, v, 14 (180).
- 108 *Contra Auxentium*, 1. On Christ as *imperator*, see Franz Dölger, "Zur antiken und frühchristlichen Auffassung der Herrschergewalt von Gottes Gnaden," *Antike und Christentum*, III, 117.
- 109 *De fide*, iii, 17 (137 ff.).
- 110 Acts 7:55.
- 111 *De fide*, iii, 17 (137).
- 112 Ep. lxiii, 5 f.
- 113 For the literature on sitting and standing gods and emperors, see A. Nock, *op. cit.*, p. 103, n. 18.
- 114 *De fide*, ii, 12, (100).
- 115 See, then, how unwilling he [God the Father] was that thou shouldst dishonour his Son—even so that he gave him to be thy judge.
 . . . Raise thine eyes to the Judge, see who it is that is seated, with whom he is seated, and where. Christ sitteth at the right hand of the Father . . . Tell me now, thou who holdest that the things of God are to be judged of from the things of this world—say whether thou thinkest him who sits at the right hand to be lower? Is it any dishonour to the Father that he sits at the Son's left hand? The Father honours the Son, and thou makest it to be an insult? The Father would have this invitation to be a sign of love and esteem, and thou wouldst make it an overlord's command! Christ hath risen from the dead, and sitteth at the right hand of God. *De fide*, ii, 12 (102). The discussion here is probably related to the Roman feeling for the superiority of the left hand to the right. See A. Frothingham, "Ancient Orientation Unveiled," *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXI (1917), p. 325.
- 116 *De fide*, ii, 12 (103).
- 117 *Ibid.*, 11 (96).
- 118 *De fide*, v, 12 (147).
- 119 *Ibid.*, (146), (149).
- 120 *Ibid.*, (147).
- 121 *Ibid.*, (151). Cf. (149): "When I am on the way [that is, on earth], I am Christ's; when I have passed through, I am the Father's; but everywhere through Christ, and everywhere under him."
- 122 *Ibid.*, iii, 12 (92).
- 123 *Ibid.*, v, 11 (144).
- 124 *De fide*, 12 (152).
- 125 *Ibid.*, i, 20 (137), (138), (139), (140); ii, 16 (136).
- 126 *Ibid.*, ii, 16 (141), (142).
- 127 *Ibid.*, (142) f.
- 128 *De Obitu Theodosii*, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 56. L. Laurand holds that this section on the Cross is an addendum by Ambrose to the oration as actually delivered. "L'oraison funèbre de Théodose par saint Ambroise," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XVII (1921), 349.
- 129 See above, p. 19, n. 1.
- 130 There seems to be no comprehensive study of the fourth century political behavior of what modern religious sociology calls the sects. Here it would be the Manichaeans, the Montanists, the Novatianists, the Donatists, and the Priscillianists.
- 131 Cf. Ambrose on the canons of Rimini: "The law did not gather the Church together, but the faith of Christ. For the law is not by faith, but 'the just shall live by faith.'" *Contra Auxentium*, 24.
- 132 "Kurz gesagt: alle arianische und semi-arianische Theologie hat eine wesensmässige Tendenz zum Byzantinismus; die athanasische und westliche Theologie hat eine wesensmässige Tendenz zur Theokratie" (p. 200), "Im Byzantinismus dient die Kirche dem Staatsplan. In der Theokratie [hoffentlich mit Toleranz und sicher auch Freiheit] dient der Staat Gottes Heilsplan" (p. 209). Berkhof suggests a parallel in the controversy between the strict Calvinists and Remonstrants in his native Holland. The former because of their more pessimistic view of human nature were intolerant of state interference, while the more confident Arminians were Erastians.
- 133 In the East, it was monasticism, as George Florovsky has recently shown, which was the bearer of the principle of freedom but at the expense of the theocratic concern. Moreover, monastic protest and withdrawal is not to be explained in terms of the soteriological-cosmological tension basic to the Catholic-Arian controversy. Needless to say, the object of the monks was salvation, but their justification for indifference or hostility toward the State goes back to Origen's doctrine that in the measure one is withdrawn from the world one is freed from paying tribute to Caesar.
- 134 *Contra Auxentium*, 37. Significantly, it was also Ambrose who had prevailed upon Gratian to divest himself (382) of the title *pontifex maximus* and to relinquish any control over Christian cultus, canon, and creed that the title might have implied.