

***LITERATURE OF THE
MEDIEVAL ERA***

TEACHER'S MANUAL

J. Parnell McCarter

©2006 J. Parnell McCarter. All Rights Reserved.

**6408 Wrenwood
Jenison, MI 49428
(616) 457-8095**

The Puritans' Home School Curriculum

www.puritans.net

**LITERATURE OF THE MEDIEVAL ERA TEACHER'S
MANUAL
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Section One : Course Instructions.....p. 4

Section Two : Course Check-off List.....p. 6

Section Three : Assignment Answers.....p. 9

Section Four : Recommended Class Schedule.....p. 26

Section Five : Teacher Class Notes.....p. 28

SECTION ONE: COURSE INSTRUCTIONS

Purpose

This course provides students the opportunity to read literature of the medieval era.

Books Required

There are three books required for this course:

- *Literature of the Medieval Era* (available free on-line at www.puritans.net)
- *Literature of the Medieval Era Workbook for Students* (available free on-line at www.puritans.net)

Check-Off List

Grades for the course should be recorded on the check-off list in this teacher's manual.

Assignments

This course consists of 14 assignments, presented in this teacher's manual.

Grading

The overall course grade is calculated based on the average scores of the assignments.

SECTION TWO: COURSE CHECK-OFF LIST

LITERATURE OF THE MEDIEVAL ERA

Student Name: _____

Teacher Name: _____

Assignment Check-Off List

ASSIGNMENT #	ASSIGNMENT COMPLETED? (X)	ASSIGNMENT SCORE (On 100-Point Scale)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
Total of Scores on 14 Assignments		
Average Assignment Score (Total of Scores/14)		

Course Grade (Letter Grade Equivalent of Course Grade on 100-Point Scale): _____

Note: Grading in this course should be done on a 100-point scale, with letter grades assigned as follows:

Letter Grade	Score on 100-Point Scale	Score on 4.0 Scale
A+	97 – 100	4.0
A	94 – 96	4.0
A-	90 – 93	4.0
B+	87 – 89	3.0
B	84 – 86	3.0
B-	80 – 83	3.0
C+	77 – 79	2.0
C	74 – 76	2.0
C-	70 – 73	2.0
D	60 – 69	1.0
F	0 – 59	0

In order to determine how many points each question in a test is worth, divide 100 by the number of questions in the test. For example, if there are 10 questions in a test, then each question is worth 10 points ($= 100 / 10$). So if a student got 9 out of the 10 questions right, then his test score is 90 ($= 9 \times 10$) on a 100-point scale. His letter grade, according to the table above, would then be an A-.

We supply in the above table the corresponding grade on a 4.0 scale.

SECTION THREE: ASSIGNMENT ANSWERS

ASSIGNMENT # 1 (COVERING CHAPTERS 1-5)

1. What were the chief genres of literature produced by early Christian society? creeds and canons (like the Nicene Creed, *Apostolic Constitutions*, and canons of the Council of Elvira), histories (such as Eusebius' *History of the Church*), doctrinal treatises (like Augustine's "Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints" and Basil's "On the Holy Ghost"), homilies (like Chrysostom's homily on Matthew 5:17), biographies and autobiographies especially concerning spiritual journeys (like Augustine's *Confessions*), polemical treatises (like Jerome's *Against Jovianus*), poetic prayers (like Patrick's "Morning Prayer") and epistles (such as Ambrose's Epistle XVII)
2. The literature chiefly produced by a society reflects that society's culture and beliefs. What does the literature chiefly produced by early Christian society indicate about its culture and beliefs? It was chiefly interested in the spread of Biblical truth and edification of the saints, and not so much on entertainment.
3. Compare and contrast the literature generally produced by earlier Christian society with the ancient pagan Greek and Roman literature you have read. The latter concentrated more on entertainment and (perhaps) art form than did the former. The latter also was philosophically pagan, unlike the former.
4. Compare and contrast the literature generally produced by earlier Christian society with most modern literature. The latter concentrates more on entertainment and (perhaps) art form than did the former. The latter also is philosophically secular humanistic, unlike the former.
5. What is a 'creed'?
6. How does the Nicene Creed teach the doctrine of the Trinity?
7. In the Nicene Creed, what is said to be the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son?
8. The *Apostolic Constitutions* open a window for us to witness Christian Church life in many of the churches of the second and third centuries. What does it say about Christian Church life then?
9. The tone of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is solemn and didactic. What does 'didactic' mean?
10. What appears to be the theology of the *Apostolic Constitutions* concerning the Ten Commandments and their role for the Christian church? They are regarded as still authoritative and applicable.
11. The issue of canonicity involves which books we should regard as divinely inspired and infallible. What appears to be the theology of the *Apostolic Constitutions* concerning the canon of Old Testament scripture?
12. What appears to be the theology of the *Apostolic Constitutions* concerning the hymns we are to sing?
13. What appears to be the theology of the *Apostolic Constitutions* concerning the reading of the Bible by lay persons?
14. According to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which day of the week is called "the Lord's day"? the day of the Lord's resurrection
15. How does the *Apostolic Constitutions* use the term 'presbyter' different from the term 'bishop'? It indicates the former are ruling elders and the latter is the congregation's teaching elder.

16. What is 'canon law'?
17. The first written mandate on record requiring church ministers to be chaste came as a canon of the Council of Elvira. A short time later, in 325, the Council of Nicea, convened by Constantine, rejected a ban on priests marrying requested by Spanish clerics. The Western (Roman Catholic) Church as a whole did not adopt the celibacy requirement until centuries later. Which canon of the Council of Elvira required celibacy of church ministers? Canon 33
18. How does the issue of ministerial celibacy vindicate the Protestant position that we should look to the Bible alone as our foundation of religious belief and practice, instead of Church tradition? There are contradictory Church traditions, and some of the Church traditions (like celibacy) contradict scripture.
19. What do the canons of the Council of Elvira indicate was the policy of the Spanish churches concerning pictures in the churches? They were prohibited.
20. What does Eusebius indicate were the reasons why he wrote his *History of the Church*? His reasons were scientific (to provide a chronicle of the history) and apologetic (to provide a defense of the church against her Jewish and Gentile enemies).
21. How did his reasons for writing his book influence Eusebius' selection of a genre and tone of his book? Since he wanted to provide a chronicle and defense, it was necessary that he write a serious historical narrative.
22. How do Eusebius' statements concerning the marital estate of the Apostles in his *History of the Church* bear upon the issue of the celibacy of church ministers (including the Pope)? It shows the fallacy of the requirement of celibacy, given that he indicates that even many of the Apostles like Peter were married.
23. Basil of Caesarea's work *On the Holy Ghost* is polemical. What does 'polemical' mean?
24. In polemical works, it is generally possible to deduce some of the positions of the writer's philosophical opponent. What did the opponents of Basil of Caesarea's view of the Holy Ghost evidently believe and assert? That the Holy Ghost is not fully God, but simply a ministering spirit.
25. Basil of Caesarea employs what metaphor in paragraph 25 of Chapter X of his work *On the Holy Ghost*? The theological opposition to the Trinitarian doctrine of the Holy Ghost is warfare against Christianity.
26. How does Basil employ imagery to support his metaphor? He mentions the various elements of war, like missiles, and equates them with the philosophical attacks of the anti-Trinitarians.

ASSIGNMENT # 2 (COVERING CHAPTERS 6-10)

1. What does the literary term 'tone' mean? The writer's or speaker's attitude toward his subject.
2. Which of these describes the tone of Jerome's "Against Jovianus": somber, solemn, ironic, formal or informal, playful, detached, condescending, or intimate?
3. What similarities are there between John Chrysostom's instructions concerning attire to the catechumens, and the instructions concerning attire in the *Apostolic Constitutions*?
4. We read about catechumens in both John Chrysostom's instructions and the canons of the Council of Elvira. What are 'catechumens'?
5. Based upon your read of John Chrysostom's homily on Matthew 5:17, how would you characterize his understanding of the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament and their laws?
6. What is a 'homily'? a sermon
7. In his homily on Matthew 5:17, John Chrysostom interprets Jesus Christ as using the figure of speech of understatement in the phrase "least in the kingdom of heaven". How so? He interprets Jesus to mean by it hell.
8. How is Matthew 5:29 an example of hyperbole?
9. The theme of the Nicene Creed is the Trinity of God. What is the theme of the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon? Jesus Christ as fully God and fully man, the two natures existing without confusion, without change, without division, without separation
10. Over church history, one great impetus for the writing of creeds and confessions has been to counteract various heresies and errors that have arisen against Biblical teaching. The Definition of the Council of Chalcedon, for instance, was written to address the Nestorian heresy. What is the Nestorian heresy?
11. In his polemic *Against Jovianus*, Jerome alludes to this parable or allegory of Jesus: "And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow...But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold." How did Jerome interpret this allegory, relating it to the issue of marriage and virginity?
12. Is there a problem with Jerome's method of interpreting the parable? Why or why not? It is arbitrary, for there is no indication in the context that it should have been related to the issue of marriage.
13. What is an 'allegory'?
14. Based upon Ambrose's Epistle XVII, what was Ambrose's view of idolatrous worship services?
15. What was Ambrose's view of the duty of the magistrate concerning idolatrous worship services?

ASSIGNMENT # 3 (COVERING CHAPTERS 11-16)

1. The *Confessions* of Augustine is an auto-biography. What is an 'auto-biography'?
2. At the beginning of Book III of *Confessions* Augustine employs the metaphor of famine. Literally speaking, what is a famine?
3. But in this metaphor, what was Augustine starving for? God
4. Yet was Augustine at the time hungry for what he lacked? no
5. What was he instead hungry for, though it would not totally feed his soul, and what defiled him as a result of it? licentious, adulterous love
6. What else in Book III does Augustine say drew him away from the love he truly needed? stage-plays
7. Which book of Cicero had a profound effect on Augustine, turning him to seek divine wisdom? Hortensius
8. In Book IV Augustine tells about the affair he had out of wedlock. How does Augustine there contrast lawful marriage versus an illicit affair? Marriage is based on self-restraint, seeking issue of children, whereas illicit sex does not seek such.
9. While Augustine was a Manichee, who had the Manichees told him could answer his quandaries concerning Manicheism? Faustus
10. What assertion of the Manichees concerning the New Testament did Augustine begin to question? that the New Testament was corrupted by pro-Jewish elements
11. How does Augustine describe his mother in Book IV?
12. Under what bishop of Milan did Augustine become a catechumen in the Catholic Church? Ambrose
13. Why does Augustine say Christianity was more honest and unassuming than Manicheism? It forthrightly says one must believe things that cannot be demonstrated.
14. We read in Book VII of Augustine's being born again. To whom did he then embrace? Jesus the Mediator
15. In his "Treatise on the Merits & Forgiveness of Sins and Baptism of Infants", what does Augustine teach concerning Original Sin? Adam's sin passed to his posterity by natural descent.
16. In "On Marriage and Concupiscence", what does Augustine state in chapter 1 is the purpose of his treatise? the holiness of marriage, even though children born of such marriage have Original Sin
17. In "A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints", how does Augustine refute the objection that if faith is effectively given by God only to some, then He ought to give it to all? God is under no moral compulsion to save any
18. In "A Treatise Concerning the Correction of the Donatist", how does Augustine employ the case of Nebuchadnezzar in his argument that magistrates should enforce the moral laws of God?
19. In his "City of God", Augustine contrasts the heavenly city of God with the earthly city. How does he define the earthly city?

ASSIGNMENT # 4 (COVERING CHAPTERS 17-20)

1. How does the style of Patrick's autobiography contrast with the style of Augustine's? more simple
2. What can we infer about the different education of Patrick and Augustine from the different styles of their autobiographies? Augustine received far more formal education
3. How do we know Patrick was conversant with scripture, from reading his "Confessio"?
4. What prominent features of Celtic Christianity can we discern from Patrick's "Confessio" and "Morning Prayer"? belief in Trinity, monasticism
5. What is the theme of Patrick's "Morning Prayer"? Patrick's looking in the morning to the Trinitarian God to give him strength through the day
6. What is the effect of repeating the opening words of the poem at the end? for emphasis
7. Based upon his "Confessio" and "Morning Prayer", does it appear Mariolatry was part of Patrick's religion? no
8. Boethius' "Consolation of Philosophy" is quite in contrast to the writings of Christians such as Patrick and Augustine. What pagan elements are displayed in it? prayer to Muses, belief in fate, Fortune
9. What similarities are there between Boethius' "Consolation of Philosophy" and the book of Job in the Bible?
10. In what form did Philosophy come to console Boethius? a woman's form
11. In his letter to an iconoclast bishop, what did Gregory commend and what rebuke in the bishop? not worshipping the image; breaking the image
12. Gregory wrote: "...from the forum of speech to the senate house of the heart..." How did this metaphorical description draw upon the experience of his readers? their experience in Rome
13. In the conclusion of his *Moralia*, what does Gregory ask of his readers? pour out prayers for his sons

ASSIGNMENT # 5 (COVERING CHAPTER 21)

1. In the opening of the Koran, who is called the “Master of the Day of Judgment”?
Allah
2. The chapter in the Koran entitled “The Cow” says much about fighting. When does it say fighting may desist with the enemy of Allah? when he stops persecution
3. According to the chapter “The Women”, what is the Islamic doctrine concerning Jesus’ crucifixion? It did not take place.
4. The Jews and the Christians, according to the Koran, are regarded as they who have been given the Book. How are these to acknowledge the superiority of Islam and be in subjection to it, according to the chapter entitled The Immunity? pay tax
5. What can we deduce about the culture of Mohammed simply from the chapter titles of the Koran? We read of a very simple, Middle Eastern, desert culture.
6. In the chapter “Abraham”, who is there said to be the 2 sons of Abraham? Ismail and Ishaq
7. According to the Koran, did all men descend from one man (Adam) and one woman?
yes
8. In the chapter entitled Marium, who is Yahya, and what was his Biblical name? John the Baptist
9. How does the birth of Jesus in the Koran differ from that in the Bible? Mary sat under a palm tree in the account of the Koran
10. Was Mary a virgin when she conceived, according to the Koran? yes

ASSIGNMENT # 6 (COVERING CHAPTERS 22-26)

1. Why does John of Damascus believe that no image of God was allowed in the Old Testament? because Jesus had not yet come in the flesh
2. John of Damascus believed images of God are allowed in the New Testament. Why? because Jesus came in the flesh
3. In Gottschalk's Longer Confession, is he arguing for or against semi-Pelagianism? against
4. Would this statement be true or false: Gottschalk believed Pope Gregory the Great believed in double predestination? true
5. In the quote of Paschas Radbertus from his *De Corpore Et Sanguine Domini*, Christ becoming flesh in His incarnation in the womb of Mary is compared to what? his supposed incarnation in the Eucharist
6. Of the 6 Medieval songs or poems, which one celebrates the dawn of spring and the passing of winter? IV. Vow to Cupid
7. The third song features 2 impudent students drinking together before they part, pledging to be true brothers to one another, with a refrain imitating a bugle call. What is the refrain of this poem? "Tara, tantara, teino!"
8. How does the refrain affect the mood of the third poem? It makes it exhilarating.
9. What is a 'refrain' in a song or poem? repeated words
10. Who does the poem say bade them to be brothers true? the Pope
11. The first poem of the Medieval Students' Songs is a tenth century piece, consisting of an invitation of a young man to his mistress, bidding her to supper at his home. How does he describe his home to make it enticing? full of beautiful flowers, wonderful food, singing servants
12. The second song is a begging petition, in which the speaker supplicated the resident of some place he was temporarily staying for alms. What is the occupation of the speaker? young scholar
13. For what purpose does he say he needs alms? to pursue his studies
14. What is the rhyme scheme? 2nd and 4th lines of each stanza rhyme
15. How do we know the speaker is just passing through town? He says he is a pilgrim and tells the resident to wish him well at parting.
16. We should not be gullible. This second poem is in the form of a sing-song doggerel. What about this verse, including its form, should make the resident wary of the worthiness of giving alms to this supplicant? not a gifted scholar, given type of verse
17. In the excerpt from Avicenna's "On Medicine", Avicenna analyzes the causes of sickness and health according to which ancient Greek philosopher's categories of causation? Aristotle

ASSIGNMENT # 7 (COVERING CHAPTERS 27-29)

1. Dialectic is an exchange of propositions (theses) and counter-propositions (antitheses) resulting in a *synthesis* of the opposing assertions, or at least a qualitative transformation in the direction of the dialogue. It is one of the three original liberal arts or trivium (the other members are rhetoric and grammar) in Western culture. In ancient and medieval times, both rhetoric and dialectic were understood to aim at being persuasive (through dialogue). The aim of the dialectical method, often known as *dialectic* or *dialectics*, is to try to resolve the disagreement through rational discussion. How did Anselm, founder of Scholasticism, employ dialectic in his work *Cur Deus Homo*?
2. One form of Dialectic is the Socratic method. The Socratic method shows the falsehood of a contrary proposition, so as to prove the proposition itself. How does Anselm employ the Socratic method, by proving the falsehood of this proposition: 'God could have justly cancelled the debt of human sin by compassion alone'?
3. One flaw of Scholasticism is that it can tend to exaggerate man's ability to reason, unaided by scripture, and in light of the Fall. How does this flaw manifest itself in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*?
4. How does a scholar's morality influence his scholarship?
5. In Abelard's autobiography, Abelard acknowledges he was given over to sensuality. Was Abelard qualified as a teacher under such circumstances?
6. How did Heloise employ the arguments of Jerome found in Jerome's *Against Jovianus* to show the complications of marriage (like its taking away from studies), to try to show Abelard why he should not marry Heloise?
7. After Abelard was castrated by Heloise's uncle, Abelard became a monk in an abbey. What was life like in the abbey? scandalous
8. To what authority did Abelard turn to support the proposition that nothing can beget itself? Augustine
9. In his Sentences, how many sacraments did Peter Lombard indicate exist? 7
10. How did Peter Lombard define 'sacrament'? a sign of a sacred thing, as well as the visible form and even cause of the invisible grace
11. How does Lombard's definition and description of 'sacrament' differ from the reformed definition? Disagree that sacrament is a cause of grace, rather than simply a sign and seal of it.
12. Given the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptism, why does Peter Lombard feel compelled to explain why circumcision was commanded to be delayed to the 8th day? Roman Catholic view is that baptism cleanses from sin, so should be done as soon as possible, lest infant die before receiving it

ASSIGNMENT # 8 (COVERING CHAPTERS 30-34)

1. What does the Nolla Leycon of the Waldenses teach concerning the Trinity? it affirms it
2. What does the Nolla Leycon imply about the identity of the Anti-Christ? It identifies him with the Pope.
3. What sacraments did the Nolla Leycon recognize as being scriptural? baptism and the Lord's Supper
4. In what metric form was "Lancelot", written by Chretien De Troyes, written? rhyming eight-syllable couplets
5. Queen Guinevere was known as the wife of King Arthur. What immorality of the storied Queen Guinevere is sensationalized by Chretien De Troyes in his work? Her adulterous affair with Lancelot
6. In the excerpts of "Lancelot" presented in the textbook, what techniques did the author employ to romanticize and sensationalize the immorality? heightened speech, suspense, intriguing setting
7. From his "On the Harmony of Religions", what can we deduce about the attitude of Averroes regarding the Koran? He believed it, for he cited it as authoritative.
8. Which argument did Averroes consider to be the best for proving the existence of God as well as the creation of the universe? the argument of analogy
9. What did Averroes believe concerning predestination? that God has ordered all causes
10. Who compiled the "Thirteen Articles of [Judaistic] Faith"? Maimonides
11. What do the "Thirteen Articles of [Judaistic] Faith" say about the Messiah? that he will come and rule in the messianic era
12. Do the "Thirteen Article of [Judaistic] Faith" affirm or deny the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead? affirm
13. Which Roman Catholic Council first declared transubstantiation to be the official church position? the Fourth Lateran Council

ASSIGNMENT # 9 (COVERING CHAPTERS 35-38)

1. Which text in Job is cited by John Bonaventure and Peter Lombard to allegedly prove Aristotle's fourfold analysis of causation? Job 28:11
2. How would you describe the nature of the argument by John Bonaventure in support of his opinion that the passage in Job teaches Aristotle's fourfold analysis of causation? eisegesis rather than exegesis
3. In "The Mind's Road to God", who does Bonaventure look to intercede to God the Father? Virgin Mary and Francis of Assisi
4. What vision does Bonaventure say he saw on Mount Alverna, and what did he believe it signified? the six-winged Seraph; the six wings represent the six stages of illumination
5. To whom does Bonaventure pray and long for in his "Prayer After Communion"? Jesus
6. To what purpose did Thomas Aquinas write *Summa Theologiae*? a systematic presentation of Christian theology
7. In Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, what did he assert concerning the question of whether theology is worthier than the other branches of science? yes, because it concerns higher ends, and above the others
8. In Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, how does he assert theology uses human reason? to clarify the implications of faith
9. Did Thomas Aquinas believe God's existence is demonstrable through argument? yes

ASSIGNMENT # 10 (COVERING CHAPTERS 39-41)

1. In what respects did Roger Bacon's views on experimental science anticipate views which would come to dominate centuries later? the importance of observation to acquiring knowledge in science, instead of relying on speculation alone
2. To what extent did Duns Scotus rely on clear scriptural teaching to arrive at the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? very little to none
3. What was the gist of Duns Scotus' argument for the Immaculate Conception? His argument ran along these lines: it is possible Christ's atonement could have produced the Immaculate Conception, it is appropriate, hence it must be the case.
4. What are flaws in Duns Scotus' argument for the Immaculate Conception? Many of his premises are clearly unscriptural, so his argument is as a whole. eg, it is not true that a most perfect mediator removes all punishment from the one He reconciles. This casts into doubt Christ's perfect mediatorship since the elect have sin.
5. Why did Dante call his "Divine Comedy" a comedy? because it has a happy ending
6. What are the alleged 3 kingdoms of afterlife which Dante visited in his "Divine Comedy"? Inferno, Purgatory, Paradise
7. What was the metrical scheme of "Divine Comedy"? triplets with a rime concatenate scheme, each verse 11 syllables long
8. In Canto I, what description do we have of the appearance of Virgil when he first meets the narrator? not discernible whether a shade or a real man
9. Why did the narrator, in Canto I, not proceed immediately to Paradise? the panther was in his way
10. Why does Virgil say he could not guide the narrator into Paradise? because he was rebellious to God's law

ASSIGNMENT # 11 (COVERING CHAPTERS 42-44)

1. In the Prologue of “Piers Plowman” we survey a spectrum of English society as it appeared in the High Middle Ages, in what is said to be the dream of Piers the Plowman. Langland offers us impressions of various occupations. How did he present the pardoner? as one who sold pardons for money to the gullible laymen
2. How did he present the friars? preaching for money
3. How did he present the “serjeants” that “practiced at Bar” (i.e., lawyers)? those who speak for money and not for the Lord
4. Who instructs Piers the Plowman in Passus I of “Piers Plowman”? Holy Church
5. What did she tell Piers the Plowman is the best of all treasures? Truth
6. In “A Hymn to the Virgin”, what imagery is employed at the beginning of the poem to depict the wonders of the Virgin Mary? brightness brighter than the day
7. Near the end of the poem Mary is called “queen of paradys”. How does that compare with the religion described in Jeremiah ?
8. According to the Unam Sanctam, what is to be the relation between the nations of the world and the Roman Catholic Church? nations subordinate to Roman Catholic Church
9. What does the Unam Sanctam say is absolutely necessary for salvation? submission to the Roman Pontiff
10. Which two swords does the Unam Sanctam say the Roman Catholic Church has been given by God? spiritual and temporal

ASSIGNMENT # 12 (COVERING CHAPTERS 45-46)

1. Briefly summarize the evolution of drama during the Middle Ages. From tropes in church to liturgical drama in church to mystery, miracle and morality plays outside the church building
2. What is a 'miracle play'? a dramatic presentation of the lives and miracles of the saints
3. What is a 'morality play'? a dramatic presentation expressing religious and ethic concerns from the perspective of the individual Christian
4. In what genre is "Everyman"? morality play
5. What is the theme of "Everyman"? when we die, the only thing we can take with us is the good deeds we have done
6. How do 'the seven deadly sins' of the medieval Roman Catholic Church figure in "Everyman"? They are said to characterize most of humanity.
7. What should we think of an actor playing God in drama? It profanes His Name.
8. Death is personified in "Everyman". How is his character depicted? as a messenger of God, to do His bidding
9. What is the tone of "Everyman"? didactic
10. How does Everyman in "Everyman" relate to the Virgin Mary? as his intercessor and co-redeemer
11. Is Everyman's salvation ultimately dependent on Everyman and his good deeds? yes
12. What is the metrical scheme of "The Marriage of Sir Gawain"? ballad meter
13. How does Queen Guinevere in "The Marriage of Sir Gawain" compare with how she is presented in "Lancelot" by Chretien De Troyes? There is no hint of adulterous character in the former.
14. In "The Marriage of Sir Gawain" we read of how King Arthur is accosted by a Baron, who will only let him go on one condition. What is that condition? Arthur must find out and tell him what a woman most desires.
15. King Arthur was let go and later returns on New Year's Day to the Baron. On his way, he meets a lady. What is the lady like? a very ugly hag
16. Loyalty to king and friend was very important in the culture of medieval knighthood. How is this demonstrated by Gawain towards King Arthur? his willingness to marry the hag
17. What choice is Gawain presented by his newlywed wife? that she be beautiful in day or night
18. How does Gawain's answer reinforce what Arthur had earlier told the Baron? Gawain gives his wife her way, and that is what Arthur told the Baron women most want.
19. How is Sir Kay different from Sir Gawain? He would have been more unwilling to marry the hag.
20. What are some of the un-Biblical aspects of "The Marriage of Sir Gawain"? the importance put on physical beauty, contradicts doctrine of female submission to husband

ASSIGNMENT # 13 (COVERING CHAPTER 47)

1. What is the setting of “Troilus and Cressida”? ancient Troy, during the period of the Trojan War
2. How are “Troilus and Cressida”, as well as “Lancelot” and “The Marriage of Sir Gawain”, examples of historical fiction? They are based in historical settings, but many of the details seem to be made up.
3. In historical fiction, which goal seems paramount- historical accuracy or entertainment? entertainment
4. Is Troilus a tragic figure? Why or why not? Yes. He loved Cressida, but she did not remain faithful to him.
5. Often tragic figures have a flaw that proves their downfall. Did Troilus have such a flaw? If you think so, what was it? yes; his passionate love for Cressida
6. Why does Chaucer have many allusions to ancient Greek and Roman deities in “Troilus and Cressida”? apparently to give it a flavor more in line with its setting
7. Who is said in “Troilus and Cressida” to have taken vengeance on Troilus in causing him to fall in love with Cressida and why? the God of Love (Cupid); because Troilus had said passionate love was foolish
8. How does Fate play a role in this work, even as it frequently did in ancient Greek and Roman works? Troilus seems fated by the gods to tragedy.
9. What malady does Troilus confess to Pandarus? (passionate) love for Cressida
10. What “sin” does Pandarus insist Troilus confess? making fun of (passionate) love
11. What was the relation of Pandarus to Cressida? uncle
12. What is foolish about the way Troilus fell in love with Cressida? It was based more on sight, than on investigation of her character.
13. Why is Cressida so reluctant at first to consider falling in love and merry-making? She was still weeping in widowhood.
14. Should Troilus have known before he married Cressida that she would later prove unfaithful? He at least should not have fallen in love without knowing her character more.

ASSIGNMENT # 14 (COVERING CHAPTER 48)

1. The characters presented in the Prologue of *The Canterbury Tales* represent a cross-section of medieval society. They represent a wide variety of medieval occupations, some of which are no longer common today. List the characters noted in the Prologue and define what each of the occupations means.
2. What is a character sketch? A portrait of a specific person
3. The Prologue of *The Canterbury Tales*, along with the Wife of Bath's Prologue and tale, provides us with a character sketch of the Wife of Bath. Write a one-paragraph essay describing the Wife of Bath, including her physical features, personality, beliefs and religious philosophy. She is deaf in one ear because one of her husbands smote her there.
4. What are some ways in which the prioress is satirized in the Prologue? she sings through her nose, her knowledge of French is deficient, she cries over the petty
5. What does the description of the monk, friar, and pardoner suggest about the spiritual state of the Church of the time? worldly
6. What does Chaucer's eulogy of the parson indicate about the attributes he admired? honesty, frugality, diligence, sincerity
7. What is a 'satire'? a genre of literature which combines criticism with humor
8. In what ways is *The Canterbury Tales* a satire? It satirizes much that was wrong in medieval life, such as the corruption of many officers in the Roman Catholic Church.
9. In the Prologue of *The Canterbury Tales*, how did the images Chaucer painted of the characters through words enhance his story of them?
10. In the Prologue of *The Canterbury Tales*, what do the Pardoner's relics suggest about the culture and religion of the times? It was very corrupted and often included a cynical use of religion for ill-gotten gain.
11. What game invented by the host of the Tabard Inn did the pilgrims on their way to Canterbury agree to? to each tell 2 stories coming and returning, and the one that told the best stories judged by the host would get a supper at the Tabard Inn paid by the others
12. In the Wife of Bath's Prologue, what does she say about the book "Against Jovinian", from which we had read earlier in this textbook? That one of her husbands would read from it regularly.
13. In the Friar's Prologue, what role does the host try to play in the dispute between the summoner and friar? peacemaker and arbiter
14. In the Summoner's Tale, what does it suggest is the motive for the friar's preaching? to bring in money
15. In the Summoner's Tale, why would the friar write people's names down who gave him food? to pretend to pray for them
16. In the Summoner's Tale, the friar responds angrily to the summoner's statement about what friars told those who gave them food. What did the summoner say friars told those who gave them food? mockeries and fables

17. In the Summoner's Tale, Thomas says to the friar that he has spent much money on friars to pray for his health, which is bad. How does Thomas say it has affected his health? It has not improved, despite the great outlay of money.
18. What did Thomas give the friar that made the friar so angry? a fart in his hand
19. How does the Summoner's Tale demonstrate the crudeness and cynicism then widespread in the culture? Because the tale dealt with a rather crude topic, and people viewed with cynicism much of the ministry of the Church.

**SECTION FIVE: RECOMMENED COURSE
SCHEDULE**

Assignment #	Textbook Chapters	Recommended Class #
1	1 – 5	1
2	6 – 10	2
3	11 - 16	3
4	17 - 20	4
5	21	5
6	22 - 26	6
7	27 - 29	7
8	30 - 34	8
9	35 - 38	9
10	39 - 41	10
11	42 - 44	11
12	45 - 46	12
13	47	13a
14	48	13b - 14

SECTION FIVE: TEACHER CLASS NOTES

Class 1:

In the first centuries AD, Christianity brought to the Gentile nations many changes. And among those changes was a tremendous literary change. As one reads the literature of the period, and especially the Christian literature, and one compares the literary climate before to the literary climate after, one is struck by the change. The literature became theological and doctrinal in nature, and displacing drama and mere rational philosophy. There was also a great interest in history, especially history from the Christian perspective. So in northern Europe the Christian scholars took the pagan history that had been in song, committed it to writing, and showed how it confirmed scriptural history.

After a few centuries of persecution under the pagan Roman Empire, Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire in the early fourth century AD, during the reign of the emperor Constantine.

Christianity brought with it great changes in culture in the world, including great changes in literature.

What were the chief genres of literature produced by early Christian society? creeds and canons (like the Nicene Creed, *Apostolic Constitutions*, and canons of the Council of Elvira), histories (such as Eusebius' *History of the Church*), doctrinal treatises (like Augustine's "Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints" and Basil's "On the Holy Ghost"), homilies (like Chrysostom's homily on Matthew 5:17), biographies and autobiographies especially concerning spiritual journeys (like Augustine's *Confessions*), polemical treatises (like Jerome's *Against Jovianus*), poetic prayers (like Patrick's "Morning Prayer") and epistles (such as Ambrose's Epistle XVII)

The literature chiefly produced by a society reflects that society's culture and beliefs. What does the literature chiefly produced by early Christian society indicate about its culture and beliefs? It was chiefly interested in the spread of Biblical truth and edification of the saints, and not so much on entertainment.

Compare and contrast the literature generally produced by earlier Christian society with the ancient pagan Greek and Roman literature you have read. The latter concentrated more on entertainment and (perhaps) art form than did the former. The latter also was philosophically pagan, unlike the former.

Compare and contrast the literature generally produced by earlier Christian society with most famous and/or popular modern literature. The latter concentrates more on entertainment and (perhaps) art form than did the former. The latter also is philosophically secular humanistic, unlike the former.

By reading literature we can come to a better understanding of where the early and medieval church generally stood on issues, and I shall cover some of those issues now. I should preface my remarks by saying there was over time controversy over many issues,

so we should not imagine that there was a uniform and monolithic response to the Biblical Christian faith, and that is the reason we should make the basis of our faith the Bible alone, and not the Bible plus church tradition. That said, there were mainstreams, some of which I shall try to point out, along with how the mainstream was controverted over time.

THE ISSUE OF THE TRINITY:

A primary issue in the early church concerned the doctrine of the Trinity. Specifically, there were questions like whether Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are divine, and separate persons from the Father.

THE ISSUE OF CELIBACY (from <http://hnn.us/articles/696.html>) :

The first written mandate requiring priests to be chaste came in AD 304. Canon 33 of the Council of Elvira stated that all "bishops, presbyters, and deacons and all other clerics" were to "abstain completely from their wives and not to have children." A short time later, in 325, the Council of Nicea, convened by Constantine, rejected a ban on priests marrying requested by Spanish clerics.

The practice of priestly celibacy began to spread in the Western Church in the early Middle Ages. In the early 11th century Pope Benedict VIII responded to the decline in priestly morality by issuing a rule prohibiting the children of priests from inheriting property. A few decades later Pope Gregory VII issued a decree against clerical marriages.

The Church was a thousand years old before it definitively took a stand in favor of celibacy in the twelfth century at the Second Lateran Council held in 1139, when a rule was approved forbidding priests to marry. In 1563, the Council of Trent reaffirmed the tradition of celibacy.

THE ISSUE OF THEATER

<http://www.apuritansmind.com/PuritanWorship/PsalterEarlyChurch.htm> :

“...while denouncing in his treatise, " De Spectaculis" attendance in the Theatre, Tertullian shows how natural it was for a psalm to be suggested to the Christian in his day. "Amid the measures of the effeminate player, will he," says Tertullian, meaning any professing Christian, "call up to himself a psalm? " It is plainly implied in this that but for the distracting and carnal excitements of the theatre the spectator, if of the Christian faith, would have psalms readily recurring to his mind, a hint as to the familiarity of the Christians of those days with the Psalms.”

THE ISSUE OF USE OF THE PSALMS:

http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=2752 :

The Psalter was the Hymn Book of the Temple, and in time came to be used in the synagogues as well, although at first those were places of study alone. By New Testament times the worship in the Temple and Synagogue was fully developed to include a regular and comprehensive use of the psalms. The influence of this Hymn Book on the life of the righteous would have been inescapable.

It is worth noting that the spiritual life of Jesus was nourished by the Psalter. Jesus would have participated in singing the psalms at all the festivals, even though they did not entirely apply to him. In fact, the great Hallel as we have seen formed part of the Last Supper service. The force of Satan's quotation of Psalm 91 in the temptation, for example, lay in the fact that a beloved psalm of trust was being presented for application. A psalm filled His thoughts when He was hanging on the cross; and with a psalm He dismissed His spirit. He uncovered the foreshadowing of His own experiences in the psalms, and taught His disciples how such passages prepared the way for Him (John. 13:18; 2:17; Luke 24:44).

James and Paul endorsed the singing of the psalms as the natural expression of the spiritual life (Jas. 5:13; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). The mention of their use in worship in 1 Corinthians 14:26 shows that they had formed part of the liturgy from the very beginning.

The frequent quotations from and allusions to the psalms in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers demonstrate their centrality in worship, both in reading and singing. Tradition says that Ignatius of Antioch (ca. 100) introduced antiphonal singing of the psalms to the Church. Tertullian and Jerome both attest to the universality of the use of the psalms in Jewish and Gentile congregations (Tertullian, *Apol.*, 10, 39; Jerome, *Ep.*, 46). Tertullian says that on the first day of the week after the reading of the Old Testament lessons “the hymns of David” were sung, and people sang the antiphons (*Apostolic Constitutions*, 11, 59).

It is clear that the Psalter itself continued to be used throughout the history of the Church, whether new compositions were written or not. The Psalms were considered basic to the spiritual life of the saints. Chrysostom says:

If we keep vigil in the Church, David comes first, last, and midst. If early in the morning we seek for melody of hymns, first, last, and midst is David again . . . Nor is it in cities and churches alone that at all times, through every age, David is illustrious; in the midst of the forum, in the wilderness, and uninhabitable land, he exacts the praises of God . . . congregating the servants of God into seraphic bands, [he] turns earth into heaven, and converts men into angels (see Neale and Littledale, *Psalms*, p. 1).

Kirkpatrick, in his commentary on the Psalms, gathers several more examples of how the Church leaders have viewed the importance of the Psalter (pp. ci-cvi). He writes:

When men and women, forsaking their ordinary callings, dedicated their lives to devotion and prayer in monasteries and communities, the singing of the Psalms formed a large part of their religious exercises. In course of time the recitation of the psalter became a clerical obligation as well. Various schemes or uses were drawn up. Fixed Psalms were generally assigned to certain of the canonical hours, while at the other services the remainder of the Psalms were recited “in course.” Thus, according to the Roman or Gregorian scheme fixed Psalms were assigned for daily use at Lauds, Prime, Tierce, Sext, Nones, and Compline; while at Mattins Pss. 1-cix, and at Vespers Pss. cx-cl were taken once a week “in course,” exclusive of the Psalms assigned to other services. The Benedictine or Monastic scheme was similar, also providing for the recitation once a week of those Psalms which were not recited daily. The Ambrosian scheme, deriving its origin from St. Ambrose, and still in use in the province of Milan, only provides for the recitation of the Psalter once a fortnight. In the Eastern Church the Psalter is divided into twenty *cathismata*, each of which is subdivided into three *staseis*. The whole Psalter is recited once a week ordinarily, and twice a

week in Lent, but the details of the arrangement vary according to the time of year.

In this way a portion of the Psalms nearly equal in amount to twice the whole Psalter was recited every week. But many instances are quoted of holy men who recited it much more frequently. It is said that St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, in the fifth century, repeated it daily; St. Maurus, the disciple of St. Benedict, and Alcuin, the famous instructor of Charles the Great, did the same. St. Kentigern, bishop of Glasgow, in the sixth century, went through it every night. Bede relates how Ecgbert, a young student of noble birth at an Irish monastery, when attacked by the plague, vowed that if he recovered he would recite the whole Psalter daily in addition to the ordinary canonical hours, as a memorial of praise to God (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 27).

A knowledge of the Psalter by heart was required

A knowledge of the Psalter by heart was required of candidates for ordination. St. Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 458-471), refused to ordain as priest anyone who had not been diligent in reciting the Psalter. St. Gregory the Great inquired if Rusticus, who had been elected Bishop of Ancona, knew the Psalter by heart, and refused to allow John the Presbyter to be consecrated as metropolitan of Ravenna on account of his ignorance of the Psalter. The second Canon of the second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 587) laid it down that no one was to be consecrated bishop unless he knew the Psalter thoroughly, and the eighth Council of Toledo (A.D. 653) ordered that “no one henceforth shall be promoted to any ecclesiastical dignity who does not perfectly know the whole Psalter” (Can. 8).

St. Athanasius in his *Marcellinus on the Interpretation of the Psalms*, the whole of which well deserves study, writes thus:

“They seem to me to be a kind of mirror for everyone who sings them, in which he may observe the motions of the soul, and as he observes them give utterance to them in words. He who hears them read, takes them as if they were spoken especially for him. Stricken in his conscience he repents, or hearing of hope in God, and of the grace which is given to those who believe, he rejoices as if this grace were promised to him in particular, and begins to thank God He who genuinely studies all that is written in this book of Divine inspiration may gather, as out of a paradise, that which is serviceable for his own need. Methinks that in the words of this book you may find an accurate survey and delineation of the whole life of man, the dispositions of the soul, and the movements of the mind. If a man has need of penitence and confession, if affliction or temptation has overtaken him, if he has been persecuted or delivered from the plots of his enemies, if he is in sorrow or trouble, or if he wishes to praise and give thanks and bless the Lord, he finds instruction in the Psalms If thou meditate on these things and study the Psalms, thou shalt be able, under the guidance of the Holy

Spirit, to grasp their meaning; and thou shalt emulate the life of the divinely inspired men who uttered these words.”

In a well-known passage of his *Confessions* (ix. 4), St. Augustine describes the comfort which he derived from the Psalms in the interval before his baptism. “In what accents I addressed Thee, my God, when I read the Psalms of David, those faithful songs, the language of devotion which banishes the spirit of pride How I addressed Thee in those Psalms! how my love for Thee was kindled by them! how I burned to recite them, were it possible, throughout the world, as an antidote for the pride of humanity Would that they [the Manichaeans who angered him] could have been somewhere near me without my knowledge and watched my face and heard my voice when I read the Fourth Psalm in that time of leisure, and have known the effect of that Psalm upon me. Would that they could have heard what I uttered between the words of the Psalm, without my knowing that they heard . . . how I spoke with myself and to myself before Thee out of the inmost feelings of my soul. I trembled for fear, and then I became fervent with hope and rejoicing in Thy mercy, O Father. And all these feelings issued forth by my eyes and voice”

<http://www.freechurch.org/crown4.html> :

The singing in the synagogue differed from the singing in the Temple in two important ways: it was unaccompanied, and the congregation were fully involved. All the indications are that the early Church sang in the same way. It is also worth noting that, surrounded as it was by Creek culture with its famous music, the Church stood apart. It not only chose the music of the synagogue rather than the music of the Creek temple; it opted for music which grew out of a context of worship rather than the entertainment music of which there was an abundance at the time.

Debate soon arose about the desirability of using instruments in worship. The arguments in favour were rejected, 'With the result that the music composed for the Church during the first thousand years or so was sung unaccompanied' (Harman and Mellers, *Man and his Music*, 1962, p.2). Hymns also became popular in some places at an early date, but, 'In the second half of the third century there was a general suppression of non-biblical hymns, caused by the dangerous popularity of heretical compositions. Psalm-singing was promoted instead' (David Hiley in Neze, *Oxford Companion to Music*, 1983, vol 2. p.1447).

In spite of these factors the simplicity of the early Church's worship was soon lost. David Hiley, again, explains: 'Chants for congregational singing - for example psalm tones and hymns - have retained a simple and direct character. But practically all other chants have come down to us in a form for trained choirs or solo singers, relatively ornate in style and rather remote or "other worldly" in character'. The story of how plain chant developed is, of course, musically fascinating. It is the embryo out of which the whole of Western music grew. But its suitability for worship is another matter. Erik Routley sums up the lesson of a thousand years in three sentences: 'Once the Church became an established public institution, congregational singing was unknown in it, and it remained unknown until a very late stage in the Middle Ages. The music appropriate to the Mass and to the monastic offices was sung always by a canter with a choir and only overheard by the lay

worshipper. If then plain song music "sounds uncongregational" to the modern ear, that is what it was meant to be' (The Music of Christian Hymns).

<http://www.apuritansmind.com/PuritanWorship/PsalterEarlyChurch.htm> :

There is nothing, however, which militates against the presumption which has just been expressed; while, besides, we have the testimony of a competent witness, Tertullian, about the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, to the effect that in religious gatherings and in the domestic circle Christians were then in the habit of singing psalms. In his "Apologeticus" this distinguished writer repels the charge, often made by the heathens, that the Christians in their meetings were guilty of atrocious practices, and gives a rapid sketch of the manner in which the love-feast, as it would seem, was conducted among them. Having described the simple, social meal partaken of by rich and poor together, he adds: "After manual ablution and the bringing in of lights, each is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the Holy Scriptures or one of his own composing."

On this statement I subjoin a few comments:

First. The service described scarcely appears to be one of regular, solemn worship, for the singing was not performed in concert but the entire company assembled, but in "solo" fashion by individuals in their turn.

Second. Hymns taken from the Scriptures formed, at least in part, the matter of song; and from what part of the Scriptures would these so probably be drawn as from the Psalter, the recognized hymn-book of the Bible? Beyond question the psalms of Scripture were often designated "hymns" by the early Christians, as very properly they might.

Third. Some of the hymns used were improvised, or at least composed by the singers themselves. In such an informal service the liberty to use such effusions may have been allowed, although not permitted in regular worship. Besides, the custom as it existed in Tertullian's day, may have been a relic and echo of that marvelous season of supernatural endowments which the Church enjoyed during the apostolic period, when individuals

may in the public Christian assemblies have been suddenly inspired to pour forth their emotions in poetic strains. If such outbursts occurred, as is very possible, they were but transient, the song or chant passing away with the occasion that had called it forth, and never being preserved as a part of the stated and permanent psalmody of the Church. Yet when the age of extraordinary gifts had closed, it can easily be credited that attempts to perpetuate it or to reproduce its scenes would be made by persons utterly devoid of the gift of inspiration.

Fourth. According to Tertullian's account there were but two sources whence the hymns used at love-feasts were derived, namely, the Scriptures and the brains of the singers respectively. It would appear, then, from this that there was then in use no written collection of hymns except that furnished in the Bible. Furthermore, in his treatise entitled "Ad Uxorem," Tertullian, describing the domestic life of Christians, says: "Between the two" (that is, husband and wife), "echo psalms and hymns, and they mutually challenge each other which shall better chant to their Lord."

According to this testimony it appears that in Tertullian's day the Christians were wont to use the Psalms in the praise of God in the domestic circle; nor is it necessary to understand that the hymns spoken of were any other than those found in the Book of Psalms.

Incidentally, while denouncing in his treatise, "De Spectaculis" attendance in the Theatre, Tertullian shows how natural it was for a psalm to be suggested to the Christian in his day. "Amid the measures of the effeminate player, will he," says Tertullian, meaning any professing Christian, "call up to himself a psalm?" It is plainly implied in this that but for the distracting and carnal excitements of the theatre the spectator, if of the Christian faith, would have psalms readily recurring to his mind, a hint as to the familiarity of the Christians of those days with the Psalms.

Descending the stream of time, we reach the age of which we have a picture in the compilation known as "The Apostolic Constitutions." This work professes to be a

production of the apostles jointly, but it is in this respect a palpable forgery. It seems to be in substance a product of the third century; but according to the judgment of the most competent scholars numerous interpolations occur in it to which no earlier date than the first quarter of the fourth century (A. D. 300 to A. D. 325) can be assigned. Now in this collection, which partakes partly of the character of a "directory for worship," particular instructions are given as to the use of the Psalms; not as if the use of them in worship was a novelty, but with the view of securing uniformity in the use of them, or in respect to the fittest times for introducing them in the service of worship. A few extracts from this ancient document will be of interest as showing the condition of the Church in regard to psalmody about the beginning of the fourth century.

In Book I., Sec. 5, occurs the following advice addressed to such as may be absent from public worship: "Or, if thou stayest at home, read the Books of the Law, with the Kings and the Prophets, and sing the hymns of David." It is noteworthy that here, as sometimes elsewhere in the "Constitutions, the psalms are called "hymns," just as we believe they are in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16.

Again we read (B. I., Sec. 6), " If thou desirest something to sing, thou hast the Psalms." Further, it is said (B II., Sec. 57), "But when there have been two lessons severally read, let some other person sing the hymns of David, and let the people join at the conclusions of the verses."

In B. II, Sec. 59, this rubric occurs: "But assemble yourselves together every day, morning and evening, singing psalms and praying in the Lord's house; in the morning saying the 63d Psalm, and in the evening the 140th Psalm, but principally on the Sabbath day."

In the course of some instructions in regard to the observance of the Lord's Supper, the following direction is given (B. VIII., Sec. 13): "And let the 23d Psalm be sung while all the rest are partaking." Although the point is unimportant for our present object, it may be mentioned in passing that by the 23rd Psalm in this instance is to be understood, according to the Septuagint numbering, the 24th Psalm. For in the Septuagint, which is

followed in this respect by the Vulgate version, the 9th and 10th Psalms are numbered as the 9th Psalm, while Psalm 141 is divided into two psalms.

The foregoing extracts, to which others might be added, from "The Apostolic Constitutions," may serve to show how customary it was in the Church at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth to use the Scripture Psalter in the exercises of worship, both public and private.

One of the most eminent churchmen of the fourth century was Basil, surnamed "The Great," Bishop of Csesarea, in Cappadocia, who was born A. D. 330, and who died A. D. 379. In his notes on the 1st Psalm, he descants in glowing terms on the excellence of the Psalter, and incidentally reveals to us the extent to which the practice of singing psalms prevailed in his time, when he says, "But the utterances of the Psalms all chant at home and bear about in the forum."

Athanasius (born A. D. 300, died A. D. 373), the famous champion of the doctrine of the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus, wrote a treatise on the Psalms, of which the learned Bingham says: "It is nothing else but a direction how to use the Psalms and forms of prayer and praises upon all particular occasions, where, with other things, he observes that the 63d Psalm was always to be used at morning prayer." His estimate of the Psalms may be learned from the statement which he makes respecting them, "They appear to me to be a mirror of the soul of ever} one who sings them." These words imply that it was customary in the time of Athanasius to sing, and not merely read, the Psalms. That this was so is corroborated by the fact that on a critical occasion in his own life, when the soldiers of the Emperor Constantius, with hostile intent, closed in around the church in Alexandria where the great theologian was preaching, he gave directions that the congregation should sing the 136th Psalm, during the singing of which he contrived to make his escape. Incidentally, also, mention is made by Athanasius of the rude treatment to which a certain woman was subjected by the soldiers of Constantius when they saw her with her Psalter, or, as we would say, her psalm book, in her hand.

But another extract from his writings must be given to show how Athanasius, the greatest man, with one exception, in the ancient Church, regarded the Psalms. "In them," says he, "you find portrayed man's whole life, the emotions of his soul and the frames of his mind. We cannot conceive of anything richer than the Book of Psalms. If you need penitence; if anguish or temptation has befallen you; if you have escaped persecution and oppression, or are immersed in deep affliction concerning each and all, you may find instruction and state, it to God in the Words of the Psalter."

In the Church of North Africa, where, in the early centuries of our era a vigorous Christianity flourished, there is clear evidence that the inspired Psalter was the recognized hymnbook. The great Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in Africa (born A. D. 353, died A. D. 430), often refers in his discourses to the psalms which had just been sung in the meetings, making it clear that the psalmody in use in those assemblies was that of the Bible. The Donatists of Africa, who differed in some particulars from their brethren who were known as Catholics, or orthodox Christians, propagated their views by means of hymns of their own composition and ridiculed the orthodox, as Augustine intimates, for adhering in their worship to the inspired songs. Moreover, Augustine, in his confessions (ix., 4), speaking of the Psalms, says, "*toto orbe cantanter*"—"they are sung through the whole world."

Jerome (born probably A. D. 340, died A. D. 420), tells us that in his childhood he had learned the Psalms by heart, and that in his old age he sang them daily. Describing the convent which he had succeeded in establishing at Bethlehem, he employs the forcible expression, "*extra psalmos silentium est*," meaning that its silence was unbroken unless by the singing of psalms.

The eloquent Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, (born A. D. 347, died A. D. 407), bears ample testimony to the prevalence of psalm singing in his time. In his sixth Homily on Repentance, he signifies that the Psalms were used by all classes and on all occasions. "When," says he, they hold their vigils all night in the church, David's Psalms are in the

beginning, and middle, and end of all their service;" "David is always in their mouths, not only in the cities and the churches, but in the courts, in the mountains, in the deserts, in the wilderness."

The mention which Chrysostom makes of the singing of psalms in deserts and other sequestered regions is in consonance with the evidence furnished by one of his contemporaries, John Cassian, touching the routine of devotional exercises then prevalent in the monasteries of Egypt. He informs us that at first in those establishments a great difference of usage existed as to the number of psalms to be sung daily, there being eighteen psalms sung in uninterrupted succession in some monasteries; in others twenty, or even more; but that at length it was arranged that twelve psalms should be sung continuously each morning, and as many each evening.

In addition to all the vouchers now produced in support of our present proposition, the fact may be mentioned that in the Council of Laodicea, held about A. D. 360, it was decreed that no psalms composed by uninspired men should be used in the Church service. The compositions thus excluded are styled in the language of the Council, "*psalmoi idiotikoi*," which seems to mean psalms not pertaining to the canon of Scripture, or at least not the direct product of supernatural inspiration. Such is the judgment of the writer of the article, "Psalmody," in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, edited by Dr. Wm. Smith and Professor Cheetham. Having referred to the hymn composed by Augustine for controversial ends, the writer alluded to says, "Such psalms of human composition were sometimes called *psalmi plebeii or vulgares*; and in Greek, *idiotikoi*."

Moreover, in the first Council of Braga, held A. D. 563, it was ordained, in response to memorials from certain quarters, that no poetic composition be sung in the Church except the Psalms of the sacred canon, "*Ut extra psalmos vel canonicarum Scripturarum Novi et Veteris Testamenti nihil potest compositum in ecclesia psallatur*." It is true that this decree seems to allow the use of other songs than those contained in the Psalter, yet it plainly debars the use of any songs in worship except those contained in the Word of

God. It is observable also that, according to this ordinance the singing must be limited to poetic portions of Scripture, not extended to any part of the Bible whatsoever.

Indeed, so prevalent was the use of the Psalms in the devotional services of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries that it was generally felt to be very desirable, and in some cases it was counted indispensable, that any who aspired to be teachers and leaders in the Church should be able to recite the Psalms from memory. The following summary, given by the writer of the article, "Psalmody," in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, is in point: " One remarkable effect of the prevalence of psalmody and the scarcity of books was that the Psalter was frequently learnt by heart. In the sixth century this is reported by Cyril, of Scythopolis, to have been done by St. Theodosius. St. Jerome desired that it should be done even by very young people. Sketching the prelect monk, he requires that by such a character it should be learnt word for word. The damsel, Pacatula, was to commit the Psalms to memory at seven years old. No one of the sisters in the Jerusalem convent might be ignorant of the Psalter. Even the Huns, he says, are learning the Psalter.

Cyril, of Scythopolis, in the "Life of St. Sabas," says that monks were not admitted till they had learnt the Psalter and the rule of psalmody. Hence it was ruled by the Second Council of Nicaea (Can. 2) that no one should be advanced to be a bishop unless he knew the Psalter by heart, and that he was to be examined by the metropolitan. Gregory the Great says that he would not ordain John the Presbyter, because he did not know the Psalms. The same Pope would not allow Rusticus, the deacon, to be made Bishop of Ancona for a similar reason. "He was a vigilant man, indeed," he said, "but he did not know the Psalms." A great deal more in the same strain might be quoted, but the citation made is sufficient for our purpose.

Enough has been advanced to prove that, even from the age of the apostles, the Church used the divine Psalter in singing the praises of God.

BASIL

Basil (ca. [330](#) - [January 1, 379](#)), also called **Basil the Great**, was [bishop](#) of [Caesarea](#), a leading churchman in the [4th century](#). The [Eastern Orthodox Church](#) considers him a [saint](#) and one of the Three Holy Hierarchs, together with [Gregory Nazianzus](#) and [John Chrysostom](#). Basil, Gregory Nazianzus, and Basil's brother [Gregory of Nyssa](#) are called the [Cappadocian Fathers](#). The [Roman Catholic Church](#) considers him a saint and a [Doctor of the Church](#).

The Basilian Fathers, also known as [The Congregation of St. Basil](#), is an international order of Roman Catholic priests and students studying for the priesthood.

In [Greek](#) tradition, his name was given to [Father Christmas](#) and is supposed to visit children and give presents every [January 1](#) (when Basil's memory is celebrated), unlike other traditions where this person is [Saint Nicolas](#) and comes every [Christmas](#).

He should not be confused with [Basil Fool for Christ](#), a Russian Orthodox [saint](#), after whom St. Basil's Cathedral on Red Square in Moscow is named.

He also should not be confused with [Saint Basil of Ostrog](#), who is a Serbian Orthodox [saint](#), who built the [Ostrog Monastery](#) which is caved in and stands on a very high hill between Danilovgrad and [Niksic](#).

http://www.answers.com/main/ntquery;jsessionid=9elt6mblgqg5f?method=4&dsid=2222&dekey=Basil+of+Caesarea&gwp=8&curtab=2222_1&sbid=lc01a&linktext=Basil%20of%20Caesarea

Basil the Great, Saint ([bă'zīl, bā'—](#)) , c.330–379, Greek prelate, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Doctor of the Church and one of the Four Fathers of the Greek Church. He was a brother of St. Gregory of Nyssa. In his student days at Athens he knew Julian, later Roman emperor, and began his lifelong friendship with St. [Gregory Nazianzen](#). Converted to the religious life by his sister, St. Macrina, he withdrew (c.357) to a retreat in Pontus. There he wrote much of the *Longer Rule* and of the *Shorter Rule*; on these the life of the [Basilian monks](#) is based. Through his rules Basil was a spiritual ancestor of St. Benedict. As counselor (365) and successor (370) of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea and head of most of the church in Asia Minor, Basil established Nicene orthodoxy over [Arianism](#) in the Byzantine East. His revision of the liturgy is occasionally used in the Byzantine rite. His works *On the Holy Ghost* and *Against Eunomius* are elegant, acute defenses of the Catholic system. In the West his feast is June 14.

BIBLE FORBIDDEN

The reason for the masking of their identities, and the concealment of their bibles is that, in the year 1229, the bible was placed on the "Index of Forbidden Books" by the Council of Valencia, and was forbidden to be read or possessed by any laymen.

Class 2:

THE ISSUE OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

Church structure.- what do we read it was like in the early centuries of the church and how was it evolving. Here is how the scholar and theologian John Calvin describes it in his *Institutes*:

Christianity tended to spread from ancient city to city, and then reach out to the outlying areas. So we read in the book of Acts how it went from Jerusalem to Antioch to Ephesus to Corinth to Rome. Once a city had a Christian church, the gospel would spread to surrounding environs around that city. The church in a city, and later the city and the environs that surrounded it, would consist of multiple congregations, since practically speaking they could not meet in just one place, or be adequately shepherded in one place. This mirrored the synagogue system of the Jews, for there were many synagogues in Jerusalem, but they all considered themselves as part of a larger congregation of synagogues. There was not just one large mega-synagogue in Jerusalem, and similarly there was not just one large church building in Jerusalem. The elders (aka bishops or presbyters) of the individual congregations in a city and its environs would form a college of elders. In Presbyterian circles that is called a presbytery; in Dutch reformed circles it is called a classis; in Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Episcopal circles it is called a diocese ([Middle English *diocise*, from Old French, from Late Latin *diocēsis*, from Latin *dioecēsis*, *jurisdiction*, from Greek *dioikēsis*, *administration*, from *dioikein*, *to keep house*, *administer* : *dia-*, *intensive pref.*; see **dia-** + *oikein*, *to inhabit* (from *oikos*, *house*. See *weik-*¹ in Indo-European Roots).] Now whenever you have a meeting of elders, you have to have someone to lead the meeting, so it is not a disorganized mess. So the college of elders elect someone to lead the college of elders. In the US House of Representatives that person is called a Speaker of the House. In Presbyterian circles that person is called a Moderator, in Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Episcopal circles it is called a bishop. In the early church, like in the US House of Representatives, the person who occupied the seat of Speaker of the House only got one vote in the presbytery. He also served of course as a chief spokesman for decisions made by the presbytery or diocese. As centuries passed the person occupying this position of bishop or moderator in a presbytery tended to accrue more and more power relative to the other elders in the presbytery (aka classis or diocese). In addition, the person who was bishop or moderator of a presbytery representing a larger or more important city tended to accrue greater and greater power relative to the other bishops. As you can imagine, there were power struggles among the bishops for preeminence.

To keep one man from accruing so much power in a presbytery, should there be a rotating moderatorship? It is similar to the question of whether to limit the power of the Speaker of the House there should be a term limit, which forces a rotation. Or if one possesses peculiar gifts as moderator should he be allowed to remain in that position? What if he starts putting in place rules of order which give him more and more power relative to the others?

Church titles- In the Apostolic church every elder was called a bishop, but over time the title came to designate the person who served in the seat of moderator of the presbytery in some city and its environs. Similarly, every elder was called father [aka in Latin ‘papa’ or pope], but over time the title came to designate only bishops, and within Roman Catholicism only the bishop of Rome. [Pope- Middle English, from Old English $p\bar{a}pa$, from Late Latin, from Latin, *father (title of bishops)*, from Greek $papp\bar{a}s$. See *papa* in Indo-European Roots.] Even still today you will hear Anglicans and Catholics calling their local parish priest “Father So-and-So”.

It should be pointed out that later writings reinforced what was written in the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon. For instance:

The Anathemas of the Second Council of Constantinople (553 AD)

The Second Council of Constantinople was called to resolve certain questions that were raised by the [Definition of Chalcedon](#), the most important of which had to do with the unity of the two natures, God and man, in Jesus Christ. The Second Council of Constantinople confirmed the Definition of Chalcedon, while emphasizing that Jesus Christ does not just embody God the Son, He **is** God the Son.

Excerpts from the Work:

- I. If anyone does not confess that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one nature or essence, one power or authority, worshipped as a trinity of the same essence, one deity in three hypostases or persons, let him be anathema. For there is one God and Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things.
- II. If anyone does not confess that God the Word was twice begotten, the first before all time from the Father, non-temporal and bodiless, the other in the last days when he came down from the heavens and was incarnate by the holy, glorious, God-bearer, ever-virgin Mary, and born of her, let him be anathema.
- III. If anyone says that God the Word who performed miracles is one and Christ who suffered is another, or says that God the Word was together with Christ who came from woman, or that the Word was in him as one person is in another, but is not one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God,

incarnate and become human, and that the wonders and the suffering which he voluntarily endured in flesh were not of the same person, let him be anathema.

- IV. If anyone says that the union of the Word of God with man was only according to grace or function or dignity or equality of honor or authority or relation or effect or power or according to his good pleasure, as though God the Word was pleased with man, or approved of him, as the raving Theodosius says; or that the union exists according to similarity of name, by which the Nestorians call God the Word Jesus and Christ, designating the man separately as Christ and as Son, speaking thus clearly of two persons, but when it comes to his honor, dignity, and worship, pretend to say that there is one person, one Son and one Christ, by a single designation; and if he does not acknowledge, as the holy Fathers have taught, that the union of God is made with the flesh animated by a reasonable and intelligent soul, and that such union is according to synthesis or hypostasis, and that therefore there is only one person, the Lord Jesus Christ one of the holy Trinity -- let him be anathema. As the word "union" has many meanings, the followers of the impiety of Apollinaris and Eutyches, assuming the disappearance of the natures, affirm a union by confusion. On the other hand the followers of Theodore and of Nestorius rejoicing in the division of the natures, introduce only a union of relation. But the holy Church of God, rejecting equally the impiety of both heresies, recognizes the union of God the Word with the flesh according to synthesis, that is according to hypostasis. For in the mystery of Christ the union according to synthesis preserves the two natures which have combined without confusion and without separation.
- V. If anyone understands the expression -- one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ -- so that it means the union of many hypostases, and if he attempts thus to introduce into the mystery of Christ two hypostases, or two persons, and, after having introduced two persons, speaks of one person according to dignity, honor or worship, as Theodore and Nestorius insanely have written; and if anyone slanders the holy synod of Chalcedon, as though it had used this expression in this impious sense, and does not confess that the Word of God is united with the flesh hypostatically, and that therefore there is but one hypostasis or one person, and that the holy synod of Chalcedon has professed in this sense the one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ; let him be anathema. For the Holy Trinity, when God the Word was incarnate, was not increased by the addition of a person or hypostasis.
- VI. If anyone says that the holy, glorious, and ever-virgin Mary [*Note: The claim that Mary is "ever-virgin" is Roman Catholic folklore. (Jonathan Barlow)*] is called God-bearer by misuse of language and not truly, or by analogy, believing that only a mere man was born of her and that God the Word was not incarnate of her, but that the incarnation of God the Word resulted only from the fact that he united himself to that man who was born of her; if anyone slanders the Holy Synod of Chalcedon as though it had asserted the Virgin to be God-bearer according to the impious sense of Theodore; or if

anyone shall call her manbearer or Christbearer, as if Christ were not God, and shall not confess that she is truly God-bearer, because God the Word who before all time was begotten of the Father was in these last days incarnate of her, and if anyone shall not confess that in this pious sense the holy Synod of Chalcedon confessed her to be God-bearer: let him be anathema.

- VII. If anyone using the expression, "in two natures," does not confess that our one Lord Jesus Christ is made known in the deity and in the manhood, in order to indicate by that expression a difference of the natures of which the ineffable union took place without confusion, a union in which neither the nature of the Word has changed into that of the flesh, nor that of the flesh into that of the Word (for each remained what it was by nature, even when the union by hypostasis had taken place); but shall take the expression with regard to the mystery of Christ in a sense so as to divide the parties, let him be anathema. Or if anyone recognizing the number of natures in the same our one Lord Jesus Christ, God the Word incarnate, does not take in contemplation only the difference of the natures which compose him, which difference is not destroyed by the union between them -- for one is composed of the two and the two are in one -- but shall make use of the number two to divide the natures or to make of them persons properly so called, let him be anathema.
- VIII. If anyone confesses that the union took place out of two natures or speaks of the one incarnate nature of God the Word and does not understand those expressions as the holy Fathers have taught, that out of the divine and human natures, when union by hypostasis took place, one Christ was formed; but from these expressions tries to introduce one nature or essence of the Godhead and manhood of Christ; let him be anathema. For in saying that the only-begotten Word was united by hypostasis personally we do not mean that there was a mutual confusion of natures, but rather we understand that the Word was united to the flesh, each nature remaining what it was. Therefore there is one Christ, God and man, of the same essence with the Father as touching his Godhead, and of the same essence with us as touching his manhood. Therefore the Church of God equally rejects and anathematizes those who divide or cut apart or who introduce confusion into the mystery of the divine dispensation of Christ.
- IX. If anyone says that Christ ought to be worshipped in his two natures, in the sense that he introduces two adorations, the one peculiar to God the Word and the other peculiar to the man; or if anyone by destroying the flesh, or by confusing the Godhead and the humanity, or by contriving one nature or essence of those which were united and so worships Christ, and does not with one adoration worship God the Word incarnate with his own flesh, as the Church of God has received from the beginning; let him be anathema.
- X. If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ who was crucified in the flesh is true God and the Lord of Glory and one of the Holy Trinity; let him be anathema.

- XI. If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, together with their impious, godless writings, and all the other heretics already condemned and anathematized by the holy catholic and apostolic Church, and by the aforementioned four Holy Synods and all those who have held and hold or who in their godlessness persist in holding to the end the same opinion as those heretics just mentioned; let him be anathema.
-

CHAPTER 8 : The Perpetual Virginity of Blessed Mary : Against Helvidius BY JEROME

Background Information

Up to this point in our textbook we have considered the works of men primarily in the eastern Roman Empire; now it is time to consider those of the western Roman Empire, and that were especially influential in the Western Christian Church.

The earliest Latin writings of influential patristic thinkers, like Tertullian, John Chrysostom, Origen, and Jerome, all of whom cited Paul as their authoritative source, subordinated the married state to an ascetic lifestyle and urged the sublimation of sexual desire into religious devotion. Perhaps what might be described as the most notorious opposition to marriage appears in Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianus*, which argues vehemently for the superiority of virginity. The argument initiates a debate on marriage that remains a contentious issue surfacing hundreds of years later, among other places, in Chaucer's *The Wife of Bath's Prologue*.

However influential Jerome might have been, it was Augustine's ambivalence about marital sexuality that ultimately had the most profound effect on clerical views of marriage. Called by at least one scholar "the architect of spiritual marriage in the West," Augustine upheld the "goods" of marriage, i.e., procreation, marital fidelity, and the sacramental bond, in his treatise on the subject. At the same time, however, he proposed that there could be a perfectly valid marriage without sex like that of Mary and Joseph, whose relation endorsed marital affection, the sacramental bond.

This tract appeared about A.D. 383. The question which gave occasion to it was whether the Mother of our Lord remained a Virgin after His birth. Helvidius maintained that the mention in the Gospels of the "sisters" and "brethren" of our Lord was proof that the Blessed Virgin had subsequent issue, and he supported his opinion by the writings of Tertullian and Victorinus. The outcome of his views was that virginity was ranked below matrimony. Jerome vigorously takes the other side, and tries to prove that the "sisters" and "brethren" spoken of, were either children of Joseph by a former marriage, or first cousins, children of the sister of the Virgin. A detailed account of the controversy will be found in Farrar's "Early Days of Christianity," pp. 124 sq. When Jerome wrote this

treatise both he and Helvidius were at Rome, and Damasus was Pope. The only contemporary notice preserved of Helvidius is that by Jerome in the following pages.

Jerome maintains against Helvidius three propositions:—

- 1st. That Joseph was only putatively, not really, the husband of Mary.
- 2d. That the “brethren” of the Lord were his cousins, not his own brethren.
- 3d. That virginity is better than the married state.

1. The first of these occupies ch. 3–8. It turns upon the record in [Matt. i. 18–25](#), and especially on the words, “Before they came together” (c. 4), “knew her not till, &c.” (5–8).

2. The second (c. 9–17) turns upon the words “first-born son” (9, 10), which, Jerome argues, are applicable not only to the eldest of several, but also to an only son: and the mention of brothers and sisters, whom Jerome asserts to have been children of Mary the wife of Cleophas or Clopas (11–16); he appeals to many Church writers in support of this view (17).

[335](#)3. In support of his preference of virginity to marriage, Jerome argues that not only Mary but Joseph also remained in the virgin state (19); that, though marriage may sometimes be a holy estate, it presents great hindrances to prayer (20), and the teaching of Scripture is that the states of virginity and continency are more accordant with God’s will than that of marriage (21, 22).

Excerpts from the Work

1. I was requested by certain of the brethren not long ago to reply to a pamphlet written by one Helvidius. I have deferred doing so, not because it is a difficult matter to maintain the truth and refute an ignorant boor who has scarce known the first glimmer of learning, but because I was afraid my reply might make him appear worth defeating. There was the further consideration that a turbulent fellow, the only individual in the world who thinks himself both priest and layman, one who, [4168](#) as has been said, thinks that eloquence consists in loquacity and considers speaking ill of anyone to be the witness of a good conscience, would begin to blaspheme worse than ever if opportunity of discussion were afforded him. He would stand as it were on a pedestal, and would publish his views far and wide. There was reason also to fear that when truth failed him he would assail his opponents with the weapon of abuse. But all these motives for silence, though just, have more justly ceased to influence me, because of the scandal caused to the brethren who

were disgusted at his ravings. The axe of the Gospel must therefore be now laid to the root of the barren tree, and both it and its fruitless foliage cast into the fire, so that Helvidius who has never learnt to speak, may at length learn to hold his tongue.

2. I must call upon the Holy Spirit to express His meaning by my mouth and defend the virginity of the Blessed Mary. I must call upon the Lord Jesus to guard the sacred lodging of the womb in which He abode for ten months from all suspicion of sexual intercourse. And I must also entreat God the Father to show that the mother of His Son, who was a mother before she was a bride, continued a Virgin after her son was born. We have no desire to career over the fields of eloquence, we do not resort to the snares of the logicians or the thickets of Aristotle. We shall adduce the actual words of Scripture. Let him be refuted by the same proofs which he employed against us, so that he may see that it was possible for him to read what is written, and yet to be unable to discern the established conclusion of a sound faith.

3. His first statement was: “Matthew says,⁴¹⁶⁹ Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. And Joseph her husband, being a righteous man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privately. But when he thought on these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.” Notice, he says, that the word used is *betrothed*, not *intrusted* as you say, and of course the only reason why she was betrothed was that she might one day be married. And the Evangelist would not have said *before they came together* if they were not to come together, for no one would use the phrase *before he dined* of a man who was not going to dine. Then, again, the angel calls her *wife* and speaks of her as *united* to Joseph. We are next invited to listen to the declaration of Scripture:⁴¹⁷⁰ “And Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife; and knew her not till she had brought forth her son.”

4. Let us take the points one by one, and follow the tracks of this impiety that we may show that he has contradicted himself. He admits that she was betrothed, and in the next breath will have her to be a man’s wife whom he has admitted to be his betrothed. Again, he calls her wife, and then says the only reason why she was betrothed was that she might one day be married. And, for fear we might not think that enough, “the word used,” he says, “is *betrothed* and not *intrusted*, that is to say, not yet a wife, not yet united by the bond of wedlock.” But when he continues, “the Evangelist would never have applied the words, *before they came together* to persons who were not to come together, any more than one says, *before he dined*, when the man is not going to dine,” I know not whether to grieve or laugh. Shall I convict him of ignorance, or accuse him of rashness? Just as if, supposing a person to say, “Before dining in harbour I sailed to Africa,” his words could not hold good unless he were compelled some day to dine in harbour. If I choose to say, “the apostle Paul before he went to Spain was put in fetters at Rome,” or (as I certainly might) “Helvidius, before he repented, was cut off by death,” must Paul on being released at once go to Spain, or must Helvidius repent after death, although the Scripture says⁴¹⁷¹ “In sheol who shall give thee thanks?” Must we not rather understand **336** that the preposition *before*, although it frequently denotes order in time, yet sometimes refers only

to order in thought? So that there is no necessity, if sufficient cause intervened to prevent it, for our thoughts to be realized. When, then, the Evangelist says *before they came together*, he indicates the time immediately preceding marriage, and shows that matters were so far advanced that she who had been betrothed was on the point of becoming a wife. As though he said, before they kissed and embraced, before the consummation of marriage, she was found to be with child. And she was found to be so by none other than Joseph, who watched the swelling womb of his betrothed with the anxious glances, and, at this time, almost the privilege, of a husband. Yet it does not follow, as the previous examples showed, that he had intercourse with Mary after her delivery, when his desires had been quenched by the fact that she had already conceived. And although we find it said to Joseph in a dream, “Fear not to take Mary thy wife”; and again, “Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife,” no one ought to be disturbed by this, as though, inasmuch as she is called *wife*, she ceases to be *betrothed*, for we know it is usual in Scripture to give the title to those who are betrothed. The following evidence from Deuteronomy establishes the point.⁴¹⁷² “If the man,” says the writer, “find the damsel that is betrothed in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her, he shall surely die, because he hath humbled his neighbour’s wife.” And in another place,⁴¹⁷³ “If there be a damsel that is a virgin betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour’s wife: so thou shalt put away the evil from the midst of thee.” Elsewhere also,⁴¹⁷⁴ “And what man is there that hath betrothed a wife, and hath not taken her? let him go and return unto his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man take her.” But if anyone feels a doubt as to why the Virgin conceived after she was betrothed rather than when she had no one betrothed to her, or, to use the Scripture phrase, no husband, let me explain that there were three reasons. First, that by the genealogy of Joseph, whose kinswoman Mary was, Mary’s origin might also be shown. Secondly, that she might not in accordance with the law of Moses be stoned as an adulteress. Thirdly, that in her flight to Egypt she might have some solace, though it was that of a guardian rather than a husband. For who at that time would have believed the Virgin’s word that she had conceived of the Holy Ghost, and that the angel Gabriel had come and announced the purpose of God? and would not all have given their opinion against her as an adulteress, like Susanna? for at the present day, now that the whole world has embraced the faith, the Jews argue that when Isaiah says,⁴¹⁷⁵ “Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son,” the Hebrew word denotes a young woman, not a virgin, that is to say, the word is ALMAH, not BETHULAH, a position which, farther on, we shall dispute more in detail. Lastly, excepting Joseph, and Elizabeth, and Mary herself, and some few others who, we may suppose, heard the truth from them, all considered Jesus to be the son of Joseph. And so far was this the case that even the Evangelists, expressing the prevailing opinion, which is the correct rule for a historian, call him the father of the Saviour, as, for instance,⁴¹⁷⁶ “And he (that is, Simeon) came in the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, that they might do concerning him after the custom of the law;” and elsewhere,⁴¹⁷⁷ “And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover.” And afterwards,⁴¹⁷⁸ “And when they had fulfilled the days, as they were returning, the boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and his parents knew not of it.” Observe also what

Mary herself, who had replied to Gabriel with the words,⁴¹⁷⁹ “How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?” says concerning Joseph,⁴¹⁸⁰ “Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing.” We have not here, as many maintain, the utterance of Jews or of mockers. The Evangelists call Joseph father: Mary confesses he was father. Not (as I said before) that Joseph was really the father of the Saviour: but that, to preserve the reputation of Mary, he was regarded by all as his father, although, before he heard the admonition of the angel,⁴¹⁸¹ “Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost,” he had thoughts of putting her away privily; which shows that he well knew that the child conceived was not his. But we have said enough, more with the aim of imparting instruction than of answering an opponent, to show why Joseph is called the father of our Lord, and why Mary is called Joseph’s wife. This also 337at once answers the question why certain persons are called his brethren.

5. This, however, is a point which will find its proper place further on. We must now hasten to other matters. The passage for discussion now is, “And Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife and knew her not till she had brought forth a son, and he called his name Jesus.” Here, first of all, it is quite needless for our opponent to show so elaborately that the word *know* has reference to coition, rather than to intellectual apprehension: as though anyone denied it, or any person in his senses could ever imagine the folly which Helvidius takes pains to refute. Then he would teach us that the adverb *till* implies a fixed and definite time, and when that is fulfilled, he says the event takes place which previously did not take place, as in the case before us, “and knew her not till she had brought forth a son.” It is clear, says he, that she was known after she brought forth, and that that knowledge was only delayed by her engendering a son. To defend his position he piles up text upon text, waves his sword like a blind-folded gladiator, rattles his noisy tongue, and ends with wounding no one but himself.

6. Our reply is briefly this,—the words *knew* and *till* in the language of Holy Scripture are capable of a double meaning. As to the former, he himself gave us a dissertation to show that it must be referred to sexual intercourse, and no one doubts that it is often used of the knowledge of the understanding, as, for instance, “the boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem, and his parents knew it not.” Now we have to prove that just as in the one case he has followed the usage of Scripture, so with regard to the word *till* he is utterly refuted by the authority of the same Scripture, which often denotes by its use a fixed time (he himself told us so), frequently time without limitation, as when God by the mouth of the prophet says to certain persons,⁴¹⁸² “Even to old age I am he.” Will He cease to be God when they have grown old? And the Saviour in the Gospel tells the Apostles,⁴¹⁸³ “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Will the Lord then after the end of the world has come forsake His disciples, and at the very time when seated on twelve thrones they are to judge the twelve tribes of Israel will they be bereft of the company of their Lord? Again Paul the Apostle writing to the Corinthians⁴¹⁸⁴ says, “Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ’s, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” Granted that the passage relates to our Lord’s human nature, we do not deny that the words are spoken of Him who endured the cross and is commanded to sit afterwards

on the right hand. What does he mean then by saying, “for he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet”? Is the Lord to reign only until His enemies begin to be under His feet, and once they are under His feet will He cease to reign? Of course His reign will then commence in its fulness when His enemies begin to be under His feet. David also in the fourth Song of Ascents⁴¹⁸⁵ speaks thus, “Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their master, as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes look unto the Lord our God, until he have mercy upon us.” Will the prophet, then, look unto the Lord until he obtain mercy, and when mercy is obtained will he turn his eyes down to the ground? although elsewhere he says,⁴¹⁸⁶ “Mine eyes fail for thy salvation, and for the word of thy righteousness.” I could accumulate countless instances of this usage, and cover the verbosity of our assailant with a cloud of proofs; I shall, however, add only a few, and leave the reader to discover like ones for himself.

7. The word of God says in Genesis,⁴¹⁸⁷ “And they gave unto Jacob all the strange gods which were in their hand, and the rings which were in their ears; and Jacob hid them under the oak which was by Shechem, and lost them until this day.” Likewise at the end of Deuteronomy,⁴¹⁸⁸ “So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in the valley, in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.” We must certainly understand by *this day* the time of the composition of the history, whether you prefer the view that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch or that Ezra re-edited it. In either case I make no objection. The question now is whether the words *unto this day* are to be referred to the time of publishing or writing the books, and if so it is for him to show, now that so many years have rolled away since that day, that either the idols hidden beneath the oak have been found, or the grave of Moses discovered; for he obstinately maintains that what does not happen so long as the point of time indicated by *until* and *unto* has not been attained, begins to be when that point **338** has been reached. He would do well to pay heed to the idiom of Holy Scripture, and understand with us, (it was here he stuck in the mud) that some things which might seem ambiguous if not expressed are plainly intimated, while others are left to the exercise of our intellect. For if, while the event was still fresh in memory and men were living who had seen Moses, it was possible for his grave to be unknown, much more may this be the case after the lapse of so many ages. And in the same way must we interpret what we are told concerning Joseph. The Evangelist pointed out a circumstance which might have given rise to some scandal, namely, that Mary was not known by her husband until she was delivered, and he did so that we might be the more certain that she from whom Joseph refrained while there was room to doubt the import of the vision was not known after her delivery.

8. In short, what I want to know is why Joseph refrained until the day of her delivery? Helvidius will of course reply, because he heard the angel say,⁴¹⁸⁹ “that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.” And in turn we rejoin that he had certainly heard him say,⁴¹⁹⁰ “Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife.” The reason why he was forbidden to forsake his wife was that he might not think her an adulteress. Is it true then, that he was ordered not to have intercourse with his wife? Is it not plain that the warning was given him that he might not be separated from her? And could the just man dare, he says, to think of approaching her, when he heard that the Son of God was in her womb? Excellent! We are to believe then that the same man who gave so much credit to a dream that he did not dare to touch his wife, yet afterwards, when he

had learnt from the shepherds that the angel of the Lord had come from heaven and said to them,⁴¹⁹¹ “Be not afraid: for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people, for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord;” and when the heavenly host had joined with him in the chorus⁴¹⁹² “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of good will;” and when he had seen just Simeon embrace the infant and exclaim,⁴¹⁹³ “Now lettest thou thy servant depart, O Lord, according to thy word in peace: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation;” and when he had seen Anna the prophetess, the Magi, the Star, Herod, the angels; Helvidius, I say, would have us believe that Joseph, though well acquainted with such surprising wonders, dared to touch the temple of God, the abode of the Holy Ghost, the mother of his Lord? Mary at all events “kept all these sayings in her heart.” You cannot for shame say Joseph did not know of them, for Luke tells us,⁴¹⁹⁴ “His father and mother were marvelling at the things which were spoken concerning Him.” And yet you with marvellous effrontery contend that the reading of the Greek manuscripts is corrupt, although it is that which nearly all the Greek writers have left us in their books, and not only so, but several of the Latin writers have taken the words the same way. Nor need we now consider the variations in the copies, since the whole record both of the Old and New Testament has since that time been⁴¹⁹⁵ translated into Latin, and we must believe that the water of the fountain flows purer than that of the stream.

9. Helvidius will answer, “What you say, is in my opinion mere trifling. Your arguments are so much waste of time, and the discussion shows more subtlety than truth. Why could not Scripture say, as it said of Tamar and Judah,⁴¹⁹⁶ ‘And he took his wife, and knew her again no more’? Could not Matthew find words to express his meaning? ‘He knew her not,’ he says, ‘until she brought forth a son.’ He did then, after her delivery, know her, whom he had refrained from knowing until she was delivered.”

10. If you are so contentious, your own thoughts shall now prove your master. You must not allow any time to intervene between delivery and intercourse. You must not say,⁴¹⁹⁷ “If a woman conceive seed and bear a man child, then she shall be unclean seven days; as in the days of the separation of her sickness shall she be unclean. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised. And she shall continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days. She shall touch no hallowed thing,” and so forth. On your showing, Joseph must at once approach, her, and be subject to Jeremiah’s⁴¹⁹⁸ reproof, “They were as mad horses in respect of women: every one neighed after his neighbour’s wife.” Otherwise, how can the words stand good, “he knew her not, till she had brought forth a son,” if he waits after the time of another purifying has expired, if his lust must brook another long delay of forty days? The mother must go unpurged from her child-bed taint, and the wailing infant be attended to by the midwives, while the husband clasps his exhausted wife. Thus for³³⁹sooth must their married life begin so that the Evangelist may not be convicted of falsehood. But God forbid that we should think thus of the Saviour’s mother and of a just man. No midwife assisted at His birth; no women’s officiousness intervened. With her own hands she wrapped Him in the swaddling clothes, herself both mother and midwife,⁴¹⁹⁹ “and laid Him,” we are told, “in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn”; a statement which, on the one hand, refutes the ravings of the apocryphal accounts, for Mary herself wrapped Him in the swaddling clothes, and on the other makes the voluptuous notion of Helvidius impossible, since there was no place suitable for married intercourse in the inn.

11. An ample reply has now been given to what he advanced respecting the words *before they came together*, and *he knew her not till she had brought forth a son*. I must now proceed, if my reply is to follow the order of his argument, to the third point. He will have it that Mary bore other sons, and he quotes the passage,⁴²⁰⁰ “And Joseph also went up to the city of David to enroll himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child. And it came to pass, while they were there, the days were fulfilled that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son.” From this he endeavours to show that the term *first-born* is inapplicable except to a person who has brothers, just as he is called *only begotten* who is the only son of his parents.

12. Our position is this: Every only begotten son is a first-born son, but not every first-born is an only begotten. By first-born we understand not only one who is succeeded by others, but one who has had no predecessor.⁴²⁰¹ “Everything,” says the Lord to Aaron, “that openeth the womb of all flesh which they offer unto the Lord, both of man and beast, shall be thine: nevertheless the first born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem.” The word of God defines *first-born* as everything that openeth the womb. Otherwise, if the title belongs to such only as have younger brothers, the priests cannot claim the firstlings until their successors have been begotten, lest, perchance, in case there were no subsequent delivery it should prove to be the first-born but not merely the only begotten.⁴²⁰² “And those that are to be redeemed of them from a month old shalt thou redeem, according to thine estimation for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary (the same is twenty gerahs). But the firstling of an ox, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy.” The word of God compels me to dedicate to God everything that openeth the womb if it be the firstling of clean beasts: if of unclean beasts, I must redeem it, and give the value to the priest. I might reply and say, Why do you tie me down to the short space of a month? Why do you speak of the first-born, when I cannot tell whether there are brothers to follow? Wait until the second is born. I owe nothing to the priest, unless the birth of a second should make the one I previously had the first-born. Will not the very points of the letters cry out against me and convict me of my folly, and declare that first-born is a title of him who opens the womb, and is not to be restricted to him who has brothers? And, then, to take the case of John: we are agreed that he was an only begotten son: I want to know if he was not also a first-born son, and whether he was not absolutely amenable to the law. There can be no doubt in the matter. At all events Scripture thus speaks of the Saviour,⁴²⁰³ “And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were fulfilled, they brought him up to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord) and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons.” If this law relates only to the first-born, and there can be no first-born unless there are successors, no one ought to be bound by the law of the first-born who cannot tell whether there will be successors. But inasmuch as he who has no younger brothers is bound by the law of the first-born, we gather that he is called the first-born who opens the womb and who has been preceded by none, not he whose birth is followed by that of a younger brother. Moses writes in Exodus,⁴²⁰⁴ “And it came to pass at midnight, that the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon: And all the first-born of cattle.” Tell me, were they

who then perished by the destroyer, only your first-born, or, something more, did they include the only begotten? If only they who have brothers are called first-born, the only begotten were saved from death. And if it be the fact that the only begotten were slain, it was contrary to the sentence pronounced, for the only begotten to die as well as the first-born. You must either release the only begotten from the penalty, and in that case you become ridiculous: or, if you allow that they were slain, we gain our point, though [340](#) we have not to thank you for it, that only begotten sons also are called first-born.

13. The last proposition of Helvidius was this, and it is what he wished to show when he treated of the first-born, that brethren of the Lord are mentioned in the Gospels. For example, [4205](#) “Behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him.” And elsewhere, [4206](#) “After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren.” And again, [4207](#) “His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judæa, that thy disciples also may behold the works which thou doest. For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou doest these things, manifest thyself to the world.” And John adds, [4208](#) “For even his brethren did not believe on him.” Mark also and Matthew, [4209](#) “And coming into his own country he taught them in their synagogues, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and mighty works? Is not this the carpenter’s son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?” Luke also in the Acts of the Apostles relates, [4210](#) “These all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.” Paul the Apostle also is at one with them, and witnesses to their historical accuracy, [4211](#) “And I went up by revelation, but other of the apostles saw I none, save Peter and James the Lord’s brother.” And again in another place, [4212](#) “Have we no right to eat and drink? Have we no right to lead about wives even as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?” And for fear any one should not allow the evidence of the Jews, since it was they from whose mouth we hear the name of His brothers, but should maintain that His countrymen were deceived by the same error in respect of the brothers into which they fell in their belief about the father, Helvidius utters a sharp note of warning and cries, “The same names are repeated by the Evangelists in another place, and the same persons are there brethren of the Lord and sons of Mary.” Matthew says, [4213](#) “And many women were there (doubtless at the Lord’s cross) beholding from afar, which had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee.” Mark also, [4214](#) “And there were also women beholding from afar, among whom were both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome”; and in the same place shortly after, “And many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem.” Luke too, [4215](#) “Now there were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them.”

14. My reason for repeating the same thing again and again is to prevent him from raising a false issue and crying out that I have withheld such passages as make for him, and that his view has been torn to shreds not by evidence of Scripture, but by evasive arguments. Observe, he says, James and Joses are sons of Mary, and the same persons who were called brethren by the Jews. Observe, Mary is the mother of James the less and of Joses. And James is called the less to distinguish him from James the greater, who was the son of Zebedee, as Mark elsewhere states, [4216](#) “And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of

Joses beheld where he was laid. And when the sabbath was past, they bought spices, that they might come and anoint him.” And, as might be expected, he says: “What a poor and impious view we take of Mary, if we hold that when other women were concerned about the burial of Jesus, she His mother was absent; or if we invent some kind of a second Mary; and all the more because the Gospel of S. John testifies that she was there present, when the Lord upon the cross commended her, as His mother and now a widow, to the care of John. Or must we suppose that the Evangelists were so far mistaken and so far mislead us as to call Mary the mother of those who were known to the Jews as brethren of Jesus?”

15. What darkness, what raging madness rushing to its own destruction! You say that the mother of the Lord was present at the cross, you say that she was entrusted to the disciple John on account of her widowhood and solitary condition: as if upon your own showing, she had not four sons, and numerous daughters, with whose solace she might comfort herself? You also apply to her the name of widow which is not found in Scripture. And although you quote all instances in the Gospels, the words of John alone displease you. You say in passing that she was present at the cross, that you may not appear to have omitted it on purpose, and yet not a word about the women who were with her. I could pardon you if you were ignorant, but I [341](#) see you have a reason for your silence. Let me point out then what John says, [4217](#) “But there were standing by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene.” No one doubts that there were two apostles called by the name James, James the son of Zebedee, and James the son of Alphæus. Do you intend the comparatively unknown James the less, who is called in Scripture the son of Mary, not however of Mary the mother of our Lord, to be an apostle, or not? If he is an apostle, he must be the son of Alphæus and a believer in Jesus, “For neither did his brethren believe in him.” If he is not an apostle, but a third James (who he can be I cannot tell), how can he be regarded as the Lord’s brother, and how, being a third, can he be called *less* to distinguish him from *greater*, when *greater* and *less* are used to denote the relations existing, not between three, but between two? Notice, moreover, that the Lord’s brother is an apostle, since Paul says, [4218](#) “Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and tarried with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord’s brother.” And in the same Epistle, [4219](#) “And when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars,” etc. And that you may not suppose this James to be the son of Zebedee, you have only to read the Acts of the Apostles, and you will find that the latter had already been slain by Herod. The only conclusion is that the Mary who is described as the mother of James the less was the wife of Alphæus and sister of Mary the Lord’s mother, the one who is called by John the Evangelist “Mary of Clopas,” whether after her father, or kindred, or for some other reason. But if you think they are two persons because elsewhere we read, “Mary the mother of James the less,” and here, “Mary of Clopas,” you have still to learn that it is customary in Scripture for the same individual to bear different names. Raguel, Moses’ father-in-law, is also called Jethro. Gedeon, [4220](#) without any apparent reason for the change, all at once becomes Jerubbaal. Ozias, king of Judah, has an alternative, Azarias. Mount Tabor is called Itabyrium. Again Hermon is called by the Phenicians Sanior, and by the Amorites Sanir. The same tract of country is known by three names, [4221](#) Negebh, Teman, and Darom in Ezekiel. Peter is also called Simon and Cephas. Judas the zealot in another Gospel is

called Thaddaeus. And there are numerous other examples which the reader will be able to collect for himself from every part of Scripture.

16. Now here we have the explanation of what I am endeavouring to show, how it is that the sons of Mary, the sister of our Lord's mother, who though not formerly believers afterwards did believe, can be called brethren of the Lord. Possibly the case might be that one of the brethren believed immediately while the others did not believe until long after, and that one Mary was the mother of James and Joses, namely, "Mary of Clopas," who is the same as the wife of Alphæus, the other, the mother of James the less. In any case, if she (the latter) had been the Lord's mother S. John would have allowed her the title, as everywhere else, and would not by calling her the mother of other sons have given a wrong impression. But at this stage I do not wish to argue for or against the supposition that Mary the wife of Clopas and Mary the mother of James and Joses were different women, provided it is clearly understood that Mary the mother of James and Joses was not the same person as the Lord's mother. How then, says Helvidius, do you make out that they were called the Lord's brethren who were not his brethren? I will show how that is. In Holy Scripture there are four kinds of brethren—by nature, race, kindred, love. Instances of brethren by nature are Esau and Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Andrew and Peter, James and John. As to race, all Jews are called brethren of one another, as in Deuteronomy,⁴²²² "If thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee." And in the same book,⁴²²³ "Thou shalt in anywise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee, which is not thy brother." And again,⁴²²⁴ "Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt surely bring them again unto thy brother. And if thy brother be not nigh unto thee, or if thou know him not, then thou shalt bring it home to thine house, and it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to him again." And the Apostle Paul says,⁴²²⁵ "I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites." Moreover they are called brethren by kindred who are of one family, that is πατρία, ³⁴² which corresponds to the Latin *paternitas*, because from a single root a numerous progeny proceeds. In Genesis⁴²²⁶ we read, "And Abram said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen; for we are brethren." And again, "So Lot chose him all the plain of Jordan, and Lot journeyed east: and they separated each from his brother." Certainly Lot was not Abraham's brother, but the son of Abraham's brother Aram. For Terah begat Abraham and Nahor and Aram: and Aram begat Lot. Again we read,⁴²²⁷ "And Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran. And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son." But if you still doubt whether a nephew can be called a son, let me give you an instance.⁴²²⁸ "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he led forth his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen." And after describing the night attack and the slaughter, he adds, "And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot." Let this suffice by way of proof of my assertion. But for fear you may make some cavilling objection, and wriggle out of your difficulty like a snake, I must bind you fast with the bonds of proof to stop your hissing and complaining, for I know you would like to say you have been overcome not so much by Scripture truth as by intricate arguments. Jacob,

the son of Isaac and Rebecca, when in fear of his brother's treachery he had gone to Mesopotamia, drew nigh and rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, and watered the flocks of Laban, his mother's brother.⁴²²⁹ "And Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted up his voice, and wept. And Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's brother, and that he was Rebekah's son." Here is an example of the rule already referred to, by which a nephew is called a brother. And again,⁴²³⁰ "Laban said unto Jacob. Because thou art my brother, shouldest thou therefore serve me for nought? Tell me what shall thy wages be." And so, when, at the end of twenty years, without the knowledge of his father-in-law and accompanied by his wives and sons he was returning to his country, on Laban overtaking him in the mountain of Gilead and failing to find the idols which Rachel hid among the baggage, Jacob answered and said to Laban,⁴²³¹ "What is my trespass? What is my sin, that thou hast so hotly pursued after me? Whereas thou hast felt all about my stuff, what hast thou found of all thy household stuff? Set it here before my brethren and thy brethren, that they may judge betwixt us two." Tell me who are those brothers of Jacob and Laban who were present there? Esau, Jacob's brother, was certainly not there, and Laban, the son of Bethuel, had no brothers although he had a sister Rebecca.

17. Innumerable instances of the same kind are to be found in the sacred books. But, to be brief, I will return to the last of the four classes of brethren, those, namely, who are brethren by affection, and these again fall into two divisions, those of the spiritual and those of the general relationship. I say *spiritual* because all of us Christians are called brethren, as in the verse,⁴²³² "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." And in another psalm the Saviour says,⁴²³³ "I will declare thy name unto my brethren." And elsewhere,⁴²³⁴ "Go unto my brethren and say to them." I say also *general*, because we are all children of one Father, there is a like bond of brotherhood between us all.⁴²³⁵ "Tell these who hate you," says the prophet, "ye are our brethren." And the Apostle writing to the Corinthians:⁴²³⁶ "If any man that is named brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one no, not to eat." I now ask to which class you consider the Lord's brethren in the Gospel must be assigned. They are brethren by nature, you say. But Scripture does not say so; it calls them neither sons of Mary, nor of Joseph. Shall we say they are brethren by race? But it is absurd to suppose that a few Jews were called His brethren when all Jews of the time might upon this principle have borne the title. Were they brethren by virtue of close intimacy and the union of heart and mind? If that were so, who were more truly His brethren than the apostles who received His private instruction and were called by Him His mother and His brethren? Again, if all men, as such, were His brethren, it would have been foolish to deliver a special message, "Behold, thy brethren seek thee," for all men alike were entitled to the name. The only alternative is to adopt the previous explanation and understand them to be called brethren in virtue of the bond of kindred, not of love and sympathy, nor by prerogative of race, nor yet by nature. Just as Lot was called Abraham's brother, and Jacob Laban's, just as the daughters of Zelophehad received a lot among their brethren, just as Abraham himself had to wife Sarah his sister, for he says,⁴²³⁷ "She is in³⁴³ deed my sister, on the father's side, not on the mother's," that is to say, she was the daughter of his brother, not of his sister. Otherwise, what are we to say of Abraham, a just man, taking to wife the daughter of his own father? Scripture, in relating the history of the men of early times, does not outrage our ears by speaking of the enormity in express terms, but prefers to leave it to be inferred by the

reader: and God afterwards gives to the prohibition the sanction of the law, and threatens,⁴²³⁸ “He who takes his sister, born of his father, or of his mother, and beholds her nakedness, hath committed abomination, he shall be utterly destroyed. He hath uncovered his sister’s nakedness, he shall bear his sin.”

18. There are things which, in your extreme ignorance, you had never read, and therefore you neglected the whole range of Scripture and employed your madness in outraging the Virgin, like the man in the story who being unknown to everybody and finding that he could devise no good deed by which to gain renown, burned the temple of Diana: and when no one revealed the sacrilegious act, it is said that he himself went up and down proclaiming that he was the man who had applied the fire. The rulers of Ephesus were curious to know what made him do this thing, whereupon he replied that if he could not have fame for good deeds, all men should give him credit for bad ones. Grecian history relates the incident. But you do worse. You have set on fire the temple of the Lord’s body, you have defiled the sanctuary of the Holy Spirit from which you are determined to make a team of four brethren and a heap of sisters come forth. In a word, joining in the chorus of the Jews, you say,⁴²³⁹ “Is not this the carpenter’s son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us? The word *all* would not be used if there were not a crowd of them.” Pray tell me, who, before you appeared, was acquainted with this blasphemy? who thought the theory worth two-pence? You have gained your desire, and are become notorious by crime. For myself who am your opponent, although we live in the⁴²⁴⁰ same city, I don’t know, as the saying is, whether you are white or black. I pass over faults of diction which abound in every book you write. I say not a word about your absurd introduction. Good heavens! I do not ask for eloquence, since, having none yourself, you applied for a supply of it to your brother Craterius. I do not ask for grace of style, I look for purity of soul: for with Christians it is the greatest of solecisms and of vices of style to introduce anything base either in word or action. I am come to the conclusion of my argument. I will deal with you as though I had as yet prevailed nothing; and you will find yourself on the horns of a dilemma. It is clear that our Lord’s brethren bore the name in the same way that Joseph was called his father:⁴²⁴¹ “I and thy father sought thee sorrowing.” It was His mother who said this, not the Jews. The Evangelist himself relates that His father and His mother were marvelling at the things which were spoken concerning Him, and there are similar passages which we have already quoted in which Joseph and Mary are called his parents. Seeing that you have been foolish enough to persuade yourself that the Greek manuscripts are corrupt, you will perhaps plead the diversity of readings. I therefore come to the Gospel of John, and there it is plainly written,⁴²⁴² “Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.” You will certainly find this in your manuscript. Now tell me, how is Jesus the son of Joseph when it is clear that He was begotten of the Holy Ghost? Was Joseph His true father? Dull as you are, you will not venture to say that. Was he His reputed father? If so, let the same rule be applied to them when they are called brethren, that you apply to Joseph when he is called father.

19. Now that I have cleared the rocks and shoals I must spread sail and make all speed to reach his epilogue. Feeling himself to be a smatterer, he there produces Tertullian as a witness and quotes the words of Victorinus bishop of⁴²⁴³ Petavium. Of Tertullian I say no

more than that he did not belong to the Church. But as regards Victorinus, I assert what has already been proved from the Gospel—that he spoke of the brethren of the Lord not as being sons of Mary, but brethren in the sense I have explained, that is to say, brethren in point of kinship not by nature. We are, however, spending our strength on trifles, and, leaving the fountain of truth, are following the tiny streams of opinion. Might I not array against you the whole series of ancient writers? Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and many other apostolic and eloquent men, who against Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentinus, held these same views, and wrote volumes replete with wisdom. If you had ever read what they wrote, you would be a wiser man. But I think it better to reply ³⁴⁴briefly to each point than to linger any longer and extend my book to an undue length.

20. I now direct the attack against the passage in which, wishing to show your cleverness, you institute a comparison between virginity and marriage. I could not forbear smiling, and I thought of the proverb, *did you ever see a camel dance?* “Are virgins better,” you ask, “than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who were married men? Are not infants daily fashioned by the hands of God in the wombs of their mothers? And if so, are we bound to blush at the thought of Mary having a husband after she was delivered? If they find any disgrace in this, they ought not consistently even to believe that God was born of the Virgin by natural delivery. For according to them there is more dishonour in a virgin giving birth to God by the organs of generation, than in a virgin being joined to her own husband after she has been delivered.” Add, if you like, Helvidius, the other humiliations of nature, the womb for nine months growing larger, the sickness, the delivery, the blood, the swaddling-clothes. Picture to yourself the infant in the enveloping membranes. Introduce into your picture the hard manger, the wailing of the infant, the circumcision on the eighth day, the time of purification, so that he may be proved to be unclean. We do not blush, we are not put to silence. The greater the humiliations He endured for me, the more I owe Him. And when you have given every detail, you will be able to produce nothing more shameful than the cross, which we confess, in which we believe, and by which we triumph over our enemies.

21. But as we do not deny what is written, so we do reject what is not written. We believe that God was born of the Virgin, because we read it. That Mary was married after she brought forth, we do not believe, because we do not read it. Nor do we say this to condemn marriage, for virginity itself is the fruit of marriage; but because when we are dealing with saints we must not judge rashly. If we adopt possibility as the standard of judgment, we might maintain that Joseph had several wives because Abraham had, and so had Jacob, and that the Lord’s brethren were the issue of those wives, an invention which some hold with a rashness which springs from audacity not from piety. You say that Mary did not continue a virgin: I claim still more, that Joseph himself on account of Mary was a virgin, so that from a virgin wedlock a virgin son was born. For if as a holy man he does not come under the imputation of fornication, and it is nowhere written that he had another wife, but was the guardian of Mary whom he was supposed to have to wife rather than her husband, the conclusion is that he who was thought worthy to be called father of the Lord, remained a virgin.

22. And now that I am about to institute a comparison between virginity and marriage, I beseech my readers not to suppose that in praising virginity I have in the least disparaged

marriage, and separated the saints of the Old Testament from those of the New, that is to say, those who had wives and those who altogether refrained from the embraces of women: I rather think that in accordance with the difference in time and circumstance one rule applied to the former, another to us upon whom the ends of the world have come. So long as that law remained,⁴²⁴⁴ “Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth”; and⁴²⁴⁵ “Cursed is the barren woman that beareth not seed in Israel,” they all married and were given in marriage, left father and mother, and became one flesh. But once in tones of thunder the words were heard,⁴²⁴⁶ “The time is shortened, that henceforth those that have wives may be as though they had none”: cleaving to the Lord, we are made one spirit with Him. And why?⁴²⁴⁷ Because “He that is unmarried is careful for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married is careful for the things of the world, how he may please his wife. And there is a difference also between the wife and the virgin. She that is unmarried is careful for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married is careful for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.” Why do you cavil? Why do you resist? The vessel of election says this; he tells us that there is a difference between the wife and the virgin. Observe what the happiness of that state must be in which even the distinction of sex is lost. The virgin is no longer called a woman.⁴²⁴⁸ “She that is unmarried is careful for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit.” A virgin is defined as she that is holy in body and in spirit, for it is no good to have virgin flesh if a woman be married in mind.

“But she that is married is careful for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.” Do you think there is no difference between one who spends her time in prayer and fasting, and one who must, at her husband’s approach, make up her countenance, walk with mincing gait, and feign a shew of endearment? The virgin’s aim is to appear less comely; she will wrong herself so as to hide her natural attractions. The married woman has the paint laid on before her mirror, and, to the insult of her Maker, strives to acquire something more than her natural beauty. Then come the prattling of infants, the noisy household, children watching for her word and waiting for her kiss, the reckoning up of expenses, the preparation to meet the outlay. On one side you will see a company of cooks, girded for the onslaught and attacking the meat: there you may hear the hum of a multitude of weavers. Meanwhile a message is delivered that the husband and his friends have arrived. The wife, like a swallow, flies all over the house. “She has to see to everything. Is the sofa smooth? Is the pavement swept? Are the flowers in the cups? Is dinner ready?” Tell me, pray, where amid all this is there room for the thought of God? Are these happy homes? Where there is the beating of drums, the noise and clatter of pipe and lute, the clanging of cymbals, can any fear of God be found? The parasite is snubbed and feels proud of the honour. Enter next the half-naked victims of the passions, a mark for every lustful eye. The unhappy wife must either take pleasure in them, and perish, or be displeased, and provoke her husband. Hence arises discord, the seed-plot of divorce. Or suppose you find me a house where these things are unknown, which is a *rara avis* indeed! yet even there the very management of the household, the education of the children, the wants of the husband, the correction of the servants, cannot fail to call away the mind from the thought of God.⁴²⁴⁹ “It had ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women”: so the Scripture says, and afterwards Abraham received the command,⁴²⁵⁰ “In all that Sarah saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice.” She who is not subject to the anxiety

and pain of child-bearing and having passed the change of life has ceased to perform the functions of a woman, is freed from the curse of God: nor is her desire to her husband, but on the contrary her husband becomes subject to her, and the voice of the Lord commands him, "In all that Sarah saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice." Thus they begin to have time for prayer. For so long as the debt of marriage is paid, earnest prayer is neglected.

23. I do not deny that holy women are found both among widows and those who have husbands; but they are such as have ceased to be wives, or such as, even in the close bond of marriage, imitate virgin chastity. The Apostle, Christ speaking in him, briefly bore witness to this when he said,⁴²⁵¹ "She that is unmarried is careful for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord: but she that is married is careful for the things of the world, how she may please her husband." He leaves us the free exercise of our reason in the matter. He lays no necessity upon anyone nor leads anyone into a snare: he only persuades to that which is proper when he wishes all men to be as himself. He had not, it is true, a commandment from the Lord respecting virginity, for that grace surpasses the unassisted power of man, and it would have worn an air of immodesty to force men to fly in the face of nature, and to say in other words, I want you to be what the angels are. It is this angelic purity which secures to virginity its highest reward, and the Apostle might have seemed to despise a course of life which involves no guilt. Nevertheless in the immediate context he adds,⁴²⁵² "But I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I think therefore that this is good by reason of the present distress, namely, that it is good for a man to be as he is." What is meant by *present distress*?⁴²⁵³ "Woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days!" The reason why the wood grows up is that it may be cut down. The field is sown that it may be reaped. The world is already full, and the population is too large for the soil. Every day we are being cut down by war, snatched away by disease, swallowed up by shipwreck, although we go to law with one another about the fences of our property. It is only one addition to the general rule which is made by those who follow the Lamb, and who have not defiled their garments, for they have continued in their virgin state. Notice the meaning of *defiling*. I shall not venture to explain it, for fear Helvidius may be abusive. I agree with you, when you say, that some virgins are nothing but tavern women; I say still more, that even adulteresses may be found among them, and, you will no doubt be still more surprised to hear, that some of the clergy are inn-keepers and some monks unchaste. Who does not at once understand that a tavern woman cannot be a virgin, nor an adulterer a monk, nor a clergy-man a tavern-keeper? Are we to blame virginity if its counterfeit is at fault? For my part, to pass over other persons and come to the virgin, I maintain that she who is engaged in huckstering, though for anything I know she may be a virgin in body, is no longer one in spirit.

24. I have become rhetorical, and have disported myself a little like a platform orator. **346** You compelled me, Helvidius; for, brightly as the Gospel shines at the present day, you will have it that equal glory attaches to virginity and to the marriage state. And because I think that, finding the truth too strong for you, you will turn to disparaging my life and abusing my character (it is the way of weak women to talk tittle-tattle in corners when they have been put down by their masters), I shall anticipate you. I assure you that I shall regard your railing as a high distinction, since the same lips that assail me have

disparaged Mary, and I, a servant of the Lord, am favoured with the same barking eloquence as His mother.

Websites for Reference and Work

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf206.vi.v.html>

Class 3:

CITY OF GOD BY AUGUSTINE

Excerpts from the Work

Preface, Explaining His Design in Undertaking This Work.

THE glorious city of God²⁸ is my theme in this work, which you, my dearest son Marcellinus,²⁹ suggested, and which is due to you by my promise. I have undertaken its defence against those who prefer their own gods to the Founder of this city,—a city surpassingly glorious, whether we view it as it still lives by faith in this fleeting course of time, and sojourns as a stranger in the midst of the ungodly, or as it shall dwell in the fixed stability of its eternal seat, which it now with patience waits for, expecting until “righteousness shall return unto judgment,”³⁰ and it obtain, by virtue of its excellence, final victory and perfect peace. A great work this, and an arduous; but God is my helper. For I am aware what ability is requisite to persuade the proud how great is the virtue of humility, which raises us, not by a quite human arrogance, but by a divine grace, above all earthly dignities that totter on this shifting scene. For the King and Founder of this city of which we speak, has in Scripture uttered to His people a dictum of the divine law in these words: “God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble.”³¹

...

Chapter 29.—What the Servants of Christ Should Say in Reply to the Unbelievers Who Cast in Their Teeth that Christ Did Not Rescue Them from the Fury of Their Enemies.

The whole family of God, most high and most true, has therefore a consolation of its own,—a consolation which cannot deceive, and which has in it a surer hope than the tottering and falling affairs of earth can afford. They will not refuse the discipline of this temporal life, in which they are schooled for life eternal; nor will they lament their experience of it, for the good things of earth they use as pilgrims who are not detained by them, and its ills either prove or improve them. As for those who insult over them in their trials, and when ills befall them say, “Where is

thy God?"⁸³ we may ask them where their gods are when they suffer the very calamities for the sake of avoiding which they worship their gods, or maintain they ought to be worshipped; for the family of Christ is furnished with its reply: our God is everywhere present, wholly everywhere; not confined to any place. He can be present unperceived, and be absent without moving; when He exposes us to adversities, it is either to prove our perfections or correct our imperfections; and in return for our patient endurance of the sufferings of time, He reserves for us an everlasting reward. But who are you, that we should deign to speak with you even about your own gods, much less about our God, who is "to be feared above all gods? For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens."

...

Chapter 33.—That the Overthrow of Rome Has Not Corrected the Vices of the Romans.

Oh infatuated men, what is this blindness, or rather madness, which possesses you? How is it that while, as we hear, even the eastern nations are bewailing your ruin, and while powerful states in the most remote parts of the earth are mourning your fall as a public calamity, ye yourselves should be crowding to the theatres, should be pouring into them and filling them; and, in short, be playing a madder part now than ever before? This was the foul plague-spot, this the wreck of virtue and honor that Scipio sought to preserve you from when he prohibited the construction of theatres; this was his reason for desiring that you might still have an enemy to fear, seeing as he did how easily prosperity would corrupt and destroy you. He did not consider that republic flourishing whose walls stand, but whose morals are in ruins. But the seductions of evil-minded devils had more influence with you than the precautions of prudent men. Hence the injuries you do, you will not permit to be imputed to you: but the injuries you suffer, you impute to Christianity. Depraved by good fortune, and not chastened by adversity, what you desire in the restoration of a peaceful and secure state, is not the tranquillity of the commonwealth, but the impunity of your own vicious luxury. Scipio wished you to be hard pressed by an enemy, that you might not abandon yourselves to luxurious manners; but so abandoned are you, that not even when crushed by the enemy is your luxury repressed. You have missed the profit of your calamity; you have been made most wretched, and have remained most profligate.

...

Chapter 28.—That the Christian Religion is Health-Giving.

They, then, are but abandoned and ungrateful wretches, in deep and fast bondage to that malign spirit, who complain and murmur that men are rescued by the name of Christ from the hellish thralldom of these unclean spirits, and from a participation in their punishment, and are brought out of the night of pestilential ungodliness into the light of most healthful piety. Only such men could murmur that the masses flock to the churches and their chaste acts of worship, where a seemly separation of the sexes is observed; where they learn how they may so spend this earthly life, as to merit a blessed eternity hereafter; where Holy Scripture and instruction in righteousness are proclaimed from a raised platform in presence of all, that both they who do the word may hear to their salvation, and they who do it not may hear to judgment. And though some enter who scoff at such precepts, all their petulance is either quenched by a sudden change, or is restrained through fear or shame. For no filthy and wicked action is there set forth to be gazed at or to be imitated; but either the precepts of the true God are recommended, His miracles narrated, His gifts praised, or His benefits implored.

...

Chapter 1.—Of the Things Which Have Been Discussed in the First Book.

HAVING begun to speak of the city of God, I have thought it necessary first of all to reply to its enemies, who, eagerly pursuing earthly joys and gaping after transitory things, throw the blame of all the sorrow they suffer in them—rather through the compassion of God in admonishing than His severity in punishing—on the Christian religion, which is the one salutary and true religion. And since there is among them also an unlearned rabble, they are stirred up as by the authority of the learned to hate us more bitterly, thinking in their inexperience that things which have happened unwontedly in their days were not wont to happen in other times gone by; and whereas this opinion of theirs is confirmed even by those who know that it is false, and yet dissemble their knowledge in order that they may seem to have just cause for murmuring against us, it was necessary, from books in which their authors recorded and published the history of bygone times that it might be known, to demonstrate that it is far otherwise than they think; and at the same time to teach that the false gods, whom they openly worshipped, or still worship in secret, are most unclean spirits, and most malignant and deceitful demons, even to such a pitch that they take delight in crimes which, whether real or only fictitious,

are yet their own, which it has been their will to have celebrated in honor of them at their own festivals; so that human infirmity cannot be called back from the perpetration of damnable deeds, so long as authority is furnished for imitating them that seems even divine.

...

Chapter 33.—That the Times of All Kings and Kingdoms are Ordained by the Judgment and Power of the True God.

Therefore that God, the author and giver of felicity, because He alone is the true God, Himself gives earthly kingdoms both to good and bad. Neither does He do this rashly, and, as it were, fortuitously,—because He is God not fortune,—but according to the order of things and times, which is hidden from us, but thoroughly known to Himself; which same order of times, however, He does not serve as subject to it, but Himself rules as lord and appoints as governor. Felicity He gives only to the good. Whether a man be a subject or a king makes no difference; he may equally either possess or not possess it. And it shall be full in that life where kings and subjects exist no longer. And therefore earthly kingdoms are given by Him both to the good and the bad; lest His worshippers, still under the conduct of a very weak mind, should covet these gifts from Him as some great things. And this is the mystery of the Old Testament, in which the New was hidden, that there even earthly gifts are promised: those who were spiritual understanding even then, although not yet openly declaring, both the eternity which was symbolized by these earthly things, and in what gifts of God true felicity could be found.

...

Chapter 11.—Concerning the Universal Providence of God in the Laws of Which All Things are Comprehended.

Therefore God supreme and true, with His Word and Holy Spirit (which three are one), one God omnipotent, creator and maker of every soul and of every body; by whose gift all are happy who are happy through verity and not through vanity; who made man a rational animal consisting of soul and body, who, when he sinned, neither permitted him to go unpunished, nor left him without mercy; who has given to the good and to the evil, being in common with stones, vegetable life in common with trees, sensuous life in common with brutes, intellectual life in common

with angels alone; from whom is every mode, every species, every order; from whom are measure, number, weight; from whom is everything which has an existence in nature, of whatever kind it be, and of whatever value; from whom are the seeds of forms and the forms of seeds, and the motion of seeds and of forms; who gave also to flesh its origin, beauty, health, reproductive fecundity, disposition of members, and the salutary concord of its parts; who also to the irrational soul has given memory, sense, appetite, but to the rational soul, in addition to these, has given intelligence and will; who has not left, not to speak of heaven and earth, angels and men, but not even the entrails of the smallest and most contemptible animal, or the feather of a bird, or the little flower of a plant, or the leaf of a tree, without an harmony, and, as it were, a mutual peace among all its parts;—that God can never be believed to have left the kingdoms of men, their dominations and servitudes, outside of the laws of His providence.

...

Chapter 25.—Concerning the Prosperity Which God Granted to the Christian Emperor Constantine.

For the good God, lest men, who believe that He is to be worshipped with a view to eternal life, should think that no one could attain to all this high estate, and to this terrestrial dominion, unless he should be a worshipper of the demons,—supposing that these spirits have great power with respect to such things,—for this reason He gave to the Emperor Constantine, who was not a worshipper of demons, but of the true God Himself, such fullness of earthly gifts as no one would even dare wish for. To him also He granted the honor of founding a city,²²⁷ a companion to the Roman empire, the daughter, as it were, of Rome itself, but without any temple or image of the demons. He reigned for a long period as sole emperor, and unaided held and defended the whole Roman world. In conducting and carrying on wars he was most victorious; in overthrowing tyrants he was most successful. He died at a great age, of sickness and old age, and left his sons to succeed him in the empire.²²⁸ But again, lest any emperor should become a Christian in order to merit the happiness of Constantine, when every one should be a Christian for the sake of eternal life, God took away Jovian far sooner than Julian, and permitted that Gratian should be slain by the sword of a tyrant. But in his case there was far more mitigation of the calamity than in the case of the great Pompey, for he could not be avenged by Cato, whom he had left, as it were, heir to the civil war. But Gratian, though pious minds require not such consolations, was avenged by Theodosius,

whom he had associated with himself in the empire, though he had a little brother of his own, being more desirous of a faithful alliance than of extensive power.

...

Chapter 10.—That the Excellency of the Christian Religion is Above All the Science of Philosophers.

For although a Christian man instructed only in ecclesiastical literature may perhaps be ignorant of the very name of Platonists, and may not even know that there have existed two schools of philosophers speaking the Greek tongue, to wit, the Ionic and Italic, he is nevertheless not so deaf with respect to human affairs, as not to know that philosophers profess the study, and even the possession, of wisdom. He is on his guard, however, with respect to those who philosophize according to the elements of this world, not according to God, by whom the world itself was made; for he is warned by the precept of the apostle, and faithfully hears what has been said, “Beware that no one deceive you through philosophy and vain deceit, according to the elements of the world.”³⁰² Then, that he may not suppose that all philosophers are such as do this, he hears the same apostle say concerning certain of them, “Because that which is known of God is manifest among them, for God has manifested it to them. For His invisible things from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, also His eternal power and Godhead.”³⁰³ And, when speaking to the Athenians, after having spoken a mighty thing concerning God, which few are able to understand, “In Him we live, and **151** move, and have our being,”³⁰⁴ he goes on to say, “As certain also of your own have said.” He knows well, too, to be on his guard against even these philosophers in their errors. For where it has been said by him, “that God has manifested to them by those things which are made His invisible things, that they might be seen by the understanding,” there it has also been said that they did not rightly worship God Himself, because they paid divine honors, which are due to Him alone, to other things also to which they ought not to have paid them,—“because, knowing God, they glorified Him not as God: neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things;”³⁰⁵—where the apostle would have us understand him as meaning the Romans, and Greeks, and Egyptians, who gloried in the name of wisdom; but

concerning this we will dispute with them afterwards. With respect, however, to that wherein they agree with us we prefer them to all others namely, concerning the one God, the author of this universe, who is not only above every body, being incorporeal, but also above all souls, being incorruptible—our principle, our light, our good. And though the Christian man, being ignorant of their writings, does not use in disputation words which he has not learned,—not calling that part of philosophy natural (which is the Latin term), or physical (which is the Greek one), which treats of the investigation of nature; or that part rational, or logical, which deals with the question how truth may be discovered; or that part moral, or ethical, which concerns morals, and shows how good is to be sought, and evil to be shunned,—he is not, therefore, ignorant that it is from the one true and supremely good God that we have that nature in which we are made in the image of God, and that doctrine by which we know Him and ourselves, and that grace through which, by cleaving to Him, we are blessed. This, therefore, is the cause why we prefer these to all the others, because, whilst other philosophers have worn out their minds and powers in seeking the causes of things, and endeavoring to discover the right mode of learning and of living, these, by knowing God, have found where resides the cause by which the universe has been constituted, and the light by which truth is to be discovered, and the fountain at which felicity is to be drunk. All philosophers, then, who have had these thoughts concerning God, whether Platonists or others, agree with us. But we have thought it better to plead our cause with the Platonists, because their writings are better known. For the Greeks, whose tongue holds the highest place among the languages of the Gentiles, are loud in their praises of these writings; and the Latins, taken with their excellence, or their renown, have studied them more heartily than other writings, and, by translating them into our tongue, have given them greater celebrity and notoriety.

...

Websites for Reference and Work

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf102.iii.html>

Class 4:

Class 5:

Class 6:

THE CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF ORANGE

Background Information

The Council of Orange was an outgrowth of the controversy between Augustine and Pelagius. This controversy had to do with degree to which a human being is responsible for his or her own salvation, and the role of the grace of God in bringing about salvation. The Pelagians held that human beings are born in a state of innocence, i.e., that there is no such thing as a sinful nature or original sin.

As a result of this view, they held that a state of sinless perfection was achievable in this life. The Council of Orange dealt with the Semi-Pelagian doctrine that the human race, though fallen and possessed of a sinful nature, is still "good" enough to be able to lay hold of the grace of God through an act of unredeemed human will.

In the West the Second Synod of Orange (529) was very significant in both combating semi-Pelagianism and setting forth the gracious character of salvation apart from works. Although it was not officially ecumenical, its declarations prevailed de jure but not de facto in the Roman Catholic Church down to the Reformation era.

Council of Orange (not counted) 529 AD

Augustine had insisted that humans require the help of God's Grace to do good and that this grace is a free gift, given by God without regard to human merit. Thus God alone determines who will receive the grace that alone assures salvation. In this sense God predestines some to salvation. Augustine's teaching was generally upheld by the church, but the further idea that some are predestined to condemnation was explicitly rejected at the Council of Orange.

The Work or Excerpts from the Work

THE CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF ORANGE (529 AD)

CANON 1. If anyone denies that it is the whole man, that is, both body and soul, that was "changed for the worse" through the offense of Adam's sin, but believes that the freedom of the soul remains unimpaired and that only the body is subject to corruption, he is deceived by the error of Pelagius and contradicts the scripture which says, "The soul that sins shall die" (Ezek. 18:20); and, "Do you not know that if you yield yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are the slaves of the one whom you obey?" (Rom. 6:126); and, "For whatever overcomes a man, to that he is enslaved" (2 Pet. 2:19).

CANON 2. If anyone asserts that Adam's sin affected him alone and not his descendants also, or at least if he declares that it is only the death of the body which is the punishment for sin, and not also that sin, which is the death of the soul, passed through one man to the whole human race, he does injustice to God and contradicts the Apostle, who says, "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned" (Rom. 5:12).

CANON 3. If anyone says that the grace of God can be conferred as a result of human prayer, but that it is not grace itself which makes us pray to God, he contradicts the prophet Isaiah, or the Apostle who says the same thing, "I have been found by those who did not seek me; I have shown myself to those who did not ask for me" (Rom 10:20, quoting Isa. 65:1).

CANON 4. If anyone maintains that God awaits our will to be cleansed from sin, but does not confess that even our will to be cleansed comes to us through the infusion and working of the Holy Spirit, he resists the Holy Spirit himself who says through Solomon, "The will is prepared by the Lord" (Prov. 8:35, LXX), and the salutary word of the Apostle, "For God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13).

CANON 5. If anyone says that not only the increase of faith but also its beginning and the very desire for faith, by which we believe in Him who justifies the ungodly and comes to the regeneration of holy baptism -- if anyone says that this belongs to us by nature and not by a gift of grace, that is, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit amending our will and turning it from unbelief to faith and from godlessness to godliness, it is proof that he is opposed to the teaching of the Apostles, for blessed Paul says, "And I am sure that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6). And again, "For by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). For those who state that the faith by which we believe in God is natural make all who are separated from the Church of Christ by definition in some measure believers.

CANON 6. If anyone says that God has mercy upon us when, apart from his

grace, we believe, will, desire, strive, labor, pray, watch, study, seek, ask, or knock, but does not confess that it is by the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Spirit within us that we have the faith, the will, or the strength to do all these things as we ought; or if anyone makes the assistance of grace depend on the humility or obedience of man and does not agree that it is a gift of grace itself that we are obedient and humble, he contradicts the Apostle who says, "What have you that you did not receive?" (1 Cor. 4:7), and, "But by the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. 15:10).

CANON 7. If anyone affirms that we can form any right opinion or make any right choice which relates to the salvation of eternal life, as is expedient for us, or that we can be saved, that is, assent to the preaching of the gospel through our natural powers without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who makes all men gladly assent to and believe in the truth, he is led astray by a heretical spirit, and does not understand the voice of God who says in the Gospel, "For apart from me you can do nothing" (John 15:5), and the word of the Apostle, "Not that we are competent of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our competence is from God" (2 Cor. 3:5).

CANON 8. If anyone maintains that some are able to come to the grace of baptism by mercy but others through free will, which has manifestly been corrupted in all those who have been born after the transgression of the

first man, it is proof that he has no place in the true faith. For he denies that the free will of all men has been weakened through the sin of the first man, or at least holds that it has been affected in such a way that they have still the ability to seek the mystery of eternal salvation by themselves without the revelation of God. The Lord himself shows how contradictory this is by declaring that no one is able to come to him "unless the Father who sent me draws him" (John 6:44), as he also says to Peter, "Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 16:17), and as the Apostle says, "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:3).

CANON 9. Concerning the succor of God. It is a mark of divine favor when we are of a right purpose and keep our feet from hypocrisy and unrighteousness; for as often as we do good, God is at work in us and with us, in order that we may do so.

CANON 10. Concerning the succor of God. The succor of God is to be ever sought by the regenerate and converted also, so that they may be able to come to a successful end or persevere in good works.

CANON 11. Concerning the duty to pray. None would make any true prayer to the Lord had he not received from him the object of his prayer, as it is written, "Of thy own have we given thee" (1 Chron. 29:14).

CANON 12. Of what sort we are whom God loves. God loves us for what we shall be by his gift, and not by our own deserving.

CANON 13. Concerning the restoration of free will. The freedom of will that was destroyed in the first man can be restored only by the grace of baptism, for what is lost can be returned only by the one who was able to give it. Hence the Truth itself declares: "So if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed" (John 8:36).

CANON 14. No mean wretch is freed from his sorrowful state, however great it may be, save the one who is anticipated by the mercy of God, as the Psalmist says, "Let thy compassion come speedily to meet us" (Ps. 79:8), and again, "My God in his steadfast love will meet me" (Ps. 59:10).

CANON 15. Adam was changed, but for the worse, through his own iniquity from what God made him. Through the grace of God the believer is changed, but for the better, from what his iniquity has done for him. The one, therefore, was the change brought about by the first sinner; the other, according to the Psalmist, is the change of the right hand of the Most High (Ps. 77:10).

CANON 16. No man shall be honored by his seeming attainment, as though it

were not a gift, or suppose that he has received it because a missive from without stated it in writing or in speech. For the Apostle speaks thus, "For if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Gal. 2:21); and "When he ascended on high he led a host of captives, and he gave gifts to men" (Eph. 4:8, quoting Ps. 68:18). It is from this source that any man has what he does; but whoever denies that he has it from this source either does not truly have it, or else "even what he has will be taken away" (Matt. 25:29).

CANON 17. Concerning Christian courage. The courage of the Gentiles is produced by simple greed, but the courage of Christians by the love of God which "has been poured into our hearts" not by freedom of will from our own side but "through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us" (Rom. 5:5).

CANON 18. That grace is not preceded by merit. Recompense is due to good works if they are performed; but grace, to which we have no claim, precedes them, to enable them to be done.

CANON 19. That a man can be saved only when God shows mercy. Human nature, even though it remained in that sound state in which it was created, could be no means save itself, without the assistance of the Creator; hence since man cannot safe-guard his salvation without the grace of God, which is a gift, how will he be able to restore

what he has lost without the grace of God?

CANON 20. That a man can do no good without God. God does much that is good in a man that the man does not do; but a man does nothing good for which God is not responsible, so as to let him do it.

CANON 21. Concerning nature and grace. As the Apostle most truly says to those who would be justified by the law and have fallen from grace, "If justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Gal. 2:21), so it is most truly declared to those who imagine that grace, which faith in Christ advocates and lays hold of, is nature: "If justification were through nature, then Christ died to no purpose." Now there was indeed the law, but it did not justify, and there was indeed nature, but it did not justify. Not in vain did Christ therefore die, so that the law might be fulfilled by him who said, "I have come not to abolish them <the law and prophets> but to fulfil them" (Matt. 5:17), and that the nature which had been destroyed by Adam might be restored by him who said that he had come "to seek and to save the lost" (Luke 19:10).

CANON 22. Concerning those things that belong to man. No man has anything of his own but untruth and sin. But if a man has any truth or righteousness, it is from that fountain for which we must thirst in this desert, so that we may be refreshed from it as by drops of water and not

faint on the way.

CANON 23. Concerning the will of God and of man. Men do their own will and not the will of God when they do what displeases him; but when they follow their own will and comply with the will of God, however willingly they do so, yet it is his will by which what they will is both prepared and instructed.

CANON 24. Concerning the branches of the vine. The branches on the vine do not give life to the vine, but receive life from it; thus the vine is related to its branches in such a way that it supplies them with what they need to live, and does not take this from them. Thus it is to the advantage of the disciples, not Christ, both to have Christ abiding in them and to abide in Christ. For if the vine is cut down another can shoot up from the live root; but one who is cut off from the vine cannot live without the root (John 15:5ff).

CANON 25. Concerning the love with which we love God. It is wholly a gift of God to love God. He who loves, even though he is not loved, allowed himself to be loved. We are loved, even when we displease him, so that we might have means to please him. For the Spirit, whom we love with the Father and the Son, has poured into our hearts the love of the Father and the Son (Rom. 5:5).

CONCLUSION. And thus according to the passages of holy scripture quoted above or the interpretations of the ancient Fathers we must, under the blessing of God, preach and believe as follows. The sin of the first man has so impaired and weakened free will that no one thereafter can either love God as he ought or believe in God or do good for God's sake, unless the grace of divine mercy has preceded him. We therefore believe that the glorious faith which was given to Abel the righteous, and Noah, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and to all the saints of old, and which the Apostle Paul <sic> commends in extolling them (Heb. 11), was not given through natural goodness as it was before to Adam, but was bestowed by the grace of God. And we know and also believe that even after the coming of our Lord this grace is not to be found in the free will of all who desire to be baptized, but is bestowed by the kindness of Christ, as has already been frequently stated and as the Apostle Paul declares, "For it has been granted to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake" (Phil. 1:29). And again, "He who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6). And again, "For by grace you have been saved through faith; and it is not your own doing, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). And as the Apostle says of himself, "I have obtained mercy to be faithful" (1 Cor. 7:25, cf. 1 Tim. 1:13). He did not say, "because I was faithful," but "to be faithful." And again, "What have you that you did not receive?" (1 Cor.

4:7). And again, "Every good endowment and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (Jas. 1:17). And again, "No one can receive anything except what is given him from heaven" (John 3:27). There are innumerable passages of holy scripture which can be quoted to prove the case for grace, but they have been omitted for the sake of brevity, because further examples will not really be of use where few are deemed sufficient.

According to the catholic faith we also believe that after grace has been received through baptism, all baptized persons have the ability and responsibility, if they desire to labor faithfully, to perform with the aid and cooperation of Christ what is of essential importance in regard to the salvation of their soul. We not only do not believe that any are foreordained to evil by the power of God, but even state with utter abhorrence that if there are those who want to believe so evil a thing, they are anathema. We also believe and confess to our benefit that in every good work it is not we who take the initiative and are then assisted through the mercy of God, but God himself first inspires in us both faith in him and love for him without any previous good works of our own that deserve reward, so that we may both faithfully seek the sacrament of baptism, and after baptism be able by his help to do what is pleasing to him. We must therefore most evidently believe that the praiseworthy faith of the thief whom the Lord called to his home in paradise, and of Cornelius

the centurion, to whom the angel of the Lord was sent, and of Zacchaeus, who was worthy to receive the Lord himself, was not a natural endowment but a gift of God's kindness.

Websites for Reference and Work

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/orange.txt>

CHAPTER 21 : MEDIEVAL STUDENTS' SONGS

Background Information

The increasing doctrinal corruption could not help but have an effect on the lives of Medieval Christians. We get a glimpse into the lives of some Medieval Christians in the lyrics of the songs of some students, contained in this chapter.

“The first song is a tenth century piece... It is the invitation of a young man to his mistress, bidding her to a little supper at his home. The next is a begging petition, addressed by a student on the road to some resident of the place where he was temporarily staying. The supplication for alms, in the name of learning, is cast in the form of a sing-song doggerel. The third, a jovial Song of the Open Road, throbs with exhilaration and even impudence. Two vagabond students are drinking together before they part. One of them undertakes to expound the laws of the brotherhood which bind them together. The refrain is intended apparently to imitate a bugle call.

Excerpts from the Work

I. *Come therefore now, my gentle fere.*

"Come therefore now, my gentle fere,
Whom as my heart I hold full dear;
Enter my little room, which is
Adorned with quaintest rarities:
There are the seats with cushions spread,
The roof with curtains overhead:
The house with flowers of sweetest scent
And scattered herbs is redolent:

A table there is deftly dight
With meats and drinks of rare delight;
There too the wine flows, sparkling, free;
And all, my love, to pleasure thee.
There sound enchanting symphonies;
The clear high notes of flutes arise;
A singing girl and artful boy
Are chanting for thee strains of joy;
He touches with his quill the wire,
She tunes her note unto the lyre:
The servants carry to and fro
Dishes and cups of ruddy glow;
But these delights, I will confess,
Than pleasant converse charm me less;
Nor is the feast so sweet to me
As dear familiarity.
Then come now, sister of my heart,
That dearer than all others art,
Unto mine eyes thou shining sun,
Soul of my soul, thou only one!
I dwelt alone in the wild woods,
And loved all secret solitudes;
Oft would I fly from tumults far,
And shunned where crowds of people are.
O dearest, do not longer stay!
Seek we to live and love to-day!
I cannot live without thee, sweet!
Time bids us now our love complete."

II. I, *A Wandering Scholar Lad.*

I, a wandering scholar lad,
Born for toil and sadness,
Oftentimes am driven by
Poverty to madness.

Literature and knowledge I
Fain would still be earning,
Were it not that want of pelf
Makes me cease from learning.

These torn clothes that cover me
Are too thin and rotten;
Oft I have to suffer cold,
By the warmth forgotten.

Scarce I can attend at church,
Sing God's praises duly;
Mass and vespers both I miss,
Though I love them truly.

Oh, thou pride of N-----,
By thy worth I pray thee
Give the suppliant help in need,
Heaven will sure repay thee.

Take a mind unto thee now
Like unto St. Martin;
Clothe the pilgrim's nakedness
Wish him well at parting.
So may God translate your soul
Into peace eternal,
And the bliss of saints be yours
In His realm supernal.

III. *We In Our Wandering.*

We in our wandering,
Blithesome and squandering,
Tara, tantara, teino!

Eat to satiety,
Drink to propriety;
Tara, tantara, teino!

Laugh till our sides we split,
Rags on our hides we fit;
Tara, tantara, teino!

Jesting eternally,
Quaffing infernally.
Tara, tantara, teino!

Craft's in the bone of us,
Fear 'tis unknown of us;
Tara, tantara, teino!

When we're in neediness,
Thieve we with greediness:
Tara, tantara, teino!

Brother catholical,
Man apostolical,
Tara, tantara, teino!

Say what you will have done,
What you ask 'twill be done!
Tara, tantara, teino!

Folk, fear the toss of the
Horns of philosophy!
Tara, tantara, teino!

Here comes a quadruple
Spoiler and prodigal!
Tara, tantara, teino!

License and vanity
Pamper insanity:
Tara, tantara, teino!

As the Pope bade us do,
Brother to brother's true:
Tara, tantara, teino!

Brother, best friend, adieu!
Now, I must part from you!
Tara, tantara, teino!

When will our meeting be?
Glad shall our greeting be!
Tara, tantara, teino!

Vows valedictory
Now have the victory:
Tara, tantara, teino!

Clasped on each other's breast,
Brother to brother pressed,
Tara, tantara, teino!

IV. The Vow to Cupid.

Winter, now thy spite is spent,
Frost and ice and branches bent!
Fogs and furious storms are o'er,

Sloth and torpor, sorrow frore,
Pallid wrath, lean discontent.

Comes the graceful band of May!
Cloudless shines the limpid day,
Shine by night the Pleiades;
While a grateful summer breeze
Makes the season soft and gay.

Golden Love! shine forth to view!
Souls of stubborn men subdue!
See me bend! what is thy mind?
Make the girl thou givest kind,
And a leaping ram's thy due!

O the jocund face of earth,
Breathing with young grassy birth!
Every tree with foliage clad,
Singing birds in greenwood glad,
Flowering fields for lovers' mirth!

V. The Love-Letter in Spring.

Now the sun is streaming,
Clear and pure his ray;
April's glad face beaming
On our earth to-day.
Unto love returneth
Every gentle mind;
And the boy-god burneth
Jocund hearts to bind.

All this budding beauty,
Festival array,
Lays on us the duty
To be blithe and gay.
Trodden ways are known, love!
And in this thy youth,
To retain thy own love
Were but faith and truth.

In faith love me solely,
Mark the faith of me,
From thy whole heart wholly,
From the soul of thee.
At this time of bliss, dear,

I am far away;
Those who love like this, dear,
Suffer every day!

VI. *Some Are Gaming.*

Some are gaming, some are drinking,
Some are living without thinking;
And of those who make the racket,
Some are stripped of coat and jacket;
Some get clothes of finer feather,
Some are cleaned out altogether;
No one there dreads death's invasion,
But all drink in emulation.

Websites for Reference and Work

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/medievalstudentsongs.html>

Class 7:

Assignment for chapter 4 is due today; for chapters 5 and 6 are due in 1 week; and for chapter 7 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we cover chapter 7 concerning the Assyrians. Reading, p. 113.

SCHOLASTICISM

The Scholastic systems, like all the distinctive institutions and movements of the Middle Ages, were on an imposing scale. The industry of their authors cannot fail to excite amazement. Statement follows statement with tedious but consequential necessity and precision until chapter is added to chapter and tome is piled upon tome, and the subject has been looked at in every possible aspect and been exhausted. Duns Scotus produced thirteen folio volumes, and perhaps died when he was only thirty-four. The volumes of Albertus Magnus are still more extensive. These theological systems are justly compared with the institution of the mediaeval papacy, and the creations of Gothic architecture, imposing, massive, and strongly buttressed. The papacy subjected all kingdoms to its divine authority. Architecture made all materials and known mechanical arts tributary to worship. The Schoolmen used all the forces of logic and philosophy to vindicate the orthodox system of theology, but they used much wood and straw in their constructions, as the sounder exegesis and more scriptural theology of the Reformers and these later days have shown.

§ 96. *Sources and Development of Scholasticism.*

The chief feeders of Scholasticism were the writings of Augustine and Aristotle. The former furnished the matter, the latter the form; the one the dogmatic principles, the other the dialectic method.

The Augustine, who ruled the thought of the Middle Ages, was the churchly, sacramentarian, anti-Manichaeian, and anti-Donatist theologian. It was the same Augustine, and yet another, to whom Luther and Calvin appealed for their doctrines of sin and grace. How strange that the same mighty intellect who helped to rear the structure of Scholastic divinity should have aided the Reformers in pulling it down and rearing another structure, at once more Scriptural and better adapted to the practical needs of life!

Aristotle was, in the estimation of the Middle Ages, the master philosophical thinker. The Schoolmen show their surpassing esteem for him in calling him again and again "the philosopher." Dante excluded both him and Virgil as pagans from paradise and purgatory and placed them in the vestibule of the inferno, where, however, they are exempt from actual suffering. Aristotle was regarded as a forerunner of Christian truth, a John the Baptist in method and knowledge of natural things—*precursor Christi in naturalibus*. Until the thirteenth century, his works were only imperfectly known. The *Categories* and the *de interpretatione* were known to Abaelard and other Schoolmen in

the Latin version of Boethius, and three books of the *Organon* to John of Salisbury. His *Physics* and *Metaphysics* became known about 1200, and all his works were made accessible early in the thirteenth century through the mediation of the Arab philosophers, Avicenna, d. 1037, Averrhoes, d. 1198, and Abuacer, d. 1185, and through Jewish sources. Roger Bacon laments the mistakes of translations made from the Arabic, by Michael Scot, Gerard of Cremona, and others.¹³¹³

At first the Stagyrite was looked upon with suspicion or even prohibited by the popes and synods as adapted to breed heresy and spiritual pride.¹³¹⁴ But, from 1250 on, his authority continued supreme. The saying of Gottfried of St. Victor became current in Paris.

Every one is excluded and banned
Who does not come clad in Aristotle's armor.¹³¹⁵

The Reformers shook off his yoke and Luther, in a moment of temper at the degenerate Schoolmen of his day, denounced him as "the accursed pagan Aristotle" and in his *Babylonish Captivity* called the mediaeval Church "the Thomistic or Aristotelian Church."

The line of the Schoolmen begins in the last year of the eleventh century with Roscellinus and Anselm. Two centuries before, John Scotus Erigena had anticipated some of their discussions of fundamental themes, and laid down the principle that true philosophy and true religion are one. But he does not seem to have had any perceptible influence on Scholastic thought. The history divides itself into three periods: the rise of Scholasticism, its full bloom, and its decline.¹³¹⁶ To the first period belong Anselm, d. 1109, Roscellinus, d. about 1125, Abaelard, d. 1142, Bernard, d. 1153, Hugo de St. Victor, d. 1161, Richard of St. Victor, d. 1173, and Gilbert of Poitiers, d. 1154. The chief names of the second period are Peter the Lombard, d. 1160, Alexander of Hales, d. 1243, Albertus Magnus, d. 1280, Thomas Aquinas, d. 1274, Bonaventura, d. 1274, Roger Bacon, d. 1294, and Duns Scotus, d. 1308. To the period of decline belong, among others, Durandus, d. 1334, Bradwardine, d. 1349, and Ockam, d. 1367. England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain made contributions to this galaxy of men. Gabriel Biel, professor at Tübingen, who died 1495, is usually called the last of the Schoolmen. Almost all the great Schoolmen were monks.

The two centuries included between the careers of Anselm and Duns Scotus show decided modifications of opinion on important questions such as the immaculate conception, and in regard to the possibility of proving from pure reason such doctrines as the incarnation and the Trinity. These two doctrines Thomas Aquinas, as well as Duns Scotus and Ockam, declared to be outside the domain of pure ratiocination. Even the existence of God and the immortality of the soul came to be regarded by Duns Scotus and the later Schoolmen as mysteries which were to be received solely upon the authority of the Church. The argument from probability was emphasized in the last stages of Scholastic thought as it had not been before.

In their effort to express the minutest distinctions of thought, the Schoolmen invented a new vocabulary unknown to classical Latin, including such words as *ens*, *absolutum*, *identitas quidditas*, *haecceitas*, *aliquiditas*, *aleitas*.¹³¹⁷ The sophisticated speculations which they allowed themselves were, for the most part, concerned with the angels, the Virgin Mary, the devil, the creation, and the body of the resurrection. Such questions as the

following were asked and most solemnly discussed by the leading Schoolmen. Albertus Magnus asked whether it was harder for God to create the universe than to create man and whether the understandings of angels are brighter in the morning or in the evening. "Who sinned most, Adam or Eve?" was a favorite question with Anselm, Hugo de St. Victor,¹³¹⁸ and others. Alexander of Hales attempted to settle the hour of the day at which Adam sinned and, after a long discussion, concluded it was at the ninth hour, the hour at which Christ expired. Bonaventura debated whether several angels can be in one place at the same time, whether one angel can be in several places at the same time, and whether God loved the human race more than He loved Christ.¹³¹⁹ Anselm, in his work on the Trinity, asked whether God could have taken on the female sex and why the Holy Spirit did not become incarnate. Of the former question, Walter of St. Victor, speaking of Peter the Lombard, very sensibly said that it would have been more rational for him to have asked why the Lombard did not appear on earth as an ass than for the Lombard to ask whether God could have become incarnate in female form. The famous discussion over the effect the eating of the host would have upon a mouse will be taken up in connection with the Lord's Supper. Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, and others pondered over the problem. It was asked by Robert Pullen whether man in the resurrection will receive back the rib he lost in Eden, and whether a man will recover all the clippings of his finger nails.

Such endless discussions have been ridiculed as puerile and frivolous, though, as has already been said, they grew out of the desire to be exhaustive. At last and justly, they brought Scholasticism into disrepute. While it was losing itself in the clouds and mists of things transcendental, it neglected the earth at its feet. As the papacy passed sentence upon itself by intolerable ambition, so Scholasticism undermined its authority by intellectual sophistries and was set aside by the practical interests of the Renaissance and Humanism and by simple faith, searching through the Scriptures, to reach the living sympathy of Christ.¹³²⁰

§ 97. Realism and Nominalism.

The underlying philosophical problem of the Scholastic speculations was the real and independent existence of general or generic concepts, called *universalia* or universals. Do they necessarily involve substantial being? On this question the Schoolmen were divided into two camps, the Realists and the Nominalists.¹³²¹ The question, which receives little attention now, was regarded as most important in the Middle Ages.

Realism taught that the universals are not mere generalizations of the mind but have a real existence. Following Plato, as he is represented by Aristotle, one class of Realists held that the universals are creative types, exemplars in the divine mind. Their view was stated in the expression—*universalia ante rem*—that is, the universals exist before the individual, concrete object. The Aristotelian Realists held that the universals possess a real existence, but exist only in individual things. This was the doctrine of *universalia in re*. Humanity, for example, is a universal having a real existence. Socrates partakes of it, and he is an individual man, distinct from other men. Anselm, representing the Platonic school, treated the universal humanity as having independent existence by itself. Duns Scotus, representing the second theory, found in the universal the basis of all classification and gives to it only in this sense a real existence.

The Nominalists taught that universals or general conceptions have no antecedent existence. They are mere names—*nomina, flatus vocis, voces*—and are derived from a comparison of individual things and their qualities. Thus beauty is a conception of the mind gotten from the observation of objects which are beautiful. The individual things are first observed and the universal, or abstract conception, is derived from it. This doctrine found statement in the expression *universalia post rem*, the universal becomes known after the individual. A modification of this view went by the name of Conceptualism, or the doctrine that universals have existence as conceptions in the mind, but not in real being.¹³²²

The starting-point for this dialectical distinction may have been a passage in Porphyry's *Isagoge*, as transmitted by Boethius. Declining to enter into a discussion of the question, Porphyry asks whether the universals are to be regarded as having distinct substantial existence apart from tangible things or whether they were only conceptions of the mind, having substantial existence only in tangible things.¹³²³ The distinction assumed practical importance when it was applied to such theological doctrines as the Trinity, the atonement, and original sin.

The theory of Realism was called in question in the eleventh century by Roscellinus, a contemporary of Anselm and the teacher of Abaelard, who, as it would seem, advocated Nominalism.¹³²⁴ Our knowledge of his views is derived almost exclusively from the statements of his two opponents, Anselm and Abaelard. He was serving as canon of Compiègne in the diocese of Soissons, 1092, when he was obliged to recant his alleged tritheism, which he substituted for the doctrine of the Trinity.

The views of this theologian called forth Anselm's treatise on the Trinity, and Abaelard despised him as a quack dialectician.¹³²⁵ Anselm affirmed that Roscellinus' heretical views on the Trinity were the immediate product of his false philosophical principle, the denial that universals have real existence. Roscellinus called the three persons of the Godhead three substances, as Scotus Erigena had done before. These persons were three distinct beings equal in power and will, but each separate from the other and complete in himself, like three men or angels. These three could not be one God in the sense of being of the same essence, for then the Father and the Holy Spirit would have had to become incarnate as well as the Son.

Defending the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, Anselm proceeded on the basis of strict realism and declared that the three persons represented three relations and not three substances. Fountain, brook, and pond are three; yet the same water is in each one and we could not say the brook is the fountain or the fountain is the pond. The water of the brook may be carried through a pipe, but in that case it would not be the fountain which was carried through, nor the pond. So in the same way, the Godhead became incarnate without involving the incarnation of the Father and Holy Spirit.

The decision of the synod of Soissons and Anselm's argument drove Nominalism from the field and it was not again publicly avowed till the fourteenth century when it was revived by the energetic and practical mind of Ockam, by Durandus and others. It was for a time fiercely combated by councils and King Louis XI., but was then adopted by many of the great teachers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Leo XIII. bore fresh witness to this when, in his encyclical of Aug. 4, 1879, he pronounced the theology of Thomas Aquinas the standard of Catholic orthodoxy, and the safest guide of Christian philosophy in the battle of faith with the scepticism of the nineteenth century.

Class 8:

Assignment for chapters 5 and 6 are due today; for chapter 7 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 8 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we cover chapter 8 concerning the Neo-Babylonians, and we begin to consider chapter 9.

Anselm

<http://custance.org/old/grace/ch3.html>

Approximately two hundred years after Gottschalk, Anselm was born in Aosta in Piedmont in 1033 of a pious mother, Ermenberga, and an indifferent though well-to-do father. From a very early childhood his mother's influence played a strong part in his development and he occupied himself in meditation on the things of God as he grew. His relations with his father were much less happy, and when he was a young man he left home to travel in France. In due time under Lanfranc he became a monk in the monastery of Bec. In 1063 he became its prior, and finally in 1078 its abbot. In 1093 he was called to be Archbishop of Canterbury. (6)

In a remarkable number of ways Anselm was like Augustine: in his gentleness, in his love for man and for God, in his contemplative nature, in his desire for holiness of life, and in his zeal to suppress his baser nature. Augustus Neander in his *General History of the Christian Religion and Church* says, "He was the Augustine of his age." What gave him his great importance was the unity of spirit in which he thought and did everything, a harmony between life and knowledge which in his case nothing disturbed. And love seems to have been the inspiring soul of his thought.

He was constantly occupied with public duties appropriate to each station of his life as he rose to become Archbishop. Rather like Augustine he felt himself throughout to be a wretched sinner unworthy of his office and privately longing to be free to return to a life of contemplation. When he died in 1109, in spite of the many conflicts in which he unwillingly became involved, he seems to have had no enemies but was completely at peace with God and everywhere revered by man.

There was one important difference, however, between the two men, Augustine and Anselm, namely, in the turmoil of the former's life as he grew up as contrasted with the comparative tranquillity of the latter's.

Both men agreed absolutely upon this fact, that faith precedes understanding. Interestingly, both seemed to have based their conviction in this not upon Hebrews 11:3 ("through faith we understand...") but upon the Septuagint version of Isaiah 7:9 which reads: "If ye believe not, neither will ye at all understand." Anselm's principle of handling Scripture was to sit down as a little child before the Word of God and accept its statements. Then, believing, to seek for understanding. Augustine's guiding principle had been that obedience to the Word in faith was the key to understanding it: "If any man will

do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John 7:17). Similarly Anselm wrote: "Self-confident human wisdom will sooner break its own horn than succeed in overturning this rock." Faith, he held, precedes intellect. (7) In Anselm we find heart and mind beautifully balanced. Yet he made singularly little use of Scripture itself... (8)

In his *De Libero Arbitrio* ("Of Freedom of Will") Anselm controverts any idea of free will in man as being the power to choose between good and evil. (9) Man has only the power to choose between evils and since he sometimes chooses the lesser evil, he appears to be choosing the good. Pelagius had argued that the effect of Adam's Fall was not inherited by his descendants, that every man is born as Adam was created, with complete freedom to choose between good and evil. This freedom is partially but not wholly lost as the individual matures, and this loss can be corrected by following the example of Jesus Christ. Anselm, with Augustine and Paul, denied this possibility. Since salvation was an absolute good, man could not choose it. The realization of this truth seems to have sprung out of Anselm's own experience with himself, as it had with Augustine. Augustine appears to have tried always to bring his thought captive to Scripture, combining the Word of God with every means at his disposal in order to base his theology on something more secure than experience. This policy transformed Augustine's thinking and theology and gave it a more secure foundation, besides vastly illuminating it. Anselm agreed with this principle entirely but did not exploit the Word

Satisfaction atonement has been the predominant atonement image of the present time as well as for much of the past millennium. It suffices for present purposes to sketch two versions of satisfaction atonement. One reflects the view of Anselm of Canterbury. In 1098 he published *Cur Deus Homo*, which constitutes the first full articulation of satisfaction atonement. Anselm wrote that Jesus' death was necessary in order to satisfy the offended honor of God. Human sin had offended God's honor and thus had upset divine order in the universe. The death of Jesus as the God-man was then necessary in order to satisfy God's honor and restore the order of the universe.

A change in this image of satisfaction occurred with the Protestant Reformers. For them, Jesus' death satisfied the divine law's requirement that sin be punished. Thus with his death, Jesus submitted to and

bore the punishment that was really due to us -- humankind -- as sinners. Jesus was punished in our place. Jesus substituted himself for us, and died a penal substitutionary death.

The third atonement image is moral influence. In this image, the death of Jesus is a loving act of God aimed toward us. God the Father shows love to us sinners by giving us his most precious possession, his Son, to die for us.

Deleting the Devil from Atonement

These theories did not develop as isolated entities. Each emerged as a response to a previous one. In the first book of *Cur Deus Homo*, Anselm specifically rejected the idea that Jesus' death was a ransom payment to the devil. Satan has no contractual rights that would obligate God to make such a payment. And even though humankind deserves punishment, Satan has no right to inflict that punishment. These considerations make it unworthy of God to deal with Satan via a ransom. Thus Anselm deleted the devil from the salvation equation. [2] Rather than seeing human beings as captive to the devil, Anselm made them directly responsible to God. Humans sinned against God; sin offended the honor of God, and thus threatened order in the universe. The death of Jesus served to restore God's honor and thus restore order in the universe.

Abelard's school followed Anselm in rejecting the idea of Jesus' death as a ransom payment to the devil. But Abelard also rejected the idea of Jesus' death as a payment to God. It made God seem vengeful and judgmental. Instead, Abelard saw the death of Jesus aimed not at God but at sinful humankind. It was a loving act of God designed to get the attention of sinners, and reveal the love of God for sinners while they were yet sinners. Its impact on the psychological or moral character of humankind identifies this view as the moral influence theory of atonement.

Thus historical relationships exist among these atonement theories. Anselm's satisfaction motif succeeded ransom, and was subsequently modified by majority Protestantism. Abelard's moral theory posed an alternative to Anselm's satisfaction theory while retaining Anselm's critique of the ransom motif.

- [Preface](#)
- [BOOK FIRST](#)
 - [I. The question on which the whole work rests](#)
 - [II. How those things which are to be said should be received](#)

- III. Objections of infidels and replies of believers
- IV. How these things appear not decisive to infidels, and merely like so many pictures
- V. How the redemption of man could not be effected by any other being but God
- VI. How infidels find fault with us for saying that God has redeemed us by his death, etc.
- VII. How the devil had no justice on his side against man
- VIII. How, although the acts of Christ's condescension which we speak of do not belong to his divinity, it yet seems improper to infidels that these things should be said of him even as a man, etc.
- IX. How it was of his own accord that he died
- X. On the same topics
- XI. What it is to sin, and to make satisfaction for sin
- XII. Whether it were proper for God to put away sins by compassion alone, without any payment of debt
- XIII. How nothing less was to be endured, in the order of things, than that the creature should take away the honor due the Creator, etc.
- XIV. How the honor of God exists in the punishment of the wicked
- XV. Whether God suffers his honor to be violated even in the least degree
- XVI. The reason why the number of angels who fell must be made up from men
- XVII. How other angels cannot take the place of those who fell
- XVIII. Whether there will be more holy men than evil angels
- XIX. How man cannot be saved without satisfaction for sin
- XX. That satisfaction ought to be proportionate to guilt
- XXI. How great a burden Sin is
- XXII. What contempt man brought upon God when he allowed himself to be conquered by the devil
- XXIII. What man took from God by his sin
- XXIV. How, as long as man does not restore what he owes God, he cannot be happy
- XXV. How man's salvation by Christ is necessarily possible
- **BOOK SECOND**
 - I. How man was made holy by God, so as to be happy in the enjoyment of God
 - II. How man would never have died, unless he had sinned
 - III. How man will rise with the same body which he has in this world
 - IV. How God will complete, in respect to human nature, what he has begun
 - V. How, although the thing may be necessary, God may not do it by a compulsory necessity

- **VI.** [How no being, except the God-man, can make the atonement by which man is saved](#)
- **VII.** [How necessary it is for the same being to be perfect God and perfect man](#)
- **VIII.** [How it behooved God to take a man of the race of Adam, and born of a woman](#)
- **IX.** [How of necessity the Word only can unite in one person with man](#)
- **X.** [How this man dies not of debt; and in what sense he can or cannot sin](#)
- **XI.** [How Christ dies of his own power](#)
- **XII.** [How, though he share in our weakness, he is not therefore miserable](#)
- **XIII.** [How, along with our other weaknesses, he does not partake of our ignorance](#)
- **XIV.** [How his death outweighs the number and greatness of our sins](#)
- **XV.** [How his death removes even the sins of his murderers](#)
- **XVI.** [How God took that man from a sinful substance, and yet without sin; and of the salvation of Adam and Eve](#)
- **XVII.** [How he did not die of necessity though he could not be born, except as destined to suffer death](#)
- **XVIIIa.** [How with God there is neither necessity nor impossibility](#)
- **XVIIIb.** [How Christ's life is paid to God for the sins of men](#)
- **XIX.** [How human salvation follows upon his death](#)
- **XX.** [How great and how just is God's compassion](#)
- **XXI.** [How it is impossible for the devil to be reconciled](#)

XXII. [How the truth of the Old and New Testament is shown in the things which have been said](#)

Cur Deus Homo? ("Why did God become Man?"), which is excerpted below. In it, Anselm sought to answer the question of why God became a man. He did so based on his understanding of sin and the need for the atonement. Influenced by medieval views of honor, Anselm believed that the essence of sin is the failure to give God the honor due Him. Sin robs God of His honor, which must be vindicated. Since God is so great, humans cannot vindicate God's honor simply by repenting and beginning to honor Him, for their sin has not only robbed God of honor, but has injured Him. Thus, in addition to rectifying the situation of failing to honor God, reparation for the injury must also be made.

God's honor could be satisfied by punishment (of humans) or by satisfaction (of God's honor). Due to God's mercy or due to the need to save some humans to compensate God

for the loss of the fallen angels, God chose to satisfy His honor through the death of Jesus Christ. Christ completely obeyed the law, but this was His duty so it did not garner any merit. However, since He was sinless, He was not obliged to suffer and die. His suffering and death brought great glory to God and merited great reward. Since Christ did not need any merit (He was sinless), His merit could be passed on to sinful humans in the form of forgiveness and future blessings. This provided the necessary reparation to God. This model provides the basis for the Roman Catholic concept of the treasury of merit.

Anselm also authored a number of other arguments for the existence of God

Literally, atonement means *at-one-ment*. It can refer to all the ways in which God and humans have been reconciled through Jesus Christ. Often, however, discussions of atonement focus on the meaning of Jesus' death. Historically, three theories of atonement have been especially influential. Each has some biblical basis and can be found among the writing of the early church fathers.

Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) first gave the substitutionary theory a systematic formulation. This view was emphasized by the Protestant Reformers, and more so by post-Reformation Protestant orthodoxy and Fundamentalism. According to this theory, the main evil from which Christ saves us is the penalty of sin: eternal death. Humans were created to merit eternal life through perfect obedience to God. But since everyone has disobeyed, no one has attained this reward. Moreover, since sin violates God's law, it carries the penalty of eternal death. Jesus' saving work, then, consisted in a life of perfect obedience, which merited eternal life for us; and in bearing God's judgment on the cross, which paid the penalty of eternal death in our place. According to the substitutionary theory, the high point of Jesus' atoning work is his death.

Peter Abelard (1079-1142) first gave detailed expression to the moral influence theory. It has been emphasized by Protestant liberalism. According to this theory, the main evil from which we need salvation is the power of sin in our lives. Jesus' life, therefore, was primarily devoted to showing us how to live. Jesus' death reveals a God who is loving. Through the moral influence of Jesus' life and death, we are inwardly transformed and thereby brought into fellowship with God. According to this theory, the high point of Jesus' atoning work is his earthly teaching and example.

Moral Influence Theory: This view sees the atonement of Christ as demonstrating God's love which causes man's heart to soften and repent. Those that hold this view believe that man is spiritually sick and in need of help and that man is moved to accept God's forgiveness by seeing God's love for man. They believe that the purpose and meaning of Christ's death was to demonstrate God's love toward man. While it is true that Christ's atonement is the ultimate example of the love of God this view is also heretical because it denies the true spiritual condition of man and denies that God actually requires a payment for sin. This view of Christ's atonement leaves mankind without a true sacrifice or payment for sin. Some leading proponents of this view were Abelard, Bushnell, and Rashdall.

Class 9:

Assignment for chapter 7 is due today; for chapter 8 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 9 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we continue our consideration of the Medes and the Persians in chapter 9.

SENTENCES OF PETER LOMBARD

BOOK I

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

The Prologue to the Book of Sentences

DISTINCTION I

Chapter 1: Every doctrine concerns things and/or signs.

Chapter 2: On the things which one is to enjoy and/or to use, and on those who use and enjoy

Chapter 3: What is it *to use* and *to enjoy*?

DISTINCTION II

Chapter 1: On the Trinity and Unity.

Chapter 2: What was the intention of those writing of the Trinity?

Chapter 3: What order is to be observed, when dealing with the Trinity?

Chapter 4: On the testimonies of the Old Testament, by which the Mystery of the Trinity is declared.

Chapter 5: On the testimonies of the New Testament, pertaining to the same.

DISTINCTION III

PART I, Chapter 1: On the cognition of God through the creatures, in which the vestige of the Trinity appears.

PART II, Chapter 2: On the image and similitude of the Trinity in the human soul.

Chapter 3: On the similitude of the creating and created trinity.

Chapter 4: On the unity of the Trinity.

DISTINCTION IV

Chapter 1: Whether God the Father begot Himself God?

Chapter 2: Whether the Trinity may be predicated of the one God, as the one God of the Three Persons?

DISTINCTION V

Chapter 1: Whether the Divine Essence begot the Son, and/or is begotten by the Father, and/or whether the Son is born from It, and/or the Holy Spirit proceeds from It?

Chapter 2: That the Son is not from nothing, but from someone or thing,

non however from matter, just as also is the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 3: Why the Word of the Father is called the Son of His Nature.

DISTINCTION VI

Chapter Sole: Whether the Father begot the Son by will, or by necessity; and whether God is willing and/or unwilling.

DISTINCTION VII

Chapter 1: Whether the Father could and/or willed to beget the Son.

Chapter 2: Or whether there is some power in the Father that can beget the Son, which is not in the Son.

DISTINCTION VIII

PART I, Chapter 1: On the truth and property of the Divine Essence.

Chapter 2: On the incommutability of the same.

PART II, Chapter 3: On the simplicity of the same.

Chapter 4: On the corporal and spiritual creature, in what manner it be multiple, and not simple.

Chapter 5: That God, though He be simple, is nevertheless spoken of in a multiple manner.

Chapter 6: That the simplicity of God is subject to none of the predicaments.

Chapter 7: That God is abusively said to be a substance.

Chapter 8: That there is not in God anything that is not God.

DISTINCTION IX

Chapter 1: On the distinction of the Three Persons.

Chapter 2: On the coeternity of the Father and of the Son.

Chapter 3: On the ineffable and intelligible manner of the generation.

Chapter 4: Whether there ought to be said: God always is begotten, and/or always has been begotten.

Chapter 5: On the objections of the heretics striving to prove, that the Son is not coeternal to the Father.

DISTINCTION X

Chapter 1: That the Holy Spirit is properly said to be the Love of the Father and of the Son.

Chapter 2: That the same names are properly and universally accepted.

Chapter 3: That the Holy Spirit, just as He is common to the Father and to the Son, so has a common proper name.

BOOK II

**DE RERUM CREATIONE ET FORMATIONE
CORPORALIUM ET SPIRITUALIUM
ET ALIIS PLURIBUS EO PERTINENTIUBUS**

BOOK III

**DE INCARNATIONE VERBI ET HUMANI
GENERIS REPARATIONE**

BOOK IV

DE DOCTRINA SIGNORUM

DISTINCTION I

PART I, Chapter 1: On the Sacraments.

Chapter 2: What is a Sacrament.

Chapter 3: What is a sign.

Chapter 4: How sign and Sacrament differ.

Chapter 5: Why the Sacraments have been instituted.

Chapter 6: On the difference of the Old and New Sacraments.

PART II, Chapter 7: On circumcision.

Chapter 8: The remedy which they had, who were before circumcision.

Chapter 9: On the institution of circumcision and its cause.

Chapter 10: On the little ones departed before the eighth day, on which circumcision was done.

Class 10:

Assignment for chapter 8 is due today; for chapter 9 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 10 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we consider the Armenians in Chapter 10, and we begin to look at chapter 11.

For Aristotle, the form is not something outside the object, but rather *in* the varied phenomena of sense. Real substance, or true being, is not the abstract form, but rather the *concrete* individual thing. Unfortunately, Aristotle's theory of substance is not altogether consistent with itself. In the *Categories* the notion of substance tends to be nominalistic (i.e., substance is a concept we apply to things). In the *Metaphysics*, though, it frequently inclines towards realism (i.e., substance has a real existence in itself).

the Averroist Physics and Astrology, source of a determinism

http://www.freivald.org/~jake/church-history/historyOfTheChurch_volume2chapter10.html#section6

Siger of Brabant (1235-1281,4) is the Averroist of whose work, thanks to some recent discoveries, we know most. At the time of his first defeat -- the condemnation of his theories by the Bishop of Paris, Etienne Tempier, December 10, 1270 -- Siger was still quite a young man, ten years junior to St. Thomas perhaps. The theses then condemned are statements of particular Averroist doctrines: that the intellect of all mankind is, numerically, the one same intellect; that the human will wills and chooses of necessity; that the world is eternal; that there never was a first man; that the soul is not immortal; that there is no divine Providence so far as the actions of individual men are concerned. In the later condemnation, of March 7, 1277, these are singled out which describe the Averroist "approach" to philosophy and the Averroist ideas about its place in a Catholic's life -- for all these Averroists claimed to be both "philosophers" and Catholics; [298] such theses, for example, as that: the Catholic religion is a hindrance to learning; there are fables and falsities in the Catholic religion as in other religions; no man knows any more from the fact that he knows theology; what theologians teach rests on fables; the only truly wise men are the philosophers; there is not a more excellent way of life than to spend it studying philosophy.

The work in which St. Bonaventure's thought finds its fullest exposition is his Commentary on Peter Lombard, composed about 1249-1250. Its frontal attack on the main theses of the Averroists is almost the first evidence we possess of the extent to which, by this time, they had captured the University of Paris. St. Bonaventure insists on the origin of the universe through the creative act of God. The Aristotelian theory, of a universe that is eternal, he even thinks contradictory to reason. The Aristotelian teaching on the unicity of form -- as dear to the Averroists as the theory last named -- he rejects, and he rejects with it two other tenets of that school, namely the doctrine that places the principle of individuation in matter and the doctrine that spiritual substances are simple. His general position has been summed up thus by a modern writer: [301] "The seraphic doctor would have it that all human knowledge is profoundly religious. He admits the role of the senses and of the intellect in the process of knowing. He recognises their necessity and their value,

but he considers that intellect and sense are by themselves insufficient if we are to know with a knowledge that is absolutely sure, perfect and certain. That is why he strengthens their value by this ray of divine light which burns in our mind and which comes to us from Christ the Word, the God-man."

St. Bonaventure's approach to the burning question of the defence of revealed truth against the new danger is extremely important. He is, in time, the first great opponent of Averroism; and in his attack he includes, from the beginning, several of the Averroistic theses which derive from Aristotle, and which another school of the Faith's defenders will accept as fundamental to their philosophy and to the defence of the Faith. The struggle around the Aristotelian corpus of doctrine as Averroes presents it, will soon be complicated by this inner struggle between the Catholic critics of Averroes themselves. St. Bonaventure's opponent here is St. Thomas Aquinas.

It was St. Bonaventure's fate that he was not only a thinker. The university professor had in him talents of another kind and, in 1257, ere his courses had done much more than reveal his genius, he was taken away to rule and re-model his order at one of the greatest crises in its history. He was but thirty-six, and for the seventeen years of life that remained to him he had other cares to occupy him as well as that of the defence of the traditional belief against the forces that now menaced it. His disciples in Paris, however, kept his teaching alive, and never did St. Bonaventure himself cease to be even passionately interested in the debate, from time to time even returning to Paris to lead his party. But from the time of his election as general it ceased, inevitably, to be his first preoccupation; and, to that extent, his knowledge of the situation was no longer first hand, his opportunities less than those of one who, like St. Thomas, never ceased through all those critical years to form one of the corps of teachers and disputants.

St. Bonaventure's doctrine had the advantage -- relative to the contest now drawing on -- that it was first in the field. Also it was in keeping with the spirit that so far characterised, not merely the Franciscan school at Paris, but the general theological teaching of the university.

Albertus Magnus

b. Lauingen (Germany), 1193, d. Cologne (Germany), November 15, 1280]

Albertus Magnus was a widely traveled German university professor and bishop who promoted Aristotle and alchemy, both with a touch of skepticism, however. In astronomy, he recognized that the Milky Way was composed of stars; in geology, he listed minerals and discussed fossils; and in botany, he collected and recorded data on plants from his extensive travels throughout Europe.

Al·ber·tus Mag·nus (ăl·bûr'təs mǎg'nəs), Saint (Originally Albert, Count von Bollstadt.) 1206?–1280.

German religious philosopher. A leading thinker of the 13th century, he is also noted as the teacher of Thomas Aquinas.

Albert's first reward, apparently, was that he was regarded in some quarters as responsible for the spread of Averroism, among the signs of which are the decision of the faculty of Arts in 1252 making obligatory the study of Aristotle's *De Anima*, or that which, three years later, made Aristotle as a whole the staple matter of its studies: two revolutionary changes which, in the then state of things, were tantamount to basing the whole teaching of the faculty on Averroes. By this time (1256) St. Albert had long left Paris. In 1248 he had been charged to organise the studies of his order at Cologne. The pope, Alexander IV, alarmed at the dissensions in Paris which threatened to end the university's usefulness -- dissensions between the secular masters-of-arts and the friars, related dissensions between the advocates and the opponents of the new learning -- ordered an enquiry. St. Albert at the moment was at the Curia and, as a leading authority on the question, he was commissioned by the pope to refute the theory of Averroes that was the root of the trouble. Hence in 1256 his book *De Unitate Intellectus contra Averroem*. The book did not however, end the greatest of St. Albert's troubles, that in his absence from Paris (1248-1255) some of those whom he had trained had developed into Averroists of a most radical kind, and were justifying the development by a reference to his teaching. Whence a resolve on the part of the philosopher to leave the academic life. The pope had desired to use him in Germany and, the saint now consenting, he was named Bishop of Ratisbon.

He was a thorough student of Aristotle, and he not only followed Robert Grosseteste in his approach to Aristotelian thought but also did much to introduce Aristotle's scientific treatises and scientific method to Europe. Like Roger Bacon, he had a scientific interest in nature. He made notable botanical observations (recorded in such works as *De vegetabilibus*), was the first to produce arsenic in a free form, and studied the combinations of metals. In philosophy he set out in his *Summa theologiae* to controvert [Averroës](#) and others and to reconcile the apparent contradictions of Aristotelianism and Christian thought.

His principal theological works are a commentary in three volumes on the Books of the Sentences of [Peter Lombard](#) (*Magister Sententiarum*), and the *Summa Theologiae* in two volumes. This last is in substance a repetition of the first in a more didactic form.

At Paris meanwhile the struggle continued to rage. Not all of Albert's followers had gone astray. The greatest of them all, Thomas Aquinas, was once more in Paris, teaching now, and developing his own thought, no less than that of his master, to criticise Averroes and

to refute the Averroists completely. There were now three parties in the arena. The Averroists; the Traditionalists who clung to St. Augustine; and the anti-Averroist disciples of St. Albert. The first worshipped at the shrine of Aristotle. The second fought the first, as Catholics on the points where the Averroist theories clashed with revealed truth, and as Platonists on the differences in philosophy. The third group was the one really critical party. It fought the Averroists with their own weapons. It used Aristotle as it used Plato and the Neoplatonists, that is to say as far as reason justified the use. Whence a certain suspicion of this group on the part of the Traditionalists -- a suspicion that was by no means lessened when the group criticised and attacked the fallacious Avicennianism latent in the Traditionalist exposition of Catholicism. This three-cornered contest filled the next twenty years (1257-1277) from the time when St. Thomas received his master's degree to the famous condemnation of his theories by the Bishop of Paris.

Class 11:

Assignment for chapter 9 is due today; for chapter 10 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 11 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we continue to consider the Egyptians in chapter 11.

Maimonides

It is the custom of many congregations to recite the Thirteen Articles, in a slightly more poetic form, beginning with the words Ani Maamin - "I believe" - every day after the morning prayers in the synagogue.

In his commentary on the Mishnah (Sanhedrin, chap. 10), Maimonides refers to these thirteen principles of faith as "the fundamental truths of our religion and its very foundations."

FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL

The Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation was officially made a dogma of the church by Pope Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.

There was a corresponding move to withdraw the cup from the laity: (1) to avoid chances of spilling the "blood" of Christ; (2) because the "whole" Christ is present in both elements (and withholding the cup would teach this to the laity); (3) it enhanced the unique spiritual privilege and authority of the priesthood above the laity.

Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) Claims Divine Authority

Pope Innocent III claimed that only the Roman Pontiff had the power to transfer and separate bishops, because when he separates, it is not a man that separates, but God that separates, because he acts "not only as a man, but as the true God's vice governor on earth" [*non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris*], ... he "dissolves not with human, but with divine authority" [*non humana, sed divina potius auctoritate dissolvit.*]:

Non enim homo, sed Deus separat, quos Romanus
Pontifex, qui non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in

terris, ecclesiarum necessitate vel utilitate pensata, non humana, sed divina potius auctoritate dissolvit.

Source: *Decretalium Gregorii papae IX*, liber 1, [titulus VII - de translatione Episcopi](#), cap. III, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Pars Secunda: Decretalium Collectiones, Decretales Gregorii p. IX, ed. Emil Ludwig Richter und Emil Friedberg, Leipzig 1881.

An excellent searchable version of [Gregorius IX Decretalium compilatio](#) with concordance.



Pope Innocent III Claims Authority Over Kings

Just as the founder of the universe established two great lights in the firmament of heaven, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night, so too He set two great dignities in the firmament of the universal church..., the greater one to rule the day, that is, souls, and the lesser to rule the night, that is, bodies. These dignities are the papal authority and the royal power. Now just as the moon derives its light from the sun and is indeed lower than it in quantity and quality, in position and in power, so too the royal power derives the splendor of its dignity from the pontifical authority.... — [Letter to the prefect Acerbius and the nobles of Tuscany, 1198.](#)

Class 12:

Assignment for chapter 10 is due today; for chapter 11 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 12 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class consider the Asian Indians in chapter 12.

Scotus' is usually associated with [voluntarism](#), the tendency to emphasize God's will and human freedom in all philosophical issues.

1. What medieval institution is credited with the rebirth of western theatre?

The Christian church.

2. What was a tropes?

The *tropes* was a verbal (sung or chanted) embellishment, an **insertion into the liturgical text** of the Mass. The most significant of these short embellishments was *Quem Quaeritis*, (925) "Whom Seek Ye," which was probably originally sung, antiphonally in Latin, by two sections of the choir. The four lines of text comes directly from the New Testament, (*The Gospel of St. Luke*, Chapter 24).

<i>Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, O Christicole?</i>	Whom seek ye in the sepulchre, O Christian women?
<i>Jesum Nazarenum crucifixum, O caelicolae.</i>	Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified, O heavenly one.
<i>Non est hic, surrexit sicut praedixerat.</i>	He is not here; He is risen, as he foretold.
<i>Ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.</i>	Go, announce that He has risen from the sepulchre.

Within approximately 40 years, this short playlet is being performed not by the choir, but by *four brethren* (priests) -- three representing the women who have gone to the tomb to anoint Christ's body with oil and the fourth representing the Angel. Bishop Ethelwold (912-984) of Winchester, England, not only includes the text of *Quem Quaeritis* in *Regularis Concordia* (ca. 970), a book of rules and advice for the English Benedictines, but gave directions on how to stage the action.

3. During which Christian festival were these early playlets performed?

Quem Quaeritis was inserted into the **Easter Mass**. Within a short period of time, similar playlets were added to the **Christmas** and **Epiphany** services.

4. What was the source of the stories which were dramatized?

The *Bible*.

5. How were these plays staged inside the church?

Quem Quaeritis was presented near the high altar. As the playlets were extended and additional scenes were added, they were staged on a number of small "platforms" distributed around the church. Both the performer and the audience (congregation) would move from one "platform" (or scene) to the next. Giotto di Bondone (1267-1337) used the same basic concept when he painted the twenty-three scenes of the *Life of Christ* on the walls of the *Cappella Scrovegni* in Padua.

6. What was a mansion or station?

The *mansion*, or *station*, was the **scenic facade** used to locate the action of the play.

The plateau?

The *plateau* was the **neutral playing area** on which the actors performed.

7. Who were the actors?

The priests.

8. Why, during the 13th century, were these plays moved out of the church?

As the plays became longer and more complicated, it became more and more **difficult to stage** them indoors. There was also the feeling that the action in some of the plays, such as the *Slaughter of the Innocents* from the *Ordo Rachelis*, an *Epiphany Play*, was **too violent**, too non-Christian, to be presented within the church. When the dramatic production moved out doors, the plays were presented (spoken, not sung) in the *vernacular* (the language of the people) by laymen. Although the dramas were still religious, they were no longer a part of worship.

9. Who produced these plays after they left the church?

The **trade guilds**. These medieval unions provided the money and personal needed to present the plays. The church continued to provide the scripts and directorial leadership.

10. What is a pageant wagon?

A pageant wagon held the *mansion*, the *plateau*, and a dressing area on one structure. This **wagon stage** would then be moved from one gathering of audience to the next, much like a float in a parade. See the illustrations on page 253.

In which country was it used?

England.

11. How were these plays staged on the European continent?

The *mansions* were arranged in a **line**, creating a "street," at the rear of a long narrow platform. At one end (stage right) of the street was the *Entrance to Heaven* or *Paradise* and at the other end (stage left) was *Gate to Hell*, the *Hellsmouth*. The *Spearfish Passion Play* uses the continental approach to staging. See the illustration on page 254.

12. What is the difference between a mystery play, a miracle play, and a morality play?

Mystery play: The plot and characters were **drawn from the books of the Bible**. It was the major form of Medieval drama. The best examples are the cycle plays of England. *The York Cycle* (14th century) contained forty-eight short plays and took approximately 14 hours to perform. Of the forty-eight plays, eleven deal with the *Old Testament* (from Creation to the crossing of the Red Sea), thirteen cover the period from the Annunciation to Palm Sunday, twenty-three cover the final week of Christ's earthly life and His Assumption into Heaven, and one describes Judgement Day. The last known medieval performance of the *York Cycle* was in 1569.

Miracle play: Built its plot around the **lives and the works of the saints**. They were usually performed on the saint's feast day. Some of the scripts were biblical, others were not.

Morality play: These dramas were based on the **spiritual trials of the average man**. They formed a bridge between the Medieval religious plays and the secular dramas of the Renaissance. The plays were **allegories** about the moral temptations which beset every man. The location was every man's soul. The action of the drama was the battle between good and evil to possess man's soul.

13. Give a specific example of a mystery play? Of a miracle play? Of a morality play?

Mystery play: *The Second Shepherd's Play* (mid 15th century) from the Wakefield Cycle or ***The Passion Play*** which dramatizes the last week of Christ's life -- from His triumphal entry on Palm Sunday through His Ascension into Heaven. Probably the most famous *Passion Play* is the *Oberammergau* (Germany) *Passion Play* which has been presented every ten years since the middle of the 17th century.

Miracle play: The four St. Nicholas plays from the *Fleury Play-Book* (13th century France) -- *Tres Fili* (Three Daughters), *Tres Clerici* (Three Scholars), *Iconia Sanctus Nicholaus* (Image of Saint Nicholas) and *Filius Getronius* (Getron's Son). These plays were presented, in Latin, on St. Nicholas Day -- December 6th.

Morality play: *Everyman* (late 15th century). Everyman is visited by Death. He is told that he can take one friend with him on his long journey. He approaches Fellowship, Kindred, Cousin, Goods, Knowledge, Discretion, Strength, Beauty, and Five Wits. All refuse. Only Good Deeds will join him on his journey. The moral is obvious.

The Morality Play in English Drama

Related Terms:

ALLEGORY?(from the Greek "allegoria," which means "speaking otherwise." A story in prose or verse that has a double meaning or multiple meanings, both the obvious surface meaning and one or more secondary meanings, and thus must be understood on two or more levels.

DIDACTIC LITERATURE?literature used to teach a moral or a lesson. Most of the didactic literature in Europe was produced during the Middle Ages.

PSYCHOMACHIA?the battle within the individual?s mind or soul, often represented allegorically in literature as a conflict between virtues and vices for the possession of the soul.

APTRONYM?a name that fits the nature or character of an individual (a "label name")>.

FABLE?a short narrative, often with animals as characters, that embodies a moral or a lesson.

EXEMPLUM?a short narrative used to illustrate a moral. Such stories were often used in sermons during the Middle Ages.

INTERLUDE?(literally, "between play"); a short entertainment put on between the courses of a feast or the acts of a longer play.

MORAL INTERLUDE?a type of interlude that was very similar to the morality play, though often shorter and more humorous. The dividing line between moral interludes and morality plays is not clear, and in many cases the two types of drama are indistinguishable. Several plays are classified both as moral interludes and as morality plays.

LITURGY?sacred rituals of the Church.

LITURGICAL DRAMA? plays performed in Latin by the clergy and the choir that sang the service, as part of the liturgy of the Church during the medieval period. As early as the fifth century, bible stories were represented in church by means of live tableaux accompanied by singing. From such simple beginnings, liturgical dramas developed gradually over several centuries as parts of the liturgy were embellished by "tropes" and then elaborated into dialogues and reenactments of scenes from the Easter story and the Nativity. Eventually the laity began to participate and vernacular elements were included.

TROPE? from the Greek, meaning "turn," a phrase or verse added as an embellishment or interpolation to the sung parts of the mass. In general, a trope is any rhetorical or figurative device, but a special development in the use of tropes occurred during the Middle Ages, when the term was applied to a verbal embellishment of the liturgical text. Some time before the tenth century, parts of the liturgy at Easter and Christmas were embellished by such tropes as the Nativity antiphonies and the "Quem Quaeritis" before the Easter Introit. Over time these tropes were expanded to include very rudimentary representations of the Nativity scene and the Three Marys at the sepulcher, mimed by the priests and the choir that sang the antiphonies

"QUEM QUAERITIS"? Latin for "Whom do you seek?" This was spoken to the three Marys by the angel at the sepulcher, who told them that Christ was not to be found in the tomb, for He had risen. This phrase was used as a trope during the Easter liturgy, and was adapted and elaborated into a dialogue that became the source of liturgical drama. Eventually it developed into a dramatized representation of the scene at the tomb and then became detached from the sacred liturgy. The "Quem Quaeritis" trope is considered to

be the primary seed from which nonliturgical religious drama, and subsequently mainstream drama, grew.

ANTIPHON?a psalm, anthem or verse sung responsively (Webster?s Dictionary, ninth ed.).

ANTIPHONY?a responsive alternation between two groups, especially of singers (Webster?s Dictionary, ninth ed.). Antiphonies lent themselves readily to development into dialogue.

FARCE?an exaggerated, comic performance with no purpose other than to amuse the audience. Farce often contains ribald elements, but because of its playfulness, it usually is not considered offensive.

English drama developed out of early nonliturgical vernacular religious dramas, which had themselves probably developed out of the liturgical drama of the medieval church. Though secularized, these early dramatic forms?the mystery, miracle, and morality plays?still focused on the religious and moral themes that dominated the Christian imagination during the Middle Ages. The mystery plays dramatized sacred history, representing events from Creation to Judgment Day. Miracle plays presented the lives and miracles of the saints, or episodes of divine intervention in human affairs, often through the agency of the Virgin Mary.

Unlike the perspective of the mystery and miracle plays, that of the morality play was individual rather than collective. The morality play (usually called simply a "morality") presented religious and ethical concerns from the point of view of the individual Christian, whose main concern was to effect the salvation of his soul.

The mystery and miracle plays developed first, around 1100 a.d. Late in the fourteenth century, morality plays on such subjects as the seven deadly sins became popular in France, England and the Netherlands. In the first decades of the fifteenth century, secular allegorical plays concerning the conflict between good and evil in the

individual soul began to be performed in France by law clerks and students, and this type of play soon became popular all over Europe, including England.

A morality play is essentially an allegory in dramatic form. It shares the key features of allegorical prose and verse narratives: it is intended to be understood on two or more levels, its main purpose is didactic, and the characters are personified abstractions with aptonyms ("label names"). The nondramatic didactic and allegorical precursors to the morality play are to be found in medieval sermon literature, homilies, exempla, fables, parables, and other works of moral or spiritual edification, as well as in the popular romances of medieval Europe.

Another dramatic form that has much in common with the morality play is the interlude, particularly that subset of interludes called "moral interludes." There is no clear dividing line between the moral interlude and the morality play, and in fact many works are classified under both headings: "The Pride of Life (c. 1300), "The Castell of Perseverance" (c. 1400), "Wisdom" (c. 1460), "Mankind" (c. 1465), "Hyckescorner" (1512), "Lusty Juventus" (1550), and "Like Will to Like" (1568). Moral interludes were usually about 1000 lines long and written in rough verse?often mere doggerel. Interludes generally, including moral interludes, were often written to be performed as entertainments at court, in the houses of nobility, at University colleges, and at the Inns of Court.

Typically, the morality play is a psychomachia, an externalized dramatization of a psychological and spiritual conflict: the battle between the forces of good and evil in the human soul. This interior struggle involves the Christian's attempt to achieve salvation, despite the obstacles and temptations that he encounters as he travels through life, toward death.

Originally, because of their roots in religious drama and their didactic purpose, moralities were serious in tone and style, but the increasing secularization of the plays led to the incorporation of elements derived from popular farce, a process encouraged by the presentation of the Devil and his servant the Vice as boisterous mischief-makers. These characters soon became figures of amusement rather than of moral edification. Even more disturbing for the Church was the way that actors would improvise humorous and often ribald scenes to increase the crowd's hilarity. By about 1500 the Church no longer officially approved of the mystery and miracle plays or the morality plays, and in England they were suppressed after the Reformation in the sixteenth century, though they continued to be performed well into the seventeenth century in the Catholic countries of Europe.

In England the moralities dramatized the progress of the Christian's life from innocence to sin, and from sin to repentance and salvation. Among the most widely known of the fifteenth-century moralities are "The Castell of Perseverance," which features a battle between Virtues and Vices; "Mankind," which incorporates topical farce; and perhaps the most famous of all the English morality plays, "Everyman" (c. 1495), which concerns the Christian's experience of mortality and Judgment.

The main characters in "Everyman" are God, a Messenger, Death, Everyman, Fellowship, Kindred, Cousin, Goods, Knowledge, Beauty, Strength, and Good Deeds. Everyman is immersed in worldly pleasures when Death summons unexpectedly him. He soon finds that none of his supposedly loyal companions (Fellowship, Kindred, Cousin) will go with him. His treasured Goods also desert him, and at the grave the qualities of the flesh (Beauty, Strength) also fade away. Only Good Deeds stays with him to help him get into Paradise, which is accomplished with the help and guidance of Knowledge, by means of Confession and Priesthood.

In other moralities, various manifestations of the forces of Evil (the Seven Deadly Sins, the World, the Flesh, the Devil, Vice) are arrayed against the Christian, who turns for help to the forces of Good (God, His angels, Virtue). The quality of writing in the moralities is uneven, and in many cases the author is unknown. Characterization is also crude and naïve, and there is little attempt to portray psychological depth.

But over time, the moralities began to show signs of increasingly sophisticated analysis of character. This increasing subtlety and depth of characterization point directly to the development of mainstream Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton's play "Gorboduc," the first of the Elizabethan tragedies, is a kind of political morality play on the proper government of a kingdom. And at least one of drama's most memorable characters, Shakespeare's Falstaff, is a direct descendant of the medieval Vice. Falstaff functions as a Vice not only in his character, but also in the way he tempts Prince Hal in "Henry IV" (Parts I and II) to neglect his duties as heir apparent to the English throne in order to pursue a life of drunkenness, wantonness, and crime. When Hal becomes king, he must repudiate Falstaff altogether, just as the Christian must repudiate Vice in the medieval morality play.

By the sixteenth century, morality plays were addressing not only religious themes, but also social and political analysis and satire. For example, "Magnificence: (1516) satirizes extravagance, and "Satyre of the Three Estaitis" (1540) is a political morality play.

From about the mid-sixteenth century, under increasing pressure from religious authorities, the popularity of the moralities began to wane, but they continued to be a major influence on mainstream drama. Besides Sackville and Norton's "Gorboduc," Nathaniel Wood's "The Conflict of Conscience" (1568) and Christopher Marlowe's "The Tragical History Of Dr. Faustus" (1588) also owe

much to the morality play, and even as late as 1625, Ben Jonson's "The Staple of News" showed the influence of the moralities, especially in Lady Pecunia, an allegorical character representing Riches. The allegorical use of aptronyms for characters in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century comedies, and also in novels and short stories all through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, suggests the ongoing significance of the tradition established by the morality play.

Class 13:

Assignment for chapter 11 is due today; for chapter 12 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 13 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we consider the Chinese in chapter 13.

http://www.everypoet.com/archive/poetry/Geoffrey_Chaucer/chaucer_poems_TROILUS_AND_CRESSIDA.htm :

[In several respects, the story of "Troilus and Cressida" may be

regarded as Chaucer's noblest poem. Larger in scale than any other of his individual works -- numbering nearly half as many lines as *The Canterbury Tales* contain, without reckoning the two in prose -- the conception of the poem is yet so closely and harmoniously worked out, that all the parts are perfectly balanced, and from first to last scarcely a single line is superfluous or misplaced. The finish and beauty of the poem as a work of art, are not more conspicuous than the knowledge of human nature displayed in the portraits of the principal characters. The result is, that the poem is more modern, in form and in spirit, than almost any other work of its author; the chaste style and sedulous polish of the stanzas admit of easy change into the forms of speech now current in England; while the analytical and subjective character of the work gives it, for the nineteenth century reader, an interest of the same kind as that inspired, say, by George Eliot's wonderful study of character in "Romola." Then, above all, "Troilus and Cressida" is distinguished by a purity and elevation of moral tone, that may surprise those who judge of Chaucer only by the coarse traits of his time preserved in *The Canterbury Tales*, or who may expect to find here the Troilus, the Cressida, and the Pandarus of Shakspeare's play. It is to no trivial gallant, no woman of coarse mind and easy virtue, no malignantly subservient and utterly debased procurer, that Chaucer introduces us. His Troilus is a noble, sensitive, generous, pure-souled, manly, magnanimous hero, who is only confirmed and stimulated in all virtue by his love, who lives for his lady, and dies for her falsehood, in a lofty and chivalrous fashion. His Cressida is a stately, self-contained, virtuous, tender-hearted woman, who loves with all the pure strength and trustful abandonment of a generous and exalted nature, and who is driven to infidelity perhaps even less by pressure of circumstances, than by the sheer force of her love, which will go

on loving -- loving what it can have, when that which it would rather have is for the time unattainable. His Pandarus is a gentleman, though a gentleman with a flaw in him; a man who, in his courtier-like good-nature, places the claims of comradeship above those of honour, and plots away the virtue of his niece, that he may appease the love-sorrow of his friend; all the time conscious that he is not acting as a gentleman should, and desirous that others should give him that justification which he can get but feebly and diffidently in himself. In fact, the "Troilus and Cressida" of Chaucer is the "Troilus and Cressida" of Shakespeare transfigured; the atmosphere, the colour, the spirit, are wholly different; the older poet presents us in the chief characters to noble natures, the younger to ignoble natures in all the characters; and the poem with which we have now to do stands at this day among the noblest expositions of love's workings in the human heart and life. It is divided into five books, containing altogether 8246 lines. The First Book (1092 lines) tells how Calchas, priest of Apollo, quitting beleaguered Troy, left there his only daughter Cressida; how Troilus, the youngest brother of Hector and son of King Priam, fell in love with her at first sight, at a festival in the temple of Pallas, and sorrowed bitterly for her love; and how his friend, Cressida's uncle, Pandarus, comforted him by the promise of aid in his suit. The Second Book (1757 lines) relates the subtle manoeuvres of Pandarus to induce Cressida to return the love of Troilus; which he accomplishes mainly by touching at once the lady's admiration for his heroism, and her pity for his love-sorrow on her account. The Third Book (1827 lines) opens with an account of the first interview between the lovers; ere it closes, the skilful stratagems of Pandarus have placed the pair in each other's arms under his roof, and the lovers are happy in perfect enjoyment of each other's love and trust. In the Fourth Book (1701 lines) the course of true love ceases to run smooth; Cressida is compelled to quit the city, in ransom for Antenor, captured in a skirmish; and she sadly departs to the camp of the Greeks, vowing that she will make her escape, and return to Troy and Troilus within ten days. The Fifth Book (1869 lines) sets out by describing the court which Diomedes, appointed to escort her, pays to Cressida on the way to the camp; it traces her gradual progress from indifference to her new suitor, to incontinence with him, and it leaves the deserted Troilus dead on the field of battle, where he has sought an eternal refuge from the new grief provoked by clear proof of his mistress's infidelity. The polish, elegance, and power of the style, and the acuteness of insight into character, which mark the poem, seem to claim for it a date considerably later than that

adopted by those who assign its composition to Chaucer's youth: and the literary allusions and proverbial expressions with which it abounds, give ample evidence that, if Chaucer really wrote it at an early age, his youth must have been precocious beyond all actual record. Throughout the poem there are repeated references to the old authors of Trojan histories who are named in "The House of Fame"; but Chaucer especially mentions one Lollius as the author from whom he takes the groundwork of the poem. Lydgate is responsible for the assertion that Lollius meant Boccaccio; and though there is no authority for supposing that the English really meant to designate the Italian poet under that name, there is abundant internal proof that the poem was really founded on the "Filostrato" of Boccaccio. But the tone of Chaucer's work is much higher than that of his Italian "auctour;" and while in some passages the imitation is very close, in all that is characteristic in "Troilus and Cressida," Chaucer has fairly thrust his models out of sight. In the present edition, it has been possible to give no more than about one-fourth of the poem -- 274 out of the 1178 seven-line stanzas that compose it; but pains have been taken to convey, in the connecting prose passages, a faithful idea of what is perforce omitted.]

Class 14:

This is our last class for the course. Assignment for chapter 12 is due today; for chapter 13 is due in 1 week; and for chapter 14 is due in 2 weeks. In today's class we consider the Japanese in chapter 14. So we conclude the course by considering the Land of the Rising Sun.

The Wife of Bath presents herself as the authority on marriage and marital life. She comments on the social and legal position of women in marriage and daily life. She claims she has her knowledge from experience, not from scriptural authority. Rather than rejecting scriptural authority, she appeals to logic thus rejecting too strict interpretations of scriptural rules and commandments.

The Summoner's Tale - Modern

In his tale, a friar is thrown into hell and sees the horrors therein. The angel that leads him to hell, tells him also that many friars do live there, and they fly and swarm out of the devil's 'arse-hole.' The Summoner begins his tale about saving all people but the unsalvageable friars.

In Holderness, a marshy part of [Yorkshire](#), a friar preached sermons begging for donations to the church and later from the local residents for charity. The [friar](#) went to [Thomas](#), a local resident's house, who was ill, and requested a meal from his wife, who told him that their child died less than two weeks earlier. The friar told them that he had a vision that their child had died and gone to heaven, as did his fellow friars. These 'holy men' have special powers that allow them to live richly spiritually on this earth. The friar goes on to say that his close relationship to God lies in impoverished lifestyle. Thomas's illness persists, he says, because he does not give enough money to the Church. The friar then tells a tale of an angry king who had sentenced a knight to death because he returned home without his partner. The king believed the knight to have murdered the partner solely because he had arrived alone. As another knight was leading the knight to his death sentence, the two stumbled across the supposed murdered knight. The third knight went to the angry king to reverse the first knight's sentence. However, he was met with more disturbances. The king sentenced all three to death.

The friar tells of another furious king named Cambyses. He was a drunkard and killed one of his knight's son's because of his foolish pride. He believed he still held his coordination in his drunken stupor and shot an arrow to prove his soberness. Yet another ireful king, Cyrus of Persia, destroyed the river Gyndes because one of his horses drowned in it. The friar again requests money from Thomas for the monks, to which he responds that the friar is sitting on the gift. Thomas farts on the friar's hands and the servants chase him away. Furious, the

friar found the lord of the manor upon exit and complained that Thomas' gift was supposed to be divided equally. The lord responded that the fart would be equally split among all deserving monks and the tale end.

APPENDIX : FOR FURTHER STUDY

Intro Anc

The purpose of the *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* series is to provide high school students with a broad exposure to the literature (and especially the chronicles) of ancient peoples from many parts of the world. The series is designed as a follow-up textbook to the textbook *Introduction to Ancient Literature*, published by *The Puritans' Home School Curriculum* (www.puritans.net). Like *Introduction to Ancient Literature*, the textbook *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* is especially prepared for courses taught by Westminster Covenant Academy. It is our conviction that the Bible of the Old and New Testaments is the foundation of all true knowledge. We believe that the literature and chronicles of the peoples of the world, when rightly interpreted, corroborate the veracity and historicity of scripture.

This textbook focusing on ancient literature is part of a series of literature textbooks exploring the history of extra-Biblical literature, published by *The Puritans' Home School Curriculum* (www.puritans.net). The series consists of anthologies divided into four eras: ancient, medieval, reformation, and modern. By 'ancient' is meant that period when paganism reigned in most of the cultures of the world. By 'medieval' is meant that era when Christianity, at least in the nominal sense, became a dominant religion of the nations, especially those of Europe, yet the Bible upon which Christianity is based became increasingly shrouded to the people. By 'reformation' is meant that era when nominal Christianity re-discovered the Bible as the foundation of knowledge, and sought to implement it as such in the world. And, finally, by 'modern' is meant that era when secular humanism became the ascendant cultural force, in place of Biblical Christianity, yet the blessings of the Protestant Reformation were not totally lost. During our study of ancient literature we must read the writings of various medieval authors (like Nennius, Bede, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Snorri Sturlson, etc.), because only by reading them can we gain access to the earlier literature. They had access to many ancient manuscripts which are lost in the modern era.

Virtually all of the contents of *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* are available on the internet. *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* gives the website addresses of the literature so students wanting to study certain works more in depth may do so. There is now a plethora of such resources available on the internet. And we hope a course using *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* as the textbook will encourage further study by students, using these resources.

Volume 1 of *Ancient Literature, Ancient Chronicles* explored some of the ancient literature and chronicles of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. This volume explores some of the ancient literature and chronicles of Europe.

For additional information

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Medieval_literature :

Medieval literature is a broad subject, encompassing essentially all written works available in [Europe](#) and beyond during the [Middle Ages](#) (encompassing the one thousand years from the [fall of the Western Roman Empire](#) ca. AD [500](#) to the beginning of the Florentine [Renaissance](#) in the late 15th century).

theological works were the dominant form of literature typically found in libraries during the Middle Ages. [Catholic](#) clerics were the intellectual center of society in the Middle Ages, and it is their literature that was produced in the greatest quantity.



Libraries: A Matter of Content - Distribution of theological vs. secular works over time

Countless [hymns](#) survive from this time period (both [liturgical](#) and paraliturgical). The liturgy itself was not in fixed form, and numerous competing missals set out individual conceptions of the order of the [mass](#). Religious scholars such as [Anselm of Canterbury](#), [Thomas Aquinas](#), and [Pierre Abélard](#) wrote lengthy [theological](#) and [philosophical](#) treatises, often attempting to reconcile the teachings of the Greek and Roman pagan authors with the doctrines of the Church. [Hagiographies](#), or "lives of the saints", were also frequently written, as an encouragement to the devout and a warning to others.

The [Golden Legend](#) of [Jacobus de Voragine](#) reached such popularity that, in its time, it was reportedly read more often than the [Bible](#). [Francis of Assisi](#) was a prolific poet, and his [Franciscan](#) followers frequently wrote poetry themselves as an expression of their piety. [Dies Irae](#) and [Stabat Mater](#) are two of the most powerful Latin poems on religious subjects. [Goliardic poetry](#) (four-line stanzas of satiric verse) was an art form used by some clerics to express dissent. The only widespread religious writing that was not produced by clerics were the [mystery plays](#): growing out of simple [tableaux](#) re-enactments of a single Biblical scene, each mystery play became its village's expression of the key events in the [Bible](#). The text of these plays was often controlled by local [guilds](#), and mystery plays would be performed regularly on set feast-days, often lasting all day long and into the night.

During the Middle Ages, the [Jewish](#) population of Europe also produced a number of outstanding writers. [Maimonides](#), born in [Cordoba, Spain](#), and [Rashi](#), born in [Troyes, France](#), are two of the best-known and most influential of these Jewish authors.

Medieval

[Aquinas](#)

Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Albert the Great and John Duns Scotus

[Bacon](#)

[Galen](#)

[Dante](#)

[Epictetus](#)

[Hobbes](#)

[Ptolemy](#)

[Goethe](#)

[Pirandello](#)

[Poincare](#)

Machiavelli
Marcus Aurelius
Nicomachus

Rabelais
Racine
Veblen

Moli & Eacute;Montaigne
Montesquieu

Theological Developments in the Medieval Age

Survey of Medieval Theological Controversies and Scholasticism

A. *Medieval Theological Controversies*

The first two controversies were particularly significant in terms of the role they played in dividing East from West (something we will address more thoroughly in our study of Eastern Orthodox theology).

1. *The Iconoclastic Controversy* [The word *iconoclastic* = lit., "image-breaker"] - Relics, images, statues and paintings of prominent biblical (primarily Christ, Mary, and angels) and historical figures were always present in the life of the church. The controversy erupted when people began to invest their worship and adoration in the image itself, attributing to the object a special sanctity and/or power. This appeared to many as a clear case of idolatry.

Initial opposition to the use of images or icons came from Leo III (a.d. 726), emperor in the east, who insisted that all such artifacts be removed from the churches (he believed their use was a clear violation of the Second Commandment). Their use was defended by Pope Gregory II as well as by the patriarch German of Constantinople (715-29) who distinguished between a profound religious "respect" or "veneration" (*proskunesis*) of an icon, which is permissible, and true "worship" (*latreia*) which is due unto God alone. Leo's son, Constantine V (741-75) brutally enforced his father's policy, resorting to torture and public humiliation of those who supported the use of icons.

John of Damascus, the last father of the Eastern church (675-749), also defended the use of icons, arguing that since God had made himself visible via the incarnation, it was his purpose to reveal himself through tangible, visible images, especially for the benefit of the uneducated. He wrote: "When we venerate icons, we do not offer veneration to matter, but by means of the icon, we venerate the person depicted."

Under the leadership of the Empress Irene (780-802), the Second Council of Nicea in 787 (also known as the Seventh Ecumenical Council) approved the honor and veneration of icons but insisted that adoration or worship (*latreia*) was reserved for God only. Unfortunately, when the results of this council were translated into Latin so that they might be communicated to the church in the West, the word *adoratio* (adoration) was used to render *proskunesis* (veneration). Since Charlemagne equated *adoratio* with true worship, he rejected the decrees of Nicea thereby adding to the rift between East and West.

2. *The Filioque Controversy* - The Nicene Creed of 325 closes rather abruptly with the phrase, "And (we believe) in the Holy Spirit." In the enlarged form of the creed, traceable to the Council of Constantinople in 381, there is the additional phrase, "the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father." This form of the creed was adopted at Chalcedon in 451.

The controversy arose when some in the West (most likely in Spain) began inserting the phrase "and from the Son" (*a patre **FILIOQUE** procedens*). It was ratified at the Council of Toledo in 589 and spread rapidly into France, Germany, and was eventually endorsed by Charlemagne.

Orthodox believers regarded this as a violation of the finality and authority of the early ecumenical councils and the wisdom of the Fathers. They also regarded it as theologically untrue and a threat to the doctrine of the Trinity. On the one hand, it tends to obscure the distinctive characteristics of each person of the Trinity, for whereas both the Son and the Spirit have their source in the Father, the Son alone is begotten of Him and the Spirit alone proceeds from Him. In other words, would not the assertion that the Spirit proceeds from *both* Father and Son tend to fuse the two persons into one and thus resemble modalism? On the other hand, it could also point in the opposite direction to ditheism, for it would imply two independent sources (Father and Son) in the Godhead. Only by insisting that the Spirit proceeds alone from the Father (and, at most, *through* the Son) is the proper view of the Trinity maintained.

Part of the rift was pride and politics as much as theological conviction, for the Eastern/Greek church was offended that the Western/Latin church would alter or add to an ecumenical creed without their consent. Whatever the primary cause of the dispute, by the 9th century the *Filioque* was a permanent part of the Western church's creed and has served as a divisive factor between East and West ever since.

3. *The Predestination Controversy* - The dispute centered around Gottschalk (805-68) of Orbais (in northern France), a vocal advocate of the theology of Augustine, and his adversaries, Rabanus Maurus and the archbishop of Reims, Hincmar (806-82). Concerning predestination, Gottschalk wrote:

“Just as the immutable God before the foundation of the world through his gratuitous grace immutably predestinated all his elect to eternal life; so in like manner all the reprobate who will in the day of judgment be condemned on account of their evil deserts has this same immutable God through his righteous judgment immutably predestinated to death justly everlasting” (in *Hincm. De praed.*, 5).

“I believe and confess that God foreknew and foreordained the holy angels and elect men to unmerited eternal life, but that he equally (*pariter*) foreordained the devil with his host and with all reprobate men, on

account of their foreseen future evil deeds, by a just judgment, to merited eternal death” (Shorter Confession).

“Those, O God, of whom thou didst foreknow that they would persist by their own misery in their damnable sins, thou didst, as a righteous judge, predestinate to perdition” (Larger Confession).

Gottschalk appeared before a Synod of Mainz (848) to defend his views. He was opposed by Hincmar of Reims, head of the monastery at Orbais. He was condemned as an incorrigible heretic, deposed from the priesthood, publicly whipped to the point of death, compelled to burn his books (while in a virtual state of delirium), and eventually imprisoned. While in prison he wrote two books reaffirming his Augustinian views. He died after twenty years in jail, unshaken in his faith.

Hincmar undertook a vigorous literary campaign to discredit both Gottschalk and his doctrine. The decisions rendered at two Councils of Chiersy and Valence (853 a.d.) supported Hincmar. The dispute was addressed repeatedly until in 860 at a council in Thuzey, presided over by Charles the Bald and Lothair II, a compromise was reached that failed to resolve the theological issues but effectively ended the controversy.

4. *The Monothelite Controversy* - The Monothelites ("one will") were theological descendants of the Monophysites ("one nature"). If Christ had only one nature, as the latter argued, then he had only one will. Opponents of the Monothelites feared that their doctrine would diminish the reality of the **two** natures in Christ (human and divine). Thus, at the Sixth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople (680), it was decided that Christ had "two natural wills or willings . . . not contrary one to the other . . . but his human will follows, not as resisting or reluctant but rather as subject to his divine and omnipotent will."

5. *The Miraculous Birth of Jesus* - This dispute emerged when some began teaching that Jesus was not born of Mary in the natural way, but had somehow "sprung out of her womb" in a mysterious and miraculous manner. Ratramnus of Corbie responded that such a doctrine would lead to docetism. He insisted, in rather strange terms, that Jesus was born "by the natural door, yet without violating its virginal integrity." He insisted that Mary was a virgin "before the birth, in the birth, and after the birth."

Paschasius Radbertus (842-53) likewise affirmed the perpetual virginity of Mary but insisted that Jesus could not have been born as other babies but rather "came to us even while the womb was closed, just as he came to his disciples even while the doors were closed" (*De Partu Virg.* 1).

It was common to appeal to Ezek. 44:2 as referring to this miraculous phenomenon: "This gate shall be shut; it shall not be opened and no one

shall pass through it, for the Lord, the God of Israel, has entered by it; therefore it shall remain shut."

The controversy ended abruptly with no final resolution.

6. *The Adoptionist Controversy* - This debate, which existed primarily in Spain, turned on the question of whether Christ in his *human* nature was the Son of God in *essence* or only by *adoption*. Those who taught the latter were known as Adoptionists. They insisted that Christ is the true Son of God (*filius proprius* or *verus*) only with respect to his divinity. As man he is God's adopted son (*filius adoptivus* or *nuncupativus*). Schaff summarizes the issues:

"The fundamental point in Adoptionism is the distinction of a double Sonship in Christ – one by nature and one by grace, one by generation and one by adoption, one by essence and one by title, one which is metaphysical and another which is brought about by an act of the divine will and choice. The idea of sonship is made to depend on the nature, not on the person; and as Christ has two natures, there must be in him two corresponding Sonships. According to his divine nature, Christ is really and essentially . . . the Son of God, begotten from eternity; but according to his human nature, he is the Son of God only nominally . . . by adoption, or by divine grace" (IV:518-19).

Their opponents detected Nestorianism (Jesus was two persons) in their doctrine and vigorously opposed them. *Sonship*, they argued, concerns only the *person* of Christ and not his natures. Adoptionism was condemned at Regensburg (794), Frankfurt (794), Aachen (799), and Rome (799).

7. *The Eucharistic Controversy* - The debate erupted with the publication of a treatise by Paschasius Radbertus (*De corpore et sanguine domini*; "concerning the body and blood of the Lord"), abbot of the monastery at Corbie (842-53), in which he asserted that a miracle of divine omnipotence occurs in the elements, a creative act, as it were. In essence, God effects or creates in the substance of the bread and wine the very flesh and blood of Jesus. Although he did not employ the term *Transubstantiation*, he defended the idea (the word itself first appeared in 1140 in a work by the man who would become Pope Alexander III). Through this miracle the daily sacrifice of Christ is continued and repeated. The flesh and blood present in the elements are the same in which Christ was born, crucified, buried and raised. The change is an *internal* mystery, hence the elements retain their natural physical properties such as taste and smell. But why, if the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ, don't they look and smell and taste like it? Two reasons were given:

- The first reason, originally articulated by Ambrose in the fifth century, is known as *horror cruoris*, i.e., "the horror of blood." Since God knew that humans could not bear the thought, much less the taste,

of blood and flesh in their mouths, he miraculously retains the natural properties of the bread and wine.

- Second, if the bread and wine actually looked and tasted like flesh and blood, what need would there be for faith on the part of the recipient? They *are*, in point of fact, flesh and blood, but that is something only faith can perceive. Thus, the miracle of transubstantiation was designed by God as a test and demonstration of faith.

Radbertus also appealed to stories of alleged miraculous phenomena associated with the eucharist to gain the support of the people. For example, he argued that the bread on the altar was often seen in the shape of a lamb or a little child; when the priest stretched out his hand to break the bread, an angel descended from heaven with a knife, slaughtered the lamb or the child, and let its blood run into a cup!

Objections came from Rabanus and Ratramnus of Corbie (d. 868), both of whom insisted that the elements were symbolic of the body and blood of Christ and that partaking of the Lord's Supper involved no more than an experience of spiritual union of the believer with the mystical body of Christ. The dispute persisted into the Scholastic period where the doctrine of Radbertus eventually won the day.

The Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation was officially made a dogma of the church by Pope Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.

"The body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by divine power. . . . And this sacrament no one can in any case administer except a priest who has been properly ordained."

There was a corresponding move to withdraw the cup from the laity: (1) to avoid chances of spilling the "blood" of Christ; (2) because the "whole" Christ is present in both elements (and withholding the cup would teach this to the laity); (3) it enhanced the unique spiritual privilege and authority of the priesthood above the laity.

Numerous superstitions and apocryphal stories emerged relating to the eucharist. For example, if a fly or spider should be found in the wine after its consecration, the insect must be removed, carefully washed, burnt, and then the water, mingled with ashes, thrown away. Another story concerned a farmer who placed a piece of the consecrated host in his beehive. The bees built a miniature church with an altar on which they placed the bread. All the neighboring bees came and sang hymns together. The miniature

church eventually was taken into the village and became a sacred relic!
See Schaff, 728ff.

8. *The Development of Roman Catholic Sacramental Theology* - McGiffert provides this helpful summary:

“The significance of the sacraments for the life of the Christians of the Middle Ages is impossible to exaggerate. They were not mere isolated rites; they were bound together by their common quality as signs and vehicles of divine grace. They constituted the very heart of Christianity. By means of them the channel of communication between God and man and man and God was kept open constantly. Where the sacraments were there was life and salvation; where they were wanting man was left helpless and alone. They accompanied the Christian from the cradle to the grave, sanctifying all life for him, equipping him for its duties and responsibilities, giving him grace to live as God would have him live, and when he failed bringing divine forgiveness and renewed assistance. They prepared him not only for life but also for death. Receiving the last rites of the church he could depart in peace assured of a blessed resurrection and the life eternal. What all this must have meant to the Christians of the Middle Ages anyone can imagine but only a Catholic can fully know” (*A History of Christian Thought*, 330-31).

Initially only baptism and the eucharist were acknowledged as sacraments. To these Abelard added confirmation and extreme unction. His pupils added matrimony. Robert Pullus (d. 1150) added penance and ordination. In *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard (book 4), these seven were given a final endorsement. They received official RC sanction at the Council of Florence in 1439 and again at Trent in 1545-63. The sacraments were efficacious *ex opere operato*, i.e., by the working of the thing worked. In other words, a sacrament did not depend for its efficacy on the merit or character of the priest who officiated (so long as was not in a state of mortal sin) but on the intrinsic power of the sacrament as ordained of God.

(1) *Baptism* – Baptism is one of the three unrepeatable sacraments (along with confirmation and ordination). It supposedly communicates an indelible mark on the soul. It has a double effect: it effects regeneration, a spiritual re-birth; and it effects the forgiveness of all pre-baptismal sin, both original and actual.

(2) *Confirmation* – This was initially joined to the baptismal experience but was separated and became a sacrament unto itself. Its purpose is to confer grace for the strengthening of the baptized believer. It is always accompanied with the words: “I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”

(3) *Eucharist* – Thomas Aquinas said of the Eucharist:

“This sacrament is not only a sacrament but also a sacrifice. For inasmuch as in it is represented the passion of Christ whereby he offered himself a victim to God, . . . it has the nature of a sacrifice. Inasmuch as in it grace is truly conferred invisibly under a visible form it has the nature of a sacrament. Thus it benefits those who receive it both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice. . . . But others that do not receive it derive benefit from it as a sacrifice inasmuch as it is offered for their salvation” (*Summa Theologiae*, III.79:7).

The Council of Trent (16th century) issued the following declarations concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist:

"And since in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, the same Christ is contained, and is bloodlessly immolated, who once offered Himself bloodily upon the Cross; and the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is *propitiatory* [emphasis mine], and that by its means, if we approach God contrite and penitent, with a true heart, and a right faith, and with fear and reverence, we may obtain mercy, and grow in seasonable succour. For the Lord, *appeased by the oblation of this sacrifice* [emphasis mine], granting grace and the gift of repentance, remits even great crimes and sins. There is one and the same victim, and the same person, who now offers by the ministry of the priests, who then offered Himself upon the Cross; the mode of offering only being different. And the fruits of that bloody offering are truly most abundantly received through this offering, so far is it from derogating in any way from the former. Wherefore, it is properly offered according to the tradition of the Apostles, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other wants of the living, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet fully purged" (Session 22, chp. 2).

"If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the Cross, and that it is not propitiatory, or that it profits only the receiver, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for their sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants -- let him be accursed" (Session 22, Canon 3).

(4) *Penance* – This sacrament provides for the restoration of the baptized believer who sins. It entails four elements: *contrition* (sorrow for sin), *confession* (at least once a year), *absolution* (“I absolve thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost”, which conveys grace, removes guilt, and remits eternal punishment), and *satisfaction* (works such as fasting, prayer, giving to the poor, etc., designed to satisfy the temporal punishment for sin, whether here or in purgatory).

During the late middle ages, penitential handbooks were issued listing a wide variety of sins together with the length of penance to be performed. For example:

If a monk gets drunk and vomits, he must do penance for 30 days. If a deacon or priest does it, penance is 40 days. For an ordinary Christian, it is 15 days.

Bestiality requires penance of 10 years! Homosexuality also carries a 10 year penance. Lesbianism entails a 3 year penance. Incest is 15 years.

(5) *Ordination* – The sacraments of ordination and marriage exclude one another. The power and grace to rule the church and to perform its sacred duties are bestowed on the recipient through seven successive acts of blessing.

(6) *Marriage* – This also conveys its own unique grace to the conjugal relationship in order to sanctify and enable husband and wife to bear one another's weaknesses and to procreate.

(7) *Extreme Unction* – As baptism marked the beginning of the Christian life, extreme unction marks its close. According to Thomas, the sacrament “removes the remains of sin and makes a man ready for final glory” (III. 65:1). Its purpose is to secure forgiveness of all sins and to assure the dying individual of escape from the pains of hell.

B. *Scholasticism*

The word “scholasticism” comes from the Latin *schola* (“school”) and “refers to the methods of thinking and speaking which were the legacy of the medieval schools” (Bell, *Many Mansions*, 34). These schools, notes Bell,

“taught three main subjects: grammar, logic, and rhetoric [known as the *trivium*]. Grammar enabled students to write and speak correctly; logic taught them how to present a reasoned argument; rhetoric provided them with the techniques they needed to win their case” (34)

But scholasticism was more than simply a method of education. The Scholastics sought to merge or integrate the philosophy of Aristotle with the theology of the church (i.e., reason with revelation), so that the Christian faith could be systematized into a logical and rationally coherent body of thought. Their stress was scientific and objective. Says Heick:

“The authority of the Scriptures, the Fathers, the councils, and the papal decrees were inviolable; they were considered divine law. Men were not concerned about seeking the truth but only about proving it and systematizing the divinely revealed metaphysics through methodical reflection” (265).

Jean Gerson (1363-1429), Chancellor of the University of Paris, was trained in medieval scholasticism but became a mystic. In his book, *On Mystical Theology*, he contrasts scholasticism and mysticism:

- Scholastics derived their information about God and religion from God's "outward effects"; i.e., they studied the Bible and church history and commentaries. Mystics found their sources in records of God's "internal effects," i.e., "in evidence of divine presence in the recorded history and tradition of the heart" (Ozment, 74).
- Scholastics relied on reason and distrusted the emotions, while mystics trusted the affections (provided they had been disciplined by true doctrine) and "believed that the reasons of the heart were closer to God than the speculations of the mind" (74).
- Scholastics strove to behold God as "the highest truth". Mystics sought to embrace him as "the highest good".

Scholasticism is difficult to date (from @ 1100 through mid 15th century) as well as define. The following brief description by Shelley is helpful:

"The aim of the Schoolmen -- as these teachers are sometimes called -- was twofold -- to reconcile Christian doctrine and human reason and to arrange the teachings of the church in an orderly system. A free search for the truth was never in view since the chief doctrines of the Christian faith were regarded as fixed. The purpose of discussion was to show the reasonableness of the doctrines [as well as their compatibility with Aristotelian philosophy, especially in the case of Aquinas] and to explain their implications" (213).

For many of the medieval scholastic theologians and philosophers, “human reason could, with the help of God’s grace, discover the answers to virtually all conceivable questions of any real importance” (Olson, 312). Logic, regarded by all as a gift of God, was highly valued. No irrational or illogical assertions or propositions could be considered true.

Among the principal scholastic thinkers were the following:

Anselm (1033-1109) – Archbishop of Canterbury (1093); articulated the *Ontological* argument for the existence of God (he described God as “that than which none greater can be conceived”); author of *Cur Deus Homo* (“Why God Became Man”); defended the satisfaction theory of the atonement.

Peter Abelard (1079-1142) – In order to support himself while teaching in Paris, Abelard tutored the teen-aged daughter (Heloise) of a leading citizen. They fell in love and began an affair that produced a son. Although they had secretly married, Heloise's uncle, a man named Fulbert, the priest of Notre Dame, hired a gang of thugs to break into Abelard's home where they castrated him. Abelard eventually left Paris in humiliation and became a monk, and then abbot, of a monastery in Brittany. He is perhaps best known for advocating, contrary to Anselm, the *moral influence* theory of the atonement.

Peter Lombard (1095-1159)

Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141)

Albertus Magnus (1200-1280)

John Bonaventure (1217-1274)

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274)

John Duns Scotus (1266-1308)

Late Latin and Medieval Latin Texts (to be read in the original):

Proba (fl. 385-387), *Cento* (ed. Schenkl, pp. 568-609: 694 hexameters)

Ausonius (ca. 310-395), *Cento nuptialis* (131 hexameters, together with short prose passages)

Augustine, *Confessions*, selections from Books 1-3 (ed. James Campbell and Martin McGuire, pp. 65-114, prose)

Prose *vitae* of Virgil in *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, ed. Georgius Brugnoli and Fabius Stok: *Vita Bernensis*, *Vita Gudiana II*, *Vita Noricensis I*, and *Vita Vossiana*

Carolingian Renaissance, ed. Peter Godman:

Alcuin (pp. 118-123, nos. 7-8, 51 hexameters and 17 elegiac distichs),
(pp. 138-141, nos. 11-12, 8 distichs and 37 acrostich hexameters)

Theodulf (pp. 168-171, no. 18, 32 distichs)

Anonymous Planctus on death of Charlemagne (pp. 206-211, no. 26,
rhythmical poetry)

Gottschalk Orbais, "Ut quid iubes" (pp. 228-233, no. 33, rhythmical
poetry)

Notker the Stammer, *Planctus* of Rachel (pp. 320-323, no. 58)

Anonymous "Clangam filii" (pp. 322-325, no. 59, sequence)

Waltharius (date much-disputed, from early Carolingian to mid Ottonian) (in
toto: 1456 hexameters)

Hrotsvit (ca. 935-after 968), *Dulcitius* and *Pafnutius* (in toto: these plays,
modeled on Terence, run from pp. 164-176 and pp. 218-244, respectively, in
Teubner edition by Walter Berschin)

Embrico of Mainz (ca. 1010-1077), Poem on Muhammad (lines 939-1148)

Ecbasis cuiusdam captivi per tropologiam (ca. 1043-1046) (in toto: 1229 hexameters)

Ruodlieb (ca. 1050), ed. B. K. Vollmann, Fragment 1 (hexameters 1-140), fragment 5 (hexameters 450-621), fragment 7 (hexameters 1-129)

Cambridge Songs 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 23-24, 27, 30A, 35, 40, 42, 48, ed. Ziolkowski (assorted meters)

Historians of the First Crusade (1095-1099: ed. Sidwell, pp. 218-229: prose)

Loire Valley poets in Karl Langosch, *Lyrische Anthologie des lateinischen Mittelalters*:

Baudri of Bourgueil (946-1130), selections 1-2 (pp. 192-198, 33 and 22 elegiac couplets, respectively) and 9-10 (pp. 228-231, 13 couplets and 41 hexameters, respectively)

Marbod of Rennes (ca. 1035-1123), 1, chapter 1 and 3 (68 and 90 lines, pp. 234-236 and 248-252, respectively), and 2 a-k (pp. 260-268)

Hildebert of Lavardin (1056-1133/4), all three selections (pp. 272-283, 90, 38, and 36 lines in elegiac couplets)

Peter the Venerable, *Summa* on doctrines of Islam (ed. Kritzeck, pp. 204-211: prose)

Peter Abelard (1079-1142), *Historia calamitatum* (prose)

Letters (against Abbot Bernard; Letter 10 to Bernard of Clairvaux, Letter 13 to an Ignoramus in the Field of Dialectic, ed. Edmé Smits, prose)

Planctus on Sampson, David, and Dinah (sequences)

Preface to the Hymns for the Paraclete (prose)

Preface to the *Sic et Non* (prose)

Nivard of Ghent, *Ysegrimus* (V.445-704 and VII.1-204, finished in 1148)

Hugh Primas (ca. 1093-1160) (all twenty-three poems, as found in the edition by Fleur Adcock)

Archpoet (fl. 1159-1165) (all ten poems, as found in the edition by Fleur Adcock: quantitative and rhythmic)

William of Blois, *Alda* (169-202, 305-356, 433-514, 551-566, in elegiac distichs)

Babio (243 elegiac distichs)

John of Alta Silva (Haute Seille), *Dolopathos* (ed. Hilka, pp. 14-25 and 88-108, prose)

Alan of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* (ed. Bossuat, book1.1-80, 2.476-513, 3.106-136, 4.95-243 [hexameters])

<http://www.factmonster.com/ce6/ent/A0858275.html> :

Until the 12th cent. A.D. most forms of writing in Gaul were in Latin. Old French emerged from the Latin vernacular of the south known as the *langue d'oïl*. Because of the French Crusades and military interests abroad (1050–1210), Old French became an international tongue, and a literature arose that reflected the attitudes and activities of the military, as in the *Chanson de Roland* (c.1100; see Roland). A tradition of epic poetry was developed by traveling minstrels, or *jongleurs*. Lengthy narratives were recited in groups of *laisses*, 10- to 12-syllable lines rhyming in groups of varied lengths (see chansons de geste).

Another early literary strain developed in the 12th cent. from the stories of saints and heroes and the Celtic romances of Chrétien de Troyes. Later, more refined romances and allegories include the philosophical Roman de la Rose and the witty *Reynard the Fox*. Marie de France and others created new forms, including the *lai*, animal fable, and *fabliau* (rhymed anecdotal piece). Many of these were based on themes from classical mythology. The works of Ovid and Aesop were especially popular sources, as was Arthurian legend.

French lyric poetry developed with the songs of the troubadours and the trouvères and from the more personal works of professional poets. Among the best-known lyric poets of the Middle Ages are Colin Muset, Rutebeuf, Christine de Pisan, Alain Chartier, Charles d'Orléans, and the outstanding poet of Old French, François Villon. The earliest French drama consisted of religious plays, the most familiar of which are the anonymous *mystères* (such as the *Mystère d'Adam*) of the 12th cent. The miracle plays of the 13th cent. include Jehan Bodel's *Jeu de St. Nicolas* (1200). By the end of the century secular and didactic pieces, many of them comedies and fantasies, were being performed by nonclerics. French prose literature began with the writings of the chroniclers and historians, among them Geoffroi de Villehardouin, Jean de Joinville, Jean Froissart, and Philippe de Comines, last of the major medieval historians.

**SECTION SIX: POTENTIAL QUESTIONS ON
FINAL EXAM**

POTENTIAL QUESTIONS ON FINAL EXAM

(At the time of the final exam we shall let you know which of these questions are actually part of the exam.)

**SECTION SEVEN: LITERARY TERMS TO
REVIEW IN THIS COURSE**

Just as many other disciplines, the study of literature has many of its own technical terms. It is important that you understand the meanings of these terms, in order to understand what is being discussed in the study of literature. Students be encountering these terms in this and other literature courses. In the final exam students will be asked questions about various literary terms, including many of the terms below, and their relation to works we have read in the course:

Literary Term	Definition of Literary Term
Action	
Allegory	
Alliteration	
Allusion	
Apostrophe	
Assonance	
Atmosphere	
Autobiography	
Ballad	
Ballad Stanza	
Bard	
Character	
Character Development	
Character Sketch	
Characterization	
Classic	
Climax	
Comedy	
Conflict	
Connotation	
Couplet	Two rhyming lines which express a complete thought.
Critic	
Dactylic Hexameter	
Denotation	
Denouement	
Deus Ex Machina	Latin for "god from the machine". In ancient Greek and Roman drama, a god introduced by means of a crane to unravel and resolve the plot.
Dialect	
Dialogue	
Didactic	
Doggerel	Crudely or irregularly fashioned verse, often of a humorous or burlesque nature. [From Middle English, <i>poor, worthless</i> , from <i>dogge, dog</i> .]
Drama	
Edda	collections of poetically narrated folk-tales relating to Norse Mythology or Norse heroes

Epic	
Epitaph	
Essay	
Eulogy	
Extended Metaphor	
Fable	
Fabliaux	
Fiction	
Figurative Language	
Figures of Speech	
Flashback	
Folk-Tale	
Foot	The pattern in a line of poetry consisting of one accented syllable and one or two unaccented syllables
Foreshadowing	
Free Verse	
Hero	
Homily	
Iambic Pentameter	
Imagery	
In Medias Res	Latin for "into the middle of things." It usually describes a narrative that begins, not at the beginning of a story, but somewhere in the middle of the action
Irony	The use of words to convey the opposite of their literal meaning, usually with humorous effect.
Kenning	a compound poetic phrase substituted for the usual name of a person or thing. For example the sea in Old English could be called <i>seġl-rād</i> 'sail-road', <i>swan-rād</i> 'swan-road', <i>bæþ-weg</i> 'bath-way' or <i>hwæl-weg</i> 'whale-way'. In line 10 of the epic Beowulf the sea is called the <i>hronrāde</i> or 'whale-road'.
Legend	
Limerick	
Literary Ballad	
Lyric	
Metaphor	
Meter	
Metonymy	
Myth	
Mythology	
Narrative	
Novel	
Ode	
Octave	A group of eight lines
Onomatopoeia	
Paradox	

Parallelism	
Paraphrase	
Periphrasis	An indirect way of stating something. Periphrasis can be used to avoid speaking about something directly, but it can also be used poetically to point out a specific attribute.
Personification	
Plot	
Poetry	
Poetic Diction	
Poetic Justice	
Point of View	
Prose	
Quatrain	A group of four lines
Realism	
Refrain	
Repetition	
Rhetorical Devices	
Rhyme	
Rhythm	
Romanticism	
Satire	
Scene	
Sensory Imagery	
Setting	
Short Story	
Simile	
Skald	
Skaldic poetry	
Sonnet	
Speech	
Stage Directions	
Stanza	
Strophe	
Strophic Form	
Style	
Surprise Ending	
Suspense	
Symbol	Something which has meaning in itself but also represents something beyond itself
Symbolism	
Synecdoche	a figure of speech that presents a kind of metonymy in which:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A part of something is used for the whole, • The whole is used for a part, • The species is used for the genus, • The genus is used for the species, or <p>The stuff of which something is made is used for the thing.</p>
Syntax	
Theme	
Tone	The writer's or speaker's attitude toward his subject. (The tone of a work may be somber, solemn, ironic, formal or informal, playful, detached, condescending, or intimate, to name some.)
Tragedy	
Tragic Flaw	
Tragic Hero	
Translation	
Verse	
Understatement	
Viewpoint	