

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

PATRISTIC STUDIES

Vol. XC

Augustinus, Aurelius, Saint, Bp. of Hippo.
THE DE HAERESIBUS
OF
SAINT AUGUSTINE

A TRANSLATION WITH AN INTRODUCTION
AND COMMENTARY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND SCIENCES OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

REVEREND LIGUORI G. MÜLLER, O. F. M., M. A.



THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1956

BR
66
.C36
v. 90

Nil Obstat:

VICTOR MILLS, O. F. M.
Censor Deputatus
BEDA DAUPHINEE, O. F. M.
Censor Deputatus

Imprimi Potest:

CELSUS R. WHEELER, O. F. M.
Minister Provincialis
Neo Eboraci, N. E.

Imprimatur:

✠ PATRICIUS A. O'BOYLE, D. D.
Archiepiscopus Washingtonii
Washingtonii, D. C., die 22 Julii, 1955

COPYRIGHT, 1956
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS, INC.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Exch.
Direct
11-27-56

TO MY PARENTS
GEORGE AND ANNA MÜLLER

PREFACE

The *De haeresibus* is one of the more interesting of the minor works of St. Augustine, reflecting as it does Augustine's acquaintance with and evaluation of the heresies which existed from New Testament times to his own day. While the data contained in the *De haeresibus* have been used in church histories and in histories of literature and dogma, the work has never been made the subject of a complete and detailed study, nor has it yet been translated into English. The recent study on the *De haeresibus* by the Italian scholar, Silvia Jannaccone, is welcome. But, though she treats of matters of general importance for an understanding of Augustine's method and sources, and discusses the greater heresies in some detail, she has not examined the individual sections of the *De haeresibus* specifically. It is rather strange that more attention has not been given to the *De haeresibus* in itself. In spite of its brevity, it can really serve—along with the indispensable *Retractationes*—as an excellent introduction to the dogmatic-polemical works of St. Augustine.

The purpose of the present monograph is to present an English translation of the *De haeresibus* with an appropriate Introduction and Commentary, and thus make this important work better known and easier to use. The Introduction, after presenting an analysis of the work, considers the pertinent problems connected with it. One of the problems concerns the identification of the deacon Quodvultdeus at whose request Augustine presented his catalogue of heresies. A second problem involves the question of Augustine's sources, a point which is complicated by Augustine's reference to unnamed writers. Two points make a reconsideration of Augustine's knowledge of Greek imperative in this study of the *De haeresibus*, namely, the use which he made of source material in Greek and the fact that the *De haeresibus* was written after long years of effort to improve his knowledge of that language. A relatively long section of the Introduction has been devoted, naturally, to Augustine's concept of heresy. Moreover, certain misconceptions of his use of the term have been considered.

Since no modern critical text of the *De haeresibus* has yet been published, I have made use of that in the original Benedictine edition (Tomus VIII, Paris 1688), following in this the example of the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne*, edited by R. P. Fulbert Cayré. It may be observed that, while the Migne reprint is acceptable, the Oehler reprint in the *Corpus Haereseologicum* leaves much to be desired in the accuracy of reproduction. In the present text it is only in minor matters of punctuation and spelling that there has been any conscious alteration of the Benedictine text. The variant readings presented by the Benedictine editors were examined, but I found no reason for accepting any of these variants in preference to the readings adopted in the Benedictine text itself.

In the Commentary I have attempted to furnish in brief compass whatever information we have on the heresies discussed by St. Augustine in the *De haeresibus*. Naturally, I have sought evidence, not only in the other works of Augustine, but in other ancient Christian writers also. Modern special studies on the greater heresies, e. g., Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Priscillianism, and Pelagianism, have been consulted. For many of the minor heresies, and particularly for the earlier ones, I have considered it sufficient to refer to the most recent manuals and other reference works.

I am grateful to my superiors, Very Reverend Celsus R. Wheeler, O. F. M., Minister Provincial of Holy Name Province, and Very Reverend Thomas Plassmann, O. F. M., former Minister Provincial, for the opportunity of studying at The Catholic University of America, and to my confreres and friends for their kind help in typing and proofreading. I acknowledge the courteous assistance of the librarians of the Library of Congress, Princeton Theological Seminary, Duke University, University of Pennsylvania, and the Mullen Library of The Catholic University. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Roy J. Deferrari for suggesting the topic and for his direction, to Dr. Martin R. P. McGuire for his constant guidance in my work, and to Dr. Bernard M. Peebles for his careful reading of the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	xi
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	xiii
INTRODUCTION	1
A. Authenticity and Editions	1
B. The Occasion and Date of Composition	2
C. Purpose and Method	7
D. Outline of the <i>De haeresibus</i>	9
E. Identity of Quodvultdeus	10
F. The Sources of the <i>De haeresibus</i> and Augustine's Use of Them	22
G. The <i>De haeresibus</i> and Augustine's Knowledge of Greek	30
H. St. Augustine's Concept of Heresy	37
1. The Meaning of <i>αἵρεσις</i> Prior to the New Testament	38
2. <i>αἵρεσις</i> in the New Testament	40
3. The Concept of Heresy in Ecclesiastical Writings from the Apostolic Fathers to Augustine	43
4. St. Augustine's Use of the Term	45
TEXT AND TRANSLATION	54
COMMENTARY	130
INDICES	217

ABBREVIATIONS

ANACEPH.	<i>Anacephaleosis</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
DHGE	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>
EPIPH.	Epiphanius
FIL.	Filastrius
GCS	<i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller</i>
LThK	<i>Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
PANAR.	<i>Panarion</i>
PG	Migne, J. P. <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
PL	Migne, J. P. <i>Patrologia Latina</i>
RE	<i>Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE *DE HAERESIBUS*

- Amerbach, J. D. *Undecima pars librorum divi Aurelii Augustini quorum mentionem non fecit in libris Retractationum* Basel 1506.
- Erasmus, D. *Sextus tomus operum divi Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi, continens Tà πολεμικά . . .* pp. 5-22 Basel 1528.
- Theologi Lovanienses, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi opera omnia tomis XI comprehensa* Vol.6.3-13 Antwerp 1577.
- Monachi Ordinis S. Benedicti e Congregatione S. Mauri, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi operum tomus octavus, continens opuscula polemica . . .* cols. 1-28 Paris 1688. (Frequently reprinted, e.g., J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina* Vol. 42.21-50 Paris 1865.)
- Raulx, M. *Oeuvres complètes de saint Augustin traduites pour la première fois en français sous la direction de M. Raulx* Vol.14.1-21 Bar-le-Duc 1869.
- Péronne, Vincent, Écalle, Charpentier, Barreau, *Oeuvres complètes de saint Augustin, traduites en français et annotées . . . renfermant le texte latin et les notes de l'édition des Bénédictins* Vol.25.211-247 (trans. by Charpentier) Paris 1870.
- Oehler, F. *Corpus haereseologicum* (3 vols. in 5) Berlin 1856-1861. (The *De haeresibus* appears in Vol. I 192-225.)

B. ANCIENT AUTHORS EXCLUSIVE OF ST. AUGUSTINE

- Sancti Ambrosii de excessu fratris Satyri* PL 16.1289-1354 Paris 1845.
- S. Athanasii contra Appolinarium* PG 26.1093-1132 Paris 1887.
- *Epistula I ad Serapionem* *ibid.* 529-676.
- *Oratio II contra Arianos* *ibid.* 145-321.
- *Oratio III contra Arianos* *ibid.* 321-468.
- Epistolae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio* (ed. O. Guenther) CSEL 35², 35³ Vienna 1895, 1898.
- S. Chrysostomi homilia in Mattheum LXXXII* PG 58.737-746 Paris 1862.
- S. Clementis constitutiones Apostolicae* PG 1.509-1156 Paris 1886.
- S. Clementis Alexandrini stromata* (ed. O. Stählin) GCS 15, 17 Leipzig 1906, 1909.
- Thasci Caecili Cypriani epistolae* (ed. G. Hartel) CSEL 3².701-717 Vienna 1871.
- S. Cyrilli catechesis* PG 33.369-1126 Paris 1857.
- S. Epiphani anacephalaeosis* PG 42.853-886 Paris 1858.

- Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)* (ed.K.Holl) GCS 25,31,37 Leipzig 1915,1922,1933.
- Eugipii excerpta ex operibus S.Augustini* (ed.P.Knöll) CSEL 9 Vienna 1885.
- S.Eusebii Pamphili historia ecclesiastica* PG 20.45-906 Paris 1857.
- Sancti Filastrii episcopi Brixiensis diversarum hereseon liber* (ed.F.Marx) CSEL 38 Vienna 1898.
- S.Eusebii Hieronymi adversus Jovinianum libri duo* PL 23.211-338 Paris 1845.
- *Apologia adversus libros Rufini* ibid.397-492.
- *De perpetua virginitate B.Mariae adversus Helvidium* ibid.183-206.
- *De viris illustribus* ibid.601-720.
- *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* ibid.155-182.
- Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi epistolae* (ed.I.Hilberg) CSEL 56 Vienna 1918.
- *In Hieremiam prophetam libri sex* (ed.S.Reiter) CSEL 59 Vienna 1913.
- Hippolytus Werke, Refutatio omnium haeresium* (ed.P.Wendland) GCS 26 Leipzig 1916.
- S.Irenaei contra haereses* PG 7.670-674 Paris 1882.
- S.Joannis Damasceni de haeresibus* PG 94.677-780 Paris 1860.
- S.Justini apologia prima pro Christianis* PG 6.327-440 Paris 1857.
- Marii Mercatoris liber subnotationum in verba Juliani* PL 48.109-172 Paris 1862.
- S.Optati Milevitani libri VII* (ed.C.Ziwsa) CSEL 26 Vienna 1903.
- Origenes Werke, De principiis* (ed.P.Koetschau) GCS 22 Leipzig 1913.
- Pauli Orosii ad Aurelium Augustinum commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum* (ed.G.Schepss) CSEL 18.151-157 Vienna 1889.
- *Historiarum adversum paganos liber VII* (ed.C.Zangemeister) CSEL 5.603-664 Vienna 1882.
- Libellus fidei Pelagii ad Innocentium* PL 45.1716-1718 Paris 1861.
- SS.Photii contra Manichaeos* PG 102.15-264 Paris 1860.
- Praedestinatus, sive praedestinatorum haeresis* PL 53.587-672 Paris 1865.
- Priscilliani quae supersunt* (ed.G.Schepss) CSEL 18.3-106 Vienna 1889.
- Aurelii Prudentii Clementis carmina* (ed.I.Bergman) CSEL 61 Vienna 1926.
- Sulpicii Severi libri qui supersunt* (ed.C.Halm) CSEL 1.3-105 Vienna 1866.
- Hermiae Sozomeni historia ecclesiastica* PG 67.843-1630 Paris 1859.
- Beati Theodoreti haereticarum fabularum compendium* PG 83.335-556 Paris 1859.
- Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani opera* (ed.E.Kroymann) CSEL 47 Vienna 1906.
- *Adversus omnes haereses* ibid.213-226.
- *Adversus Hermogenem* ibid.126-176.
- *Adversus Praxeas* ibid.227-289.
- *Adversus Valentinianos* ibid.177-212.
- *De carne Christi* (ed.E.Kroymann) CSEL 70.189-250 Vienna 1942.

- *Apologeticum* (ed.H.Hoppe) CSEL 69 Vienna 1939.
- *De monogamia* PL 2.929-954 Paris 1844.
- *De pudicitia* (ed.A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa) CSEL 20.219-273 Vienna 1890.

C. WORKS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE

- Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas* PL 42.669-678 Paris 1861.
- *Ad Consentium contra mendacium* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 41.528 Vienna 1900.
- *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53.39-92 Vienna 1910.
- *Contra Adimantum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.115-190 Vienna 1891.
- *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 52.326-582 Vienna 1909.
- *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* (ed.C.Urba and J.Zycha) CSEL 60.423-570 Vienna 1913.
- *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant "Fundamenti"* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.193-248 Vienna 1891.
- *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 51.19-141 Vienna 1908.
- *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.251-797 Vienna 1891.
- *Contra Felicem Manichaeum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.801-852 Vienna 1892.
- *Contra Fortunatum Manichaeum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.83-112 Vienna 1891.
- *Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum episcopum* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53.262-274 Vienna 1910.
- *Contra Iulianum* PL 44.641-874 Paris 1861.
- *Contra litteras Petiliani* (ed. M.Petschenig) CSEL 52.4-227 Vienna 1909.
- *Contra partem Donati post gesta* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53.98-162 Vienna 1910.
- *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem imperfectum opus* PL 45.1049-1608 Paris 1861.
- *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.905-947 Vienna 1892.
- *De baptismo* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 51.145-375 Vienna 1908.
- *De civitate Dei* (ed.E.Hoffmann) CSEL 40¹,40² Vienna 1899,1900.
- *De dono perseverantiae* PL 45.993-1034 Paris 1861.
- *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25¹.51-80 Vienna 1891.
- *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* PL 34.173-220 Paris 1861.
- *De gestis Pelagii* (ed.C.Urba and J.Zycha) CSEL 42.51-122 Vienna 1902.

- *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali libri duo* ibid.125-206.
- *De libero arbitrio* PL 32.1221-1310 Paris 1841.
- *De moribus ecclesiae Catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* ibid. 1309-1378.
- *De natura boni* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25^a.855-889 Vienna 1892.
- *De natura et gratia liber unus* (ed.C.Urba et J.Zycha) CSEL 60. 233-299 Vienna 1913.
- *De natura et origine animae* ibid.303-419.
- *De opere monachorum* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 41.531-596 Vienna 1900.
- *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* (ed.C.Urba et J.Zycha) CSEL 60.3-151 Vienna 1913.
- *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (ed.C.Urba and J.Zycha) CSEL 42.3-48 Vienna 1902.
- *De spiritu et littera* (ed.C.Urba et J.Zycha) CSEL 60.155-229 Vienna 1913.
- *De unico baptismo contra Petilianum* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53. 3-34 Vienna 1910.
- *De utilitate credendi* (ed.J.Zycha) CSEL 25^a.3-48 Vienna 1891.
- *De vera religione* PL 34.121-172 Paris 1861.
- *Epistulae* (ed.A.Goldbacher) CSEL 34^a,34^a,44,57,58 Vienna 1895, 1898,1904,1911,1923.
- *Epistula ad Catholicos de secta Donatistarum* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 52.232-322 Vienna 1909.
- *Gesta cum Emerito Donatistarum episcopo* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53.181-196 Vienna 1910.
- *Psalmus contra partem Donati* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 51.3-15 Vienna 1908.
- *Retractationum* (ed.P.Knöll) CSEL 36 Vienna 1902.
- *Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem* (ed.M.Petschenig) CSEL 53.168-178 Vienna 1910.
- *Sermones* PL 38 Paris 1861.

D. OTHER WORKS

- Alfaric, P. *L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin* Paris 1918.
- Allo, E. *Saint Paul, Première Éptre aux Corinthiens* Paris 1934.
- Altaner, B. "Augustinus und Epiphanius von Salamis. Eine quellenkritische Studie," *Museum Lessianum* Sect.hist.13 (1951:Mélanges J. de Ghellinck I: Antiquité) 265-275.
- "Augustinus und Eusebius von Kaisareia," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 44(1950:Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 60. Geburtstage gewidmet.) 1-6.
- *Patrologie* Freiburg im Breisgau 1950.
- Amanieu, A., "Archdiacre," *Dictionnaire du droit canonique* I(1935)950.
- Bardenhewer, O. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* 5 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau 1913-1932 (I,II in 2ed.,III with supplement).

- Bardy, G. "Le *De haeresibus* et ses sources," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome 1931) 397-416.
- "Manichéisme," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 9.2 (1927) 1841-1895.
- Batiffol, P. *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin* Paris 1920.
- Baudrillart-Vogt-Rouziès, *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 12 vols. Paris 1909 ff. Vol.13 partly published—Colman-Consalvi—1953.
- Bayard, L. *Le latin de Saint Cyprien* Paris 1902.
- De Bruyne, D. "Saint Augustin Reviseur de la Bible," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome 1931) 521-606.
- Buchberger, M. *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche* 10 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau 1929-1938.
- Burkitt, F. *The Religion of the Manichees* Cambridge 1925.
- Cayré, F. *Précis de patrologie et d'histoire de la théologie* Vol.I, 2nd ed. Paris 1931. (There is an English translation by H. Howitt *Manual of Patrology* Vol.I 1936.)
- Ceillier, R. *L'Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques* Vol.9 Paris 1861.
- Chapman, J. "Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casae Nigrae," *Revue Bénédictine* 26 (1909) 13-23.
- Copleston, F. *A History of Philosophy* Vol.1 Westminster, Md. 1950.
- Courcelle, P. *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques* Paris 1948.
- *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobie à Cassiodore* 2nd ed. Paris 1948.
- Dekkers, E. *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (opera usus qua rem preparavit et iuvit E. Gaar) *Sacris Erudiri* III Steenbrugge and The Hague 1951.
- Dyroff, A. "Der philosophische Teil der Encyclopädie des Cornelius Celsus," *Rheinisches Museum* 88 (1939) 7-18.
- Fliche, A. and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* Paris 1934 ff. (Vol. 1 reprinted 1946; vol. 2 reprinted 1948; vol. 3 in 3rd ed. reprinted 1950 with bibliographical additions; vol. 4 in 2nd ed. reprinted 1948).
- Franses, D. "Die Werke des h. Quodvultdeus, Bischofs von Karthago," *Veröffentlichungen des Kirchenhistorischen Seminar* IV Reihe Nr. 9 Munich 1920.
- Freund, W. *The Donatist Church, Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* Oxford 1952.
- De Guibert, J. "La notion d'hérésie chez St. Augustin," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 21 (1920) 369-382.
- Hefele, C. *Histoire des conciles* (2nd ed. cor. et aug. par H. Leclercq) Paris 1907-1938.
- Holl, K. "Die Ueuechtheit der Anakephalaïosis," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 36.2 (1910) 95-98.
- Jackson, A. *Researches in Manichaeism* New York 1932.

- "The Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Manichaeism," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45(1925) 246-268.
- Jannaccone, S. *La dottrina eresologica di S. Agostino* (Raccolta di studi letteratura cristiana antica 20; Catania 1952).
- Janssen, H. *Kultur und Sprache zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian* Nijmegen 1938.
- Kappelmacher, A. "Echte und unechte Predigten Augustins," *Wiener Studien* 49(1931) 89-102.
- Krüger, G. *Luzifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* Leipzig 1886.
- De Labriolle, P. *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne* (3ème éd., rev. et aug. par G. Bardy) 2 vols. Paris 1947.
- *La crise Montaniste* University of Paris 1913.
- *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme* Paris 1913.
- De Lagarde, P. *Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri quatuor* Berlin 1859.
- Legrange, M. *Saint Paul, Épître aux Galates* (3rd ed.) Paris 1926.
- Maher, J. *Saint Augustine's Defense of the Hexameron against the Manichaeans* St. Meinrad, Ind. 1946.
- Mansi, J. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio* Vol. 9 1763.
- Marrou, H. *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* Paris 1938.
- *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, "Retractatio" (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 145 bis) Paris 1949.
- Mohrmann, C. *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin I* Nijmegen 1932.
- Monceaux, P. *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe* Vol. 5, Vol. 7 Paris 1920, 1923.
- Moricca, U. *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* Vol. III.1 Turin 1932.
- Morin, G. "Le *Liber dogmatum* de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s'y rattachent," *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907) 445-455.
- "Notes d'ancienne littérature ecclésiastique," *Revue Bénédictine* 13 (1896) 342.
- "Pour une future édition des opuscules de S. Quodvultdeus évêque de Carthage au V^e siècle," *ibid.* 31(1914) 156-162.
- O'Brien, Sister Mary Bridget, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 A.D.* 21 (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies) Washington 1930.
- Paschini, P., P. Testore, S. J., A. Frutaz. *Enciclopedia cattolica*. 12 vols. Città del Vaticano 1948-1954.
- Pétre, H. "Haeresis, schisma, et leurs synonymes latines," *Revue des études latines* 15(1937) 316-319.
- De Plinval, G. *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme* Lausanne 1943.
- Polotsky, H. "Manichäismus," in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplementband* 6(1935) 240-271.
- Prat, F. "Hérésie," in Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible* 3(1903) 607-609.

- Puech, H. *Le Manichéisme* Paris 1949.
- Quasten, J. *Patrology* Vol. I, Vol. 2 Westminster, Md. 1950, 1953.
- Schanz, M., C. Hosius and G. Krüger, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* Vol. IV 2 Munich 1920.
- Schanz, M. "Ueber die Schriften des Cornelius Celsus," *Rheinisches Museum* 36(1881) 369-371.
- Schepens, P. "*Liber de promissionibus*," *Recherches de science religieuse* (1919) 230-243.
- Schlier, H. "*ἀλπεύς*," in Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament I* Stuttgart 1933.
- Schwabe, L. "Die Opiniones philosophorum des Celsus," *Hermes* 19(1884) 385-392.
- Simonetti, M. "Studi sulla letteratura cristiana d'Africa in età Vandาลica," *Rendiconti, Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, classe di lettere e scienze morali e storiche* 83(1951; 3rd. series, Vol. 14) 407-424.
- Smith, W., and H. Wace. *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* 4 vols. London 1877-1887.
- Specht, T. *Die Lehre von der Kirche nach dem h. Augustin* Paderborn 1892.
- Tillemont, L. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* Vol. 13, Vol. 16 Paris 1702, 1712.
- Tixeront, J. *Histoire des dogmes* (Eng. trans. from 5th ed. by H.L.B.) 3 vols. St. Louis 1910, 1914, 1916.
- Ueberweg, F. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (ed. K. Praechter) Part I *Die Philosophie des Altertums* 12th ed. Berlin 1926.
- Vacant-Mangenot-Amann, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 15 vols. Paris 1899-1950.
- Watson, E. *The Style and Language of St. Cyprian* Oxford 1896.
- Weiskotten, H. T. *Sancti Augustini vita scripta a Possidio episcopo* (rev. text, introduction, notes and Eng. trans.) Princeton 1919.
- Wetzer and Welte *Kirchenlexikon* 12 vols. (with Register) Freiburg im Breisgau 1880-1903.
- Willis, G. *Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* London 1950.
- Wilmart, A. "Operum S. Augustini Elenchus a Possidio eiusdem discipulo Calamensi episcopo digestus," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome 1931) 149-233.
- Zarb, S. *Chronologia Operum S. Augustini* Rome 1934.
- Zorell, F. *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (2nd. ed.) Paris 1931.

INTRODUCTION

A. AUTHENTICITY AND EDITIONS

The *De haeresibus* of St. Augustine belongs to a literary genre popular in the Church since the time of Justin Martyr, the catalogue of heresies.¹ In exhibiting his keenness to alert the faithful to the dangers of false doctrines, Augustine showed himself a fellow-spirit of Justin Martyr in his lost *Syntagma*, of Irenaeus in his *Adversus haereses*, and especially of Epiphanius of Salamis and Filastrius of Brescia, his immediate sources. The genuineness of the *De haeresibus*—written too late, as will be seen, to be included in the *Retractationes*—is attested by Possidius,² Cassiodorus,³ Gregory the Great,⁴ Isidore of Seville,⁵ and Eugippius.⁶ The description of Cassiodorus, “that book of his in which, following bishop Epiphanius, he encompassed various heresies with summary brevity,”⁷ that of Gregory, who speaks of the book written on heresies by the blessed Augustine in agreement with the words of Filastrius,⁸ and that of Isidore, who, in his *De viris illustribus*, tells of Primasius’ explanations of “what most blessed Augustine in times past had left unfinished when death overtook him,”⁹ apply without any doubt to the *De haeresibus* as we have it, for the summary treatise, brief in compass, is based in great part on the work of Epiphanius and of Filastrius, and a proposed second part is lacking to the work.¹⁰

¹ Schanz IV 2.438.

² *Indic.* VIII 16 (Wilmart, *Misc. Agost.* 2.174).

³ *Inst.* 1.22 (ed. Mynors, Oxford 1937, p. 61.15).

⁴ *Ep.* 7.15 (MGH *Ep.* 1.458).

⁵ *Vir. ill.* 22 (PL 83.1095).

⁶ *Excerpta* 19, 280 (CSEL 9.166.34, 897.305).

⁷ “liber eiusdem, ubi diversas haereses post Epiphanium pontificem compendiosa brevitate complexus est.” *loc. cit.*

⁸ “Cuius [sc. Filastrii] verbis beatus quoque Augustinus in eo libro concordat, quem de haeresibus scripsit.” *loc. cit.*

⁹ “quod olim beatissimus Augustinus in libro haereseon imperfectum, morte interveniente, reliquerat.” *loc. cit.*

¹⁰ Cf. *infra* p. 9.

The popularity of the *De haeresibus* in medieval times, to mention but a single indication, is suggested by the number of manuscripts drawn upon by the Maurists: ¹¹ five of the Vatican, twelve in French libraries, and the seven Belgian codices used by the Louvain Theologians. It had already appeared in the editions of Amerbach (vol. XI, Basel 1506) and Erasmus (vol. VI, Basel 1528) before being published by the Louvain Theologians at Antwerp in 1577 (vol. VI). Moreover, it has appeared in separate editions, among which we may mention that of Lambertus Danaeus, Geneva 1576; G. Th. Meier, Helmstadt 1673; L. Cozza and E. Welchman, Oxford 1721; F. Oehler (*Corpus Haereseologicum* I 192-225), Berlin 1856. The *De haeresibus* has been translated into French under the direction of Poujoulat and Raulx by M. l'Abbé Aubert (*Oeuvres complètes de s. Augustin*, vol. 14.1-21), Bar-le-Duc 1869, and again under the direction of Péronne, Vincent, Écalle, Charpentier, and Barreau, by Charpentier (*Oeuvres complètes de saint Augustin*, vol. 25. 211-247), Paris 1870.

B. THE OCCASION AND DATE OF COMPOSITION

In an exchange of letters ¹ between St. Augustine and Quodvultdeus, deacon of Carthage—a person with whom we shall have much to do—the circumstances which led to the composition of the *De haeresibus* are clearly stated. Of these letters, which are all short, two are written by Quodvultdeus, two by Augustine. The last of the series, Augustine's *Ep.* 224, is to be dated, as we shall see, in 427-428. There is nothing to show clearly how long the entire exchange took.²

The first letter of this correspondence (221) contains Quodvultdeus' earnest solicitation of St. Augustine to prepare a handbook of heresies which could provide for the instruction of clergy and laity alike. This book was to treat of the heresies which had arisen since the coming of Christ, was to contain an exposition of their errors and the teachings of the Church contrary to them, and was

¹¹ "Syllabus codicum" (Tom. VIII 1005; PL 42.21-22).

¹ *Epp.* 221-224 (ed. Goldbacher, CSEL 57.442-454).

² Goldbacher (CSEL 58.60) suggests that all four were written in 427-428, and this is surely not unlikely.

to describe the method which the Church employed in treating such heretics as returned to her fold. Realizing how vast a project this could be, Quodvultdeus suggests a simple compendium to serve the needs of all ranks in the Church, enabling the faithful to avoid errors themselves, and equipping them, at the same time, with the means of combatting false doctrines.

In letter 222 Augustine begins by saying that he had immediately answered Quodvultdeus in a message—no longer extant—which he sent by a certain Philocalus³ to state the difficulty of the proposed task. But, another opportunity offering itself, Augustine now intends to explain the difficulty in brief. He informs Quodvultdeus that both Filastrius of Brescia and Epiphanius of Cyprus have written on this subject, both of them treating of heresies which had appeared before and after the coming of Christ, Filastrius counting 156 heresies altogether, Epiphanius only eighty. Augustine observes that the reason for this discrepancy evidently lies in the fact that each of them had his own concept of heresy, and, in reality, he adds, heresy is a very difficult matter to define. In closing this portion of his letter, Augustine seems to be hoping that he has convinced Quodvultdeus of the uselessness of any further work on heresies and proposes to send him Epiphanius' Greek work—that of Filastrius, in Latin, he regards as inferior—that he might have it translated at Carthage for their mutual advantage.⁴ The concluding paragraph entrusts the bearer of the letter to the good graces of Quodvultdeus and asks his help in furthering the letter of recommendation which Augustine has given the man to a certain Orontius.⁵ The precise terms of the request, as indicating the relatively high position of Quodvultdeus in being asked for such aid, will be discussed later. Augustine finally asks for information on a certain Theodosius and the Manichaeans who had been detected

³ Philocalus seems to be known only from this letter and its answer, *Ep.* 223. Cf. W. Ensslin, "Philokalos," RE 19.2486.

⁴ "Vide ergo, ne forte librum sancti Epiphanii tibi mittere debeam . . . qui possit apud Carthaginem in latinam linguam verti facilius atque commodius, ut tu potius praestes nobis quod quaeris a nobis."

⁵ This letter and Aug. *Ep.* 257 seem to be our only sources on this man, evidently a friend of Augustine who was undecided about entering the Christian religion. Cf. W. Ensslin, "Orontius," RE 18.1167.

through his instrumentality,⁶ and wants to be informed of the departure of the holy bishops.⁷

Letter 223 opens with the statement that Quodvultdeus had received but a single letter from Augustine, that sent to him *per ecclesiasticum*; the first one, sent through Philocalus, had not yet arrived.⁸ In the paragraph in which Quodvultdeus returns to the question of the handbook of heresies and insists upon the lack of such a work as he desires, he seems to have Augustine's Letter 222 in his hands, for he specifically mentions Filastrius and Epiphanius, only, however, to brush them aside, saying that though these writers are on record as having written works of this sort, he does not believe that they proceeded in the desired way or with the required brevity. There need be no doubt that the letter received *per ecclesiasticum* is *Ep.* 222. Quodvultdeus then refers to Augustine's suggestion, that he use and translate Epiphanius' work, as a practical impossibility.⁹ The letter closes with a strong appeal for Augustine to reconsider the terms of the letter in which he had originally made his request, and to act favorably upon it.

Letter 224 is evidently Augustine's answer to Letter 223, for he begins by stating that as soon as he was given the opportunity to write to Quodvultdeus, he had done as asked and reread the letter containing his friend's petition for the book. He wished, thus, to see whether he should in fact begin the work and send part of it to Quodvultdeus. But owing to the press of business he was not able to do even this. He was busy with his refutation of the books of the Pelagian, Julian, eight of which had appeared after he had answered the first four.¹⁰ Five of the new books had been sent from

⁶ Here Augustine refers, no doubt, to the instance which he cites later in the *De haer.* 46. Cf. *infra* p. 88-90, l. 66-81.

⁷ Tillemont suggests (*Mémoires* XIII 924) that the voyage in question may be related to Alypius' presence in Rome in 428. Cf. *Aug. Ep.* 224.2.

⁸ "Unum quidem Reverentiae tuae commonitorium, quod per ecclesiasticum dignatus es destinare, suscepi. Nam, quod prius directum esse Beatitudo tua significavit per virum honorabilem Philocalum, necdum ad me pervenit."

⁹ "Frustra etiam homini, qui latine non didici, graeca facundia delegatur. . . . Quid autem Venerationem tuam de interpretum non solum difficultate, sed etiam obscuritate commoneam . . . ?"

¹⁰ Augustine's six books against Julian's four appeared between 420-421. Cf. Schanz IV 2.434.

Rome to Augustine by Alypius, as soon as he could get them copied, with the promise that he would send the remaining three as soon as possible. However, Alypius pressed Augustine not to delay his answer to Julian's recent pronouncements. Yielding to Alypius, Augustine undertook the new task while yet prosecuting another—the composition of his *Retractationes*. At the time of this letter he had finished the two volumes of the *Retractationes*, but intended to continue the work with a treatment of his letters and tractates. He had also begun to answer the fourth book of Julian's second series. He proposed to answer the fifth, and, if the remaining three did not arrive, to begin the work on heresies for Quodvultdeus, dividing his days and nights between his *Retractationes* and the *De haeresibus*. This letter, like Letter 222, concludes with a petition that Quodvultdeus aid the bearer of the letter with his influence.

In her recent monograph on the *De haeresibus*,¹¹ Silvia Jannaccone claims that Letter 223, in which¹² Quodvultdeus insists upon the lack of such a work as he desires Augustine to write, is anterior to Letter 222 in which Augustine mentions the work of Epiphanius, and asks to have it translated at Carthage. She claims that there is need to suppose here a lost letter sent by Quodvultdeus to Augustine along with such a translation and stressing again that Augustine write a treatise that would supply practical needs better than that of Epiphanius. According to Jannaccone, the preface of the *De haeresibus* is the answer to that lost letter.

It is difficult to understand Jannaccone's insistence that Letter 223 is prior to Letter 222,¹³ for the former seems to be a direct

¹¹ S. Jannaccone, *La dottrina eresologica di S. Agostino* (Raccolta di studi di letteratura Cristiana antica 20; Catania 1952) 19.

¹² I am here translating the author's words, which run as follows: "La lettera 223, nella quale Quodvultdeus insiste sulla mancanza di un'opera tale quale egli desidera che Agostino scriva, è anteriore all'ep. 222 nella quale Agostino gli indica l'opera di Epifanio, domandandogli di fargliela tradurre a Cartagine. Bisogna dunque supporre qui una lettera perduta, con la quale Quodvultdeus accompagnava l'invio ad Agostino di questa traduzione e insisteva ancora perchè Agostino scrivesse un trattato che rispondesse meglio di quello di Epifanio alle sue pratiche esigenze. La prefazione al *De haeresibus* è la risposta a questa lettera perduta."

¹³ The present order of these letters, at least as old as the Louvain Theologians, satisfied Tillemont (*Mémoires* XIII 923-924), the Benedictines (Preface to the *Letters* [PL 33.47]; Preface to the *De haer.* [PL 42.15-16]), and Goldbacher (CSEL 57.442-454).

answer to the latter. Letter 222 states that Augustine had written one note which was sent through Philocalus, and that this second letter was being sent through a subdeacon, accompanied by a man of the Church (*homo ecclesiae*), lest access to Quodvultdeus be difficult.¹⁴ Letter 223, as we have seen, states that the letter through Philocalus had not arrived, but the one entrusted to an ecclesiastic (*per ecclesiasticum*) had. Quodvultdeus' references in 222 to Filastrius and Epiphanius and to the impossibility of having recourse to a Greek work seem to be the deacon's reactions to Augustine's suggestions in Letter 222. Moreover, Jannaccone's statement that the preface to the *De haeresibus* is the answer to that lost letter is very puzzling in view of the fact that in his preface Augustine himself refers to the letter he had first received from Quodvultdeus (221), proceeding then to discuss that letter point by point, and mentions no other. In assuming a Carthaginian translation of Epiphanius' work, which Quodvultdeus is supposed to have sent along with the lost letter, Jannaccone seems to ignore the fact that Bardy, Courcelle, Marrou, and others, as we shall see later,¹⁵ maintain that Augustine made his own translation from the Greek.

A fairly approximate date can be given for the *De haeresibus*, based on information given by Augustine himself. As we have seen in Letter 224.2, he promised Quodvultdeus that he would write the desired work as soon as he could, stating that he had finished his two books of *Retractationes* and was in the midst of his answer to the eight books of Julian, working on the five Alypius had sent him and waiting for the remaining three. But Augustine did not receive the first five books until 428.¹⁶ Augustine promised to begin the *De haeresibus* as soon as he finished the five books of Julian, provided that he did not, in the meantime, receive the remaining three books. On this basis we may ascribe the work to some time in the year 428 or 429. Bardenhewer,¹⁷ Moricca,¹⁸ and Altaner¹⁹ speak of it as being written around 428; Schanz²⁰ and Zarb²¹ put it about 429.

¹⁴ "Misi autem cum illo etiam hominem ecclesiae, ne ad tuam Sanctitatem difficilis ei esset accessus."

¹⁵ Cf. *infra* p. 36 f.

¹⁶ So Bardenhewer IV 478 and Schanz IV 2.439.

¹⁷ IV 463.

¹⁸ *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* 3.500.

¹⁹ *Patrologie* 378.

²⁰ 4.2.439.

²¹ *Chronologia* 85.

C. PURPOSE AND METHOD

The purpose of this treatise is clearly revealed by the letters exchanged between Quodvultdeus and St. Augustine¹ and in the preface of the work itself. Quodvultdeus wanted a manual of heresies, a book which would treat in simple fashion all the errors which had come into existence from the time of Christ until that time. It was not to be too large a work, but one which "breviter, perstricte atque summam" would give the number, differences, summary, and refutation of the various errors which had arisen contrary to the Catholic Faith. The book was to serve for the use of both clergy and laity, for there was a genuine need for such a manual to enable true Christians to determine error and defend the Faith in North Africa.² This request of Quodvultdeus is understandable in the light of the circumstances. North Africa was suffering from a plethora of heretics and schismatics at the time, and Greek works on heresies could not be read by most of the African clergy. It was natural that Quodvultdeus would turn to Augustine, whose years of reading and study, experience with heretics, and great reputation for learning would enable him to meet the situation.

In his reply to Quodvultdeus (Letter 222) Augustine, in referring to Epiphanius and Filastrius, as authors of earlier catalogues of heresies, already indicates the difficulty of determining the precise nature of heresy:

Therefore, though both of these men desired to do what you are asking me, you still see, however, how much they differ on the number of sects. But this would certainly not have occurred, unless one thing seemed a heresy to one of them and another to the other. . . . But, without doubt, on that question, just what constitutes a heresy, there was no harmony between the two of them; and in truth this is difficult to define absolutely. Therefore, in attempting to list all of them we must beware of omitting some which are really heresies, or adding others which are not.*

¹ [Aug.] *Epp.* 221-224, which are prefixed to the *De haeresibus* in the Maurist, Migne, and Oehler editions.

² *Ep.* 221.

* "Cum ergo ambo id vellent facere quod a me petis, quantum tamen inter se differant de numero interim sectarum vides; quod utique non evenisset, nisi aliud uni eorum videretur haeresis, et aliud alteri. . . . Sed procul dubio in ea quaestione, ubi disceptatur quid sit haeresis, non idem

So earnestly requested by Quodvultdeus, even in the face of the difficulties here foreseen, Augustine undertook the work, hoping and praying that as the book progressed he would be better able to solve the problems which would arise. Taking the various points of Quodvultdeus' request, Augustine discusses them in his preface to the work. He intends to present each of the heresies briefly and concisely, but the refutation of each one is to be omitted. In place of the refutations, a second part of the work is projected to serve as a guide-book against heresy.⁴ It was to be a means of avoiding every heresy and judging the nature of those which might appear in the future.

At the conclusion of Chapter 57 Augustine explains his method of dealing with the various heresies he has treated. He has followed the order, but not the method of Epiphanius. Where he thought necessary, Augustine added or subtracted from the account given by Epiphanius. At times he supplemented from other sources. But always he kept before his mind the brevity and conciseness which he had proposed to follow from the beginning. Fifty-seven was the number of heresies which he obtained from Epiphanius; the rest, as he tells us, he had to get from others—Filastrius, certain anonymous writers, and his own recollection.

In the *De haeresibus* Augustine shows little of his genius and originality, for he is forced to depend very much on the work of predecessors and his treatment of most heresies is very brief. But he reveals the critical habits of mind which justly merit for him a reputation for genuine scholarship. In his treatment he attempts to discover the source and to emphasize the fundamental ideas of each heresy from Simon Magus to Pelagius. When he reaches his own times he goes into greater detail, e. g., in reference to the Manichaeans, the Donatists, the Pelagians. Naturally his own experience with these errors allowed him to speak more fully and completely. But in the main, he is giving us the substance, critically revised when necessary, of the works of Epiphanius, Filastrius

videbatur ambobus; et revera hoc omnino definire difficile est et ideo cavendum, cum omnes in numerum redigere conamur, ne praetermittamus aliquas quamvis haereses sint, aut annumeremus aliquas cum haereses non sint."

⁴ Cf. *infra* "Praefatio," l. 111 f.

and whatever other sources he had at his disposal. The work is an abridgement of his sources with the addition of whatever further information he could obtain and verify. It is true that we cannot consider this work a contribution to the advancement of our theological knowledge of heresy, for his analysis was to appear later. But it is of great value to the history of heresy, for the critical attitude and the scientific approach which Augustine employed have no doubt spared us from the confusion which other ancient writers on heresy, e. g., Epiphanius and Filastrius, would have occasioned.

D. OUTLINE OF THE *De haeresibus*

The work falls into 88 sections or chapters, corresponding to the number of heresies treated. But on the basis of authors used, or sources employed it can be divided into three parts:

1-57. These sections cover the heresies from the Simonians to the Messalians and follow the work of Epiphanius.

58-80. These heresies, beginning with the Metangismonites and ending with the sect which attributed a temporal beginning to the Nativity of Christ from the Father, which are missing in Epiphanius, are supplied from the work of Filastrius.

81-88. In these sections, covering the Luciferians to the Pelagians, Augustine makes use of whatever sources he can.

For sections 22 and 83 he drew on the *Church History* of Eusebius, and for 81 and 82 he made use of Pseudo-Jerome.

The treatise adheres closely to the limits which Augustine set for himself. It is a clear and concise manual of heresies which could have served admirably the purpose Quodvultdeus had in mind, to enable clergy and people alike to distinguish heresy from the true Faith. There are no detailed, no complicated discussions to confuse the minds of the simple faithful. Augustine treated all the heresies which he could discover had existed from the time of Christ down to his own day. However, the second book, which would have been of immense help to Quodvultdeus and others in recognizing the nature of heresy, did not appear. This second book, which was intended to answer questions of a general nature, would have been exceptionally valuable, for in it Augustine intended to

give the fruits of his research into heresy: "We should next investigate what makes a heretic, that while we are avoiding this with the help of God, we may be escaping the venom of heresies, those we know, those we do not, those that are and those that may be."¹

E. IDENTITY OF QUODVULTDEUS

With many persons bearing the name Quodvultdeus in North Africa at the time, it has been only natural, in an attempt to extend our knowledge of Augustine's correspondent, to identify some one or the other with the petitioner and addressee of the *De haeresibus*. As a preliminary to such identification, it would first be necessary to form as clear an impression as possible of Augustine's friend. The only positive knowledge which we have of him comes from the four letters already mentioned and from his relation with the *De haeresibus*. From these sources we learn that Quodvultdeus, deacon in the church of Carthage, was most persistent in requesting a work on heresies from St. Augustine. In spite of the considerable labor which such a task demanded, Augustine did accede to his wishes and wrote the *De haeresibus*. In both of the extant letters of reply to Quodvultdeus, Augustine requested of him favors which supposed a certain amount of influence and power on the part of the deacon, for he was asked to aid the bearers of the different letters with his intercession.¹ Access to Quodvultdeus seems not to have been easy, for Augustine sends a *homo ecclesiae* with the bearer of Letter 222 to insure his approach to the deacon of Carthage. Quodvultdeus was, moreover, in a position to send St. Augustine the episcopal acts of a process involving some Manichaeans at Carthage, which occurred *ca.* 421 when Quodvultdeus was already deacon.² These points will be considered in detail when we come to draw our own conclusions on the personality of Quodvultdeus.

¹ "Quid ergo faciat haereticum, deinceps requirendum est ut, cum hoc Domino adjuvante vitamus, non solum ea quae scimus, verum etiam quae nescimus, sive quae jam orta sunt, sive quae adhuc oriri poterunt, haeretica venena vitemus." Cf. *infra* "Epilogus," p. 128, l. 48-51.

² *Epp.* 222.3; 224.3.

³ *Aug. Haer.* 46 cf. *infra* p. 88, l. 67; Possid. *Vita Aug.* 16 (ed. Weiskotten, Princeton 1919, pp. 76-79).

But, as early as the end of the seventeenth century, the suggestion was made by Tillemont that this Quodvultdeus was perhaps the same Quodvultdeus who was bishop of Carthage at the time Carthage fell to the invading Vandals, and whom he treats as a likely author of a number of pseudo-Augustinian sermons. Tillemont handles the matter in three passages of his *Mémoires*. In the first, where the *De haeresibus* is treated,³ he does no more than suggest the identity of deacon and bishop. Tillemont seems to have reasoned that the deacon was a man of considerable ability and high position in the church of Carthage and, hence, could well have succeeded to the bishopric of that city. For Tillemont considers it worth explaining that, though Quodvultdeus claimed that he knew no Greek and had not even studied Latin,⁴ Quodvultdeus meant only that he had not made any particular study of Latin, or that he had not mastered the rules of eloquence; for, declares Tillemont, "il écrit assez bien." Moreover, in speaking of letter 224,⁵ Tillemont says that this letter indicates that the deacon Quodvultdeus was a highly respected and very busy man; he could perhaps have been archdeacon of Carthage.

So much for the first phase of Tillemont's exposition of the point in question. Next comes a passage in which the name of Quodvultdeus is not mentioned, but which is central to the argument: an extended discussion of a group of nine sermons of the Vandal period attributed to St. Augustine and of long disputed authorship.⁶ In handling these nine texts, Tillemont points out multiple and close connections among them, individually or by groups.⁷ It is much later and in another volume,⁸ when Tillemont

³ *Mémoires* XIII 923. Tillemont died 1698. *Mémoires* XIII appeared first in 1702; *Mémoires* XVI in 1712. Cf. Leclercq's extensive discussion in DACL 6.2624-2638.

⁴ Aug. Ep. 223.2.

⁵ *Mémoires* XIII 924.

⁶ *Ibid.* XIII 935-938.

⁷ In the sixth tome of their edition of Augustine's works, published in 1685, the Maurists likewise recognized a close connection among these nine sermons and supposed some one of Augustine's disciples, writing at the time of the Vandal invasion, as their author (PL 40.625-626). A history of the problem of authorship is given by D. Franes, "Die Werke des hl. Quodvultdeus," *Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen*

has occasion to speak again of some of these sermons of the Vandal invasion, that he makes a suggestion as to a precise author. But even here, it is only for one of the nine sermons, the *De tempore barbarico*⁹—the only sermon of that name then known—that he makes his suggestion. Tillemont stated that this sermon, though bearing the name of Augustine, could not be his, for it employs language concerning the city in which it was delivered which points to Carthage and Carthage alone. He then proposes that the sermon was apparently delivered by Capreolus,¹⁰ or Quodvultdeus, who were bishops of Carthage around this time, or by one of their priests. Tillemont—who is the first to bring the name of Quodvultdeus into the discussion—makes, however, no statement affirming a single author for the nine sermons. It is only by a process of deduction that we can state that he felt that Quodvultdeus could have delivered the entire group.¹¹

In the present century interest in these sermons and their author has been renewed through the efforts of Dom Germain Morin. Comparing the nine sermons considered by Tillemont with three published later in Mai's *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, Morin proposed a single author for all twelve, and was at first inclined to ascribe them to the Voconius, bishop of Castellum (Tingitanum?), whose writings are dealt with by Gennadius (*De viris illustribus* 79).¹² Some years later, altering his opinion, yet even then advancing conclusions which he proposed that others must test and develop, he published a short article, "Pour une future édition des opus-

Seminar München 4.9(1920)5-9. For an apparent fault in Portalié's handling of the problem (DThC 1.2310) see Brother S. Dominic Ruegg, F. S. C., *S. Aurelii Augustini De utilitate ieiunii* 18 n. 23.

⁹ *Mémoires* XVI 502.

¹⁰ *De tempore barbarico* (I) in present day nomenclature (PL 40.699-708).

¹⁰ Tillemont had previously suggested Capreolus alone as the author of the *De tempore barbarico* and perhaps (as he says) of many of the other Vandal invasion sermons attributed to St. Augustine (*Mémoires* XVI 497).

¹¹ Franes, "Quodvultdeus" 8, gives the erroneous impression that Tillemont flatly proposes one author for all nine sermons, "[Tillemont] hat auch zum ersten Male einen Autor in Vorschlag gebracht, nämlich einen der beiden ersten Nachfolger des Aurelius von Karthago, Capreolus oder Quodvultdeus."

¹² *Revue Bénédictine* 13 (1896) 342.

cules de S. Quodvultdeus, évêque de Carthage.”¹³ The following is a list of the sermons which he thought could be attributed to Quodvultdeus:

<i>Sermo II de symbolo ad catechumenos</i>	PL 40.637-652... Clavis	401.
“ III “ “ “ “	“ “ 651-660... “	402.
“ IV “ “ “ “	“ “ 659-668... “	403.
<i>De cantico novo sermo ad catechumenos</i>	“ “ 677-686... “	405.
<i>De ultima IV feria sive de cultura agri dominici</i>	“ “ 685-694... “	406.
<i>De cataclysmo sermo ad catechumenos</i>	“ “ 693-700... “	407.
<i>De tempore barbarico (I)</i>	“ “ 699-708... “	411.
<i>Tractatus adversus quinque haereses</i>	“ 42.1101-1116. “	410.
<i>Contra Judaeos, Paganos et Arianos</i>	“ “ 1117-1130. “	404.
<i>De accedentibus ad gratiam (I)</i>	NPB I 251-264... “	408.
“ “ “ “ (II)	“ “ 264-274... “	409.
<i>De tempore barbarico (II)</i>	“ “ 274-282... “	412.

Dom Morin's own edition of the *De tempore barbarico* (II) (with the fuller ending) in his *Sancti Aurelii Augustini tractatus sive sermones inediti* (Munich-Kempten 1917; Zurich 1918) 200-218 (cf. p. xxx) is superior to Mai's.

To these he adds, although with less assurance, not only seven additional sermons, but also, as an afterthought, the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, traditionally, but falsely ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine.¹⁴

In regard to their author, as he tells us himself, he took inspiration from Tillemont. But, while Tillemont hesitated between Capreolus and Quodvultdeus—since none of his nine sermons speaks of the city as taken—Morin found convincing evidence in favor of Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage at its fall, in the *De tempore barbarico* (II), in which the city is described as taken. In concluding his article, Morin expressed the personal opinion that the deacon Quodvultdeus and the bishop Quodvultdeus were the same person, giving as his reasons the general custom of that time for a man to advance from the deaconate to the bishopric, and the fact that the two letters of Quodvultdeus appear to come from the same author as the sermons; the characteristic note is there,

¹³ *Ibid.* 31 (1914-1919) 156-162.

¹⁴ PL 51.733-858.

says Morin, more than ordinary natural talent, somewhat limited by a relative lack of training.¹⁵

Fr. Desiderius Franes, O. F. M., following the suggestions of Dom Morin, labored to justify the ascription of the twelve sermons and of the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei* to Quodvultdeus, deacon and bishop.¹⁶ To establish the relationship which he believes exists among these sermons, Franes¹⁷ presents a cursory review of the manuscript tradition, old editions and catalogues of Augustine's works, showing that from early times a common relationship was recognized among them.

Against this background, Franes then develops his argument, basically along lines familiar from Tillemont and Morin. He first attempts to establish that the *De tempore barbarico* (II) was the work of Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage, and that the time was after the fall of that city.¹⁸ He argues that from internal evidence it is clear that the sermon was delivered in a great city of Africa, particularly devoted to the patronage of Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, which had long been immune from siege though other cities had fallen to the barbarian; and that the city was finally taken amid scenes of murder, plundering and imprisonment, vividly described by the speaker who witnessed them. These facts, coupled with the description of the taking of Carthage by Genseric, related by Prosper of Aquitaine,¹⁹ Victor de Vita²⁰ and Salvian,²¹ says Franes, indicate that the sermon must have been delivered in Carthage shortly after the taking of the city in 439, and, since the speaker reveals himself as the spiritual shepherd of the people, he can be none other than the bishop Quodvultdeus.

¹⁵ The identification of the deacon Quodvultdeus with the bishop Quodvultdeus had been accepted by the authors of the life of St. Quodvultdeus in the *Acta Sanctorum* 60 (Oct. Tom. 11 [1863]) 851.

¹⁶ "Quodvultdeus." Franes appears to have summarized his position in an article "Een nieuw Kerkvader (Sint Quodvultdeus Van Carthago)," *De Katholiek* 132 (1922) 93-104. It is this paper, not Franes' dissertation, that Dom Capelle reviewed. (cf. *infra* n. 33).

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 2-11.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 11-16.

¹⁹ *Chronicon ad annum 439* (ed. Mommsen, MGH Auct. Antiq. 9.477. 1339).

²⁰ *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* 1.6, 22.

²¹ *De gubernatione Dei* 6.12.69 (Pauly, CSEL 8.144).

Franses now attempts to demonstrate the common authorship of all twelve sermons.²² His argument runs as follows: All of them belong to the time of the Vandal domination. With the exception of the *De tempore barbarico* (II), they were delivered in a city which had not yet been taken. These circumstances can refer only to Cirta and Carthage. Since the sermons describe a great city with circus, theater and amphitheater, and one in which Perpetua and Felicitas were particularly venerated, there remains only Carthage to be considered. That the sermons speak repeatedly of the efforts of the Arians to have Catholics apostatize and to be rebaptized is an important element for Franses in establishing the date of their delivery, for he argues that the Vandals were too occupied in waging war and plundering the land to make concentrated attempts at proselytizing before the peace of 435. Hence, says Franses, the sermons must have been delivered not long before 437—and certainly not after 439—in the time Quodvultdeus held the see of Carthage.²³ Having established to his satisfaction that Quodvultdeus was the author of *De tempore barbarico* (II) and that the remaining eleven sermons belong to a time when Quodvultdeus could have delivered them as bishop of Carthage, Franses proceeds to his demonstration of Quodvultdeus' responsibility for all twelve sermons by citing parallels in thought and expression which he believes they have with one another.²⁴

In ascribing the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei* to Quodvultdeus,²⁵ Franses uses evidence, found in the work itself, to show that it was written between 450 and 455²⁶ by an author who, exiled from Carthage,²⁷ was in Campania around 443.²⁸ There-

²² "Quodvultdeus" 16-36.

²³ *Ibid.* 16-18.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 18-36.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 37-45.

²⁶ PL 51.835C: "... sub Constantio et Augusta Placidia quorum nunc filius Valentinianus pius et christianus imperat." Franses maintains that this passage refers to the time after the death of Galla Placidia (450) and before Valentinian's murder (455).

²⁷ *Ibid.* 808A: "... expulsi exiliatique;" 841C: "Aspero VI cos. Carthagine constituto." Aspar was not consul six times; the VI is evidently viro illustri. His consulship is indicated for the year 434. Cf. Diehl, *Inscript. lat. chr. vet.* 1.20.67, 3.244. That this refers to no mere visit to

fore, Franes concludes, the writer must have been one of the ecclesiastics exiled from Carthage by Genseric in 439, Quodvultdeus or one of his companions. Next, by demonstrating that the *De promissionibus* and the sermons have much in common in their bitter anti-Arianism, in their repeated references to Arian proselytizing and rebaptism of Catholics, and in their use of similar expressions, Franes attempts to prove that Quodvultdeus was the author of the *De promissionibus* also. P. Schepens, working independently of Franes, likewise claimed the *De promissionibus* for Quodvultdeus.²⁹

In attempting to identify more exactly the Quodvultdeus under discussion,³⁰ Franes refers to the suggestion of Tillemont³¹ that bishop Quodvultdeus was perhaps the same man who as deacon of Carthage in 428 had petitioned St. Augustine to write a work on heresies, and tries to further this suggestion by remarking that of sixteen bishops of that name given by Morcelli in his *Africa Christiana* (I) only Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage at its fall, could have been the deacon of St. Augustine's *De haeresibus*. Then, considering the obvious importance of the deacon Quodvultdeus as revealed in Augustine's letters to him and the custom, mentioned by Morin,³² of passing from the diaconate to the episcopacy, Franes states that there is little reason for doubting that the deacon Quodvultdeus became bishop of Carthage after the short episcopacy of Capreolus. In support of this identification, Franes maintains that the bitter, untiring anti-heretical nature of the sermons is characteristic of the deacon who so energetically besought St. Augustine to write on heresies.

Franes' attempt to establish a new literary personality in Quod-

Carthage is evident from his presence there in his youth when bishop Aurelius (shortly after 399) transferred and dedicated the temple of *Dea Caelestis* to Christian use. Cf. PL 51.835.44.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 843B: "In Italia quoque, nobis apud Campaniam constitutis, dum venerabilis et apostolico honore nominandus papa Leo Manichaeos subverteret et contereret Pelagianos et maxime Julianum."

³⁰ "Liber de promissionibus." *Recherches de science religieuse* 9 (1919) 230-243; "Les oeuvres de saint Quodvultdeus" *ibid.* 13 (1923) 76-78.

³¹ "Quodvultdeus" 50-52.

³² Cf. *supra* p. 11.

³³ Cf. *supra* p. 13.

vultdeus, deacon and bishop of Carthage, naturally aroused great interest. In the reviews given to his dissertation, there was acceptance of his work in general, though some hesitation was manifested in accepting his assignment of the *De promissionibus* to Quodvultdeus.³³ The handbooks of literature and Patristics seem to have adopted Franes' constructions with little reservation.³⁴

However, the position of Morin and Franes on the works ascribed to Quodvultdeus and on the identification of the bishop Quodvultdeus with the deacon Quodvultdeus was seriously challenged in 1931 by Alfred Kappelmacher.³⁵ Taking the *De tempore barbarico* (II) which Franes used as the starting point of his demonstration, Kappelmacher maintained that it is so superior in style and in its application of Biblical quotations that the *De tempore barbarico* (I) is only a poor imitation of the former by a vastly inferior writer. The *De tempore barbarico* (II) could be the work of Augustine himself. Moreover, the two sermons *De accedentibus ad gratiam* are directly indicated as Augustine's work, for in Pseudo-Prosper we read, "In reference to these mysteries, if any one wishes to know how it is that David dancing naked before the Ark in the presence of his servants and maids represented Christ crucified in the presence of men and women, let him read the words of bishop Augustine of venerable memory."³⁶ At the end of the *De accedentibus* (I) we find the words, "King David

³³ H. Jordan, *Theologischen Literatur* 42 (1921) 166, was convinced that the attribution of the twelve sermons to Quodvultdeus was obvious, that of the *De promissionibus* fairly obvious. B. Capelle, *BALCL* 1.100-101 (*Suppl. Rev. Bén.* 36 [1924]) was very positive in accepting Franes' conclusions; but A. Feder, *Theologische Revue* 20 (1921) 386, A. Vaccari, *Biblica* 2 (1921) 101, and A. Jülicher, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 46 (1921) 82, were not willing to grant the *De promissionibus* to Quodvultdeus. Vaccari expressed, moreover, some hesitation in accepting the historical details of Franes' argument, stating that the sermons could have been preached in a city other than Carthage.

³⁴ Cf. Bardenhewer IV 522; Schanz IV 2.471 f.

³⁵ "Echte und unechte Predigten Augustins," *Wiener Studien* 49 (1931) 89-102.

³⁶ PL 51.798D: "De quibus mysteriis qui etiam illud nosse desiderat, quomodo sit David saltans ante arcam nudatus coram servis et ancillis suis ut Christum crucifixum praesentibus viris et feminis demonstraret, venerandae memoriae Augustini episcopi dicta inspiciat."

in some mystic action or other . . . sported before the Ark of the Lord, danced and was naked in the presence of his servants and maids."³⁷ The second sermon *De accedentibus* takes up where the first has left off: "Therefore, king David in some mystic action. . . ."³⁸ To disregard this evidence on the ground that Pseudo-Prosper had a lost work of Augustine in mind is ridiculous, says Kappelmacher.³⁹

In discussing the *De tempore barbarico* (II) Kappelmacher claims that Morin and Franes attach too much significance to the fact that the sermon was delivered in a city conquered by the Vandals and that allusion to the martyrs Perpetua and Felicitas is made. These facts do not necessarily limit the sermon to the time of the conquest of Carthage in 439. Augustine himself knew and wrote against the Arians, as did others of his time living in North Africa. According to Possidius, Augustine was still living and preaching to the people when the Vandals first attacked Hippo. Descriptions of cities sacked and ruined were common enough to the classes of rhetoric, so that they could easily make their way into the sermons of the clergy. Moreover, Saints Perpetua and Felicitas were venerated and spoken of through all North Africa.⁴⁰

Even the identification of Quodvultdeus is not too certain as far as Kappelmacher is concerned.⁴¹ For, he says, Franes' chief argument in identifying the bishop Quodvultdeus and the deacon of the same name rests on the bitter anti-heretical character of the sermons, but it must be obvious that others in North Africa at that time could have written in the same manner. Moreover, Franes' ascription of the *De promissionibus* to Quodvultdeus, bishop, can not be extended to the deacon, for this work, with its better style

³⁷ "David rex nescio qua mystica actione . . . ante arcam Domini ludebat, saltabat, et nudabatur coram servis et ancillis."

³⁸ "David ergo rex quadam mystica actione. . . ."

³⁹ Dom C. Lambot, *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine* II (1929-38) no. 495, p. 141 f. (Published with *Rev. Bén.* 45, 1933) observes that any one the least familiar with the writings of Augustine will have great trouble recognizing him in these three works. In any case, says Lambot—and rightly so—Dom Morin's negative verdict should be taken with more consideration.

⁴⁰ Kappelmacher 96 f.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 98-101.

and evident familiarity with classical literature, far surpasses the ability of the deacon as it is revealed in the two letters to Augustine.⁴²

Manlio Simonetti, writing in 1950, takes a position largely in agreement with the conclusions of Kappelmacher.⁴³ He maintains: (1) A linguistic examination confirms the hypothesis of Kappelmacher that the two sermons, *De accedentibus ad gratiam* and *De tempore barbarico* (II) are to be ascribed to Augustine. (2) There seems to be no reason for not ascribing the *Adversus quinque haereses* to Augustine and, on the other hand, strong proofs can be offered in its favor. (3) The three sermons *De symbolo*, *Contra Judaeos*, and perhaps the *De cantico novo*, are the work of one author, who wrote during the Vandal invasion. (4) To another author, who was likewise active during the Vandal invasion, belong the sermons *De ultima quarta feria*, the *De cataclysmo*, and, perhaps, the *De tempore barbarico* (I).

In reference to the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, Simonetti takes issue with Kappelmacher. Kappelmacher maintained that Quodvultdeus was not particularly trained in the learning of the day and hence could not be the author of this work, which shows the influence of the better schooling of that time.⁴⁴ Simonetti, on the other hand, states that the traces of Vergil and Sallust, part of Kappelmacher's argument against the deacon Quodvultdeus as author, are common enough in the writings even of those who had not a thorough rhetorical training. Moreover, the two letters of Quodvultdeus show a reasonable familiarity with the literary style of the period and a certain tendency to employ the complete and developed period. Hence, Kappelmacher's objections

⁴² P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions Germaniques* 102-109 and especially note 6 to p. 102, rejects Kappelmacher's criticisms entirely and builds his treatment of Quodvultdeus on the theories of Morin, Franes, and Schepens. Altaner, *Patrologie* (1950) 288; De Labriolle—Bardy, *Hist. litt. lat. chrét.* (1947) 2.673 f and Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* 3.1 (1932) 706-709, unaffected by Kappelmacher's arguments, incorporated Morin's and Franes' work into their own histories.

⁴³ "Studi sulla letteratura cristiana d'Africa in età Vandalica," *Rendiconti. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Classe di lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche* 83 (1951; 3rd series, Vol. 14) 407-424.

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.* *Wiener Studien* 49.98-101.

on these grounds are invalid. However, there are no grounds for ascribing this work to the author of either of the two groups of non-Augustinian sermons, for a linguistic examination in such a case reveals very little. A tract written with literary finish cannot be compared with a group of sermons dedicated to the oral instruction of the faithful and composed with little care. Moreover, we have no proof that Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage, was the author of either of the two groups of sermons. Franes had built his reconstruction of the personality of Quodvultdeus around the common authorship of the twelve sermons and the *De promissionibus*. With the collapse of this theory we have nothing left but the two letters of the deacon Quodvultdeus to Augustine and the probability that the deacon later became bishop of Carthage.⁴⁵

Attractive as the proposals of Morin and Franes may be, we must admit that the evidence which they brought forth in support of their theories is not conclusive. Both Kappelmacher and Simonetti, whether we wish to agree with their conclusions or not, have shown that the data contained in the sermons and the *De promissionibus* can be interpreted variously. It is natural enough to consider these writings, composed at the time of the Vandal invasion, a closely related group and to find in them similarities in word and expression. But it seems extremely hazardous to attempt an ascription of these works to one author on the basis of resemblances which could easily have been the common property of a school of writers who took their inspiration from St. Augustine and who found common themes in the theological errors and in the horrors of war brought to North Africa by the Arian Vandals.

However, the identification of Quodvultdeus, the deacon of St. Augustine's *De haeresibus*, with Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage in 437, seems to enjoy considerable probability. As we have already seen,⁴⁶ the man who requested the treatise on heresies must have had some prestige in Carthage, for we find St. Augustine asking him for favors which demanded power and influence on the part of the deacon. Moreover, Augustine hastened ("continuo reperta occasione")⁴⁷ to answer the first letter containing the deacon's initial

⁴⁵ Simonetti, 422-424.

⁴⁶ Cf. *supra* p. 10.

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 222.1.

request—an indication that Quodvultdeus was in a position justifying Augustine's immediate attention. The request itself seems to indicate a man of high ecclesiastical position, for it involved considerable work on the part of Augustine and treated of a subject concerned with ecclesiastical discipline, the detection of heresy. It seems unlikely that an ordinary deacon would have asked for a work of this nature, or that Augustine would have involved himself in such labor unless the circumstances warranted it. Hence, as Tillemont suggested,⁴⁸ Quodvultdeus could well have been archdeacon of Carthage.

This suggestion and its implication that as primary deacon or archdeacon Quodvultdeus was in position to succeed to the bishopric is quite justifiable. About the end of the fourth century the principal deacon in each church bore the title of archdeacon and had been assigned the work of general discipline and censure.⁴⁹ Quodvultdeus' interest in heresies can be considered further evidence of his position in the church of Carthage. Thanks to his recognized ability and the position which he enjoyed, this person had great influence in the election of the new bishop and might use it in his own behalf.⁵⁰ In certain churches, particularly in the Church of Rome, the first deacon or archdeacon was in reality the principal personage of the Christian community after the bishop and very often succeeded him.⁵¹ It is highly probable, then, that Quodvultdeus, the deacon of St. Augustine's *De haeresibus*, succeeded to the see of Carthage after the episcopacy of Capreolus and was the bishop Quodvultdeus who was exiled to Campania by Genseric.

Any further attempt to identify the Quodvultdeus of the *De haeresibus* seems impossible at the present time. Therefore, we must be content with the little information contained in the exchange of letters between St. Augustine and the deacon Quodvultdeus, and in the *De haeresibus* itself. From these sources we know

⁴⁸ Cf. *supra* p. 11.

⁴⁹ A. Amanieu, "Archidiacre," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* 1 (1935) 950.

⁵⁰ P. Palazzini, "Diacono e arcidiacono," *Enciclopedia cattolica* 4 (1950) 1538 f.

⁵¹ J. Zeiller, "L'organisation ecclésiastiques," Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'église* 2 (1948) 392 f.

that the man who requested the *De haeresibus* of St. Augustine was a zealous and influential deacon in the city of Carthage, interested in furthering the work of the Church and anxious for the best means of combatting heresies. From the manner in which Augustine speaks to him, it is evident that they had been friends over a period of years. Despite Quodvultdeus' claim that he was ignorant of worldly learning we can gather from his own use of the Latin language that he was a man of some training. This is the only positive knowledge we have of the recipient of the *De haeresibus*.⁵²

F. THE SOURCES OF THE *De haeresibus* AND AUGUSTINE'S USE OF THEM ¹

The two writers, Epiphanius and Filastrius, to whom Augustine had attempted to refer Quodvultdeus, are the basic sources for his own work on heresies. Augustine makes no attempt to dissimulate this fact, but mentions his sources on frequent occasions.

The first fifty-seven chapters are based primarily on Epiphanius (315-403), bishop of ancient Salamis in Cyprus. Two works bearing the name of Epiphanius are of concern to us in this present investigation: the *Panarion* (GCS 25, 31, 37), or *Medicine Chest*, and the *Anacephaleosis* (PG 42.853-886), or *Recapitulation* (of the *Panarion*). The *Panarion*, an authentic work of St. Epiphanius, is a survey of all heresies with a refutation of each. It is, however, of uneven worth. For the first three centuries, whenever the author does not use the information supplied by St. Irenaeus or St. Hippolytus, the *Panarion* is of little value. But for the middle years of the fourth century, from about 325 to 375, the author's own time, the work is of considerable worth. However, the refutations which follow the expositions are usually of little interest. The *Panarion* deals with eighty heresies; but to reach this number,

⁵² H. Weiskotten, *Vita Aug.* p. 167, n. 6 believing the deacon Quodvultdeus to be different from the bishop Quodvultdeus, is inclined to identify the bishop of Carthage with a bishop Quodvultdeus mentioned in Possidius *Vita* 30. It seems very improbable, however, that a man who was already bishop ca. 428 would have been elected to the see of Carthage after the death of Aurelius and of Capreolus.

¹ G. Bardy, "Le *De haeresibus* et ses sources," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2.397-416, has given an excellent treatment of this matter. To him I am indebted for most of the material on this subject unless otherwise noted.

which is the same as that of the concubines in the Cantic of Canticles (6.7), Epiphanius actually includes among his heresies a number of philosophical schools and Jewish sects: Epicureans, Stoics, Pharisees, etc. Epiphanius finished this work in 377. The *Anacephaleosis*, a much shorter work, is a summary of the *Panarion*, but it completely omits the refutations contained in the *Panarion*. Composed not by Epiphanius himself but by an unknown writer, it appeared shortly after the publication of the larger work.

Since we speak of Epiphanius as Augustine's primary source for his first fifty-seven heresies, we must clarify that point immediately. The work which Augustine used was not Epiphanius' *Panarion*, but its recapitulation, the *Anacephaleosis*, which, however, he considered authentic. This can be gathered from the preface to the *De haeresibus*, as well as from the various formal references he makes to Epiphanius. In his preface St. Augustine states that the work of Epiphanius contained no refutation of the heresies mentioned, and that it was a very short composition, too short even for the brevity which Quodvultdeus desired. These statements could not possibly refer to the *Panarion*, with its elaborate and detailed refutations. The work of which St. Augustine spoke was, without doubt, the *Anacephaleosis*. Further proof of this can be gathered from a comparison of Augustine's quotations from Epiphanius with corresponding passages of the *Anacephaleosis*. If we set 42 and 43 of the *De haeresibus* beside the treatment of the same heresies in the *Anacephaleosis* 63-64, it is immediately evident that Augustine is giving a literal translation. Even in sections where the name of Epiphanius is not mentioned we find literal translations of the *Anacephaleosis*: thus, chapters 20 on the Archontici, 29 on the Tessarescaedecatitae, 31 on the Adamians, 34 on the Melchisedeciani, 35 on the Bardessanists, 39 on the Angelici, and 47 on the Hieracites are translations of *Anacephaleosis* 40, 50, 52, 55, 56, 60, 80 respectively.

With the *Anacephaleosis* established as the work from which Augustine drew the bulk of his information for the first part of his work, there still remains the question of its authorship. Holl ²

² K. Holl, "Die Unechtheit der Anakephalaiosis," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 36.2 (Leipzig 1910) 95-98. For further consideration of the *Anacephaleosis* and Augustine's use of Epiphanius, cf. B. Altaner, "August-

has demonstrated the improbability of Epiphanius' responsibility for its production as follows:

The *Anacephaleosis* is a faithful epitome of the *Panarion*, or rather, almost nothing other than a compilation from the "recapitulations" which are to be found in Epiphanius' own work. Only in the beginning, that is, in the introduction and in the first part of the first book, are there passages taken out of the main work and placed one after the other. For the rest we have, simply repeated, the summaries Epiphanius himself had provided for the individual *tomoi*. But since, even in the summaries substantially repeated, there is very little verbal identity between the *Anacephaleosis* and the *Panarion*, the genuineness of the work is to be questioned, for it seems highly improbable that Epiphanius would have produced a synopsis of his *Panarion* which shows such individuality.

Yet, in behalf of Epiphanius' authorship of the *Anacephaleosis*, it should be observed that he had developed a repetitiousness which was almost a passion, and had an especial fondness for giving short summaries. Moreover, both the author of the *Anacephaleosis* and the *Panarion* use the first person in speaking, and the indications of time given in the *Panarion* are allowed to stand exactly the same in the *Anacephaleosis*. Thus we have the possibility that Epiphanius could have composed both works at the same time.

Yet the very passages which seem to show his authorship so clearly are in reality the proof for the contrary. The text of the *Panarion*, when used, is repeated word for word when it should have been adjusted to the context of the *Anacephaleosis*; the *Panarion* is spoken of as if it is yet to be written, and in such a tone as to indicate that this was an introduction to the *Panarion*; the announcement is made that refutations of the heresies will be given, which is true of the *Panarion*, but not of the *Anacephaleosis*; passages are given which make no sense outside of the *Panarion* and imply in their uses a lack of familiarity with the *Panarion* as a whole. Whatever charges of repetition, confusion of mind, or even of stupidity which one may try to level against Epiphanius, it seems that he could not have been guilty of the errors of this work. No

tinus und Epiphanius von Salamis. Eine quellenkritische Studie," *Museum Lessianum* Sect. hist. 13 (1951: Mélanges J. de Ghellinck I: Antiquité) 265-276.

mater how he rambles, or how confused he may seem at times, it must be admitted that Epiphanius is aware of what he writes and of what he has written. The author of the *Anacephaleosis*, on the other hand, thinks he has done enough when he has added parts of the *Panarion*, taken from the beginning and the end, to the "recapitulations" of Epiphanius and formed a useful handbook of the history of heresies.

Starting with 58, as Augustine himself tells us,³ Filastrius is the basis for the material on the remaining heresies except those otherwise noted. Though the point has been doubted,⁴ De Labriolle states that Filastrius quite evidently made use of the *Panarion* in his work, *De haeresibus liber*.⁵ On internal evidence the date of this work may be placed in the years between 385 and 391. Besides the *Panarion*, Filastrius drew on treatises written before his, notably the *Syntagma*, now lost, of St. Hippolytus.⁶ In his *De haeresibus liber* Filastrius treated 128 Christian heresies, which he divided into two series. In the first series he treated of the originators of the various heresies, or at least of those who were responsible for their propagation; in the second series he gave a résumé of heretical doctrines. In striving to balance the two series, 64 in each, Filastrius is guilty of repetitions. But St. Augustine, who had adopted the more chronological order of Epiphanius and preserved it to the end of his work, rejected some heresies which Filastrius gave, mentioning only the principal ones and those which appear less peculiar. Filastrius seemed to be intent on producing a work of great size, and for this purpose piled heresy upon heresy. On the other hand, Augustine, with a finer historical and critical sense, sought to treat only of real and positive heresies. This is evident from Augustine's own words: "Has haereses putavi in hoc opus meum de Filastri opere transferendas. Et alias quidem ipse commemorat, sed mihi appellandae haereses non videntur. Quaecumque autem sine nominibus posui, nec ipse earum nomina memoravit."⁷ Augustine

³ *De haer.*, 57: "Nunc ergo addo quas Filaster posuit, nec posuit Epiphanius." For a discussion of the name, "Filastrius," cf. Fridericus Marx, CSEL 38. viii-xi.

⁴ Cf. Bardenhewer, 3.483; Schanz, 4.1.395.

⁵ Cf. De Labriolle-Bardy, 1.434; cf. also Altaner, 322.

⁶ Altaner p. 322 does not agree that Filastrius used the *Syntagma*.

⁷ *Haer.* 80.

seems to speak in a tone of frustration of those anonymous heresies. As Bardy states,⁸ Augustine is suspicious of the imagination of writers who might have been led to invent heresies for the pleasure of refuting them. Augustine himself tells us that he considered Filastrius an inferior writer.⁹ Modern writers endorse this judgment of St. Augustine; they censure Filastrius' mediocrity in style and clumsiness of thought.¹⁰

With Chapter 81 a new division of Augustine's *De haeresibus* begins. He has drawn all he could from Epiphanius and Filastrius, and is now forced to employ other sources. In the case of recent heresies, however, he will be able to draw upon his own knowledge and experience. The Luciferians, the subject of this Chapter 81, present a problem for St. Augustine. No mention was made of them by Epiphanius or Filastrius, he reports, but a certain anonymous writer listed them as heretics.

Bardy¹¹ is convinced that 81 and 82 are derived from Pseudo-Jerome's *Indiculus de haeresibus* (Oehler 1.283-300) and that this same source is, along with Filastrius, the "anonymous" authority Augustine uses throughout the work. The following is his argument: Augustine quotes: "Luciferiani, inquit, cum teneant in omnibus catholicam veritatem in hunc errorem stultissimum prolantur, ut animam dicant ex transfusione generari, eandemque dicunt et de carne et de carnis esse substantia." These words are to be found in *Indiculus* 25. Is this one of the sources of the *De haeresibus*? Or has the author taken this from Augustine along with several other notices? The relations between these two works are too numerous to give a complete list. But we can, for example, compare *De haeresibus* 26: "De infantis anniculi sanguine quem de toto eius corpore minutis punctionum vulneribus extorquent quasi eucharistiam suam conficere perhibentur, miscentes eum farinae, panemque inde facientes; qui puer, si mortuus fuerit, habetur apud eos pro martyre, si autem vixerit pro magno sacer-

⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 407.

⁹ *Ep.* 222.

¹⁰ Cf. De Labriolle-Bardy, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne* (Paris 1947) 432-434, and Tixeront-Raemers, *Handbook of Patrology* (St. Louis 1947) 234-235.

¹¹ *Le De haer.* 407-411.

dote," and *Indiculus* 19: "Quotannis unum infantem anniculum perfectum offerunt, ac compuncto vulneribus eius corpusculo in farinam sanguinem eius suscipiunt, sicque panem huius ex scelestissimi frumenti admixtione facientes diabolicum edunt eucharistiae feralissimae sacramentum. Infans autem, si ex compunctione vulneris obierit, observatione martyrii colitur; si vixerit, pro veneratione summi sacerdotis aspicitur." Also *De haeresibus* 28: "Dicentes a primis hominibus oblationes de fructibus terrae et ovium fuisse celebratas," and *Indiculus* 20: "Dicentes a primis hominibus oblationem a fructibus terrae et a fructibus ovium fuisse celebratam."

Either Augustine had the *Indiculus*, or Pseudo-Jerome, the *De haeresibus* before him. Bardy takes issue with De Labriolle, who thought it possible to date the *Indiculus* after St. Isidore of Seville.¹² De Labriolle's argument is this: "The *Indiculus* and the work of Isidore of Seville are the only works which mention the Genistae and the Meristae among the heretics who existed before the time of Christ. The etymologies of the names of the sects given in the *Indiculus* are quite similar in manner to the etymologies which are characteristic of St. Isidore. It is probable then that Pseudo-Jerome employed the work of Isidore, and hence the *Indiculus* could not have been written before the beginning of the seventh century. Bardy's objections are these: The Genistae and the Meristae are mentioned by St. Justin in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (80.4). Furthermore, St. Isidore is, by no means, the only writer in antiquity who attempted to give etymologies and in particular both Augustine and Filastrius employed that device in explanation of the Ascitae and the Ascodrugitae. Moreover, that argument is completely overthrown, if it be true, as Dom Morin maintains, that Gennadius of Marseilles had known and used the *Indiculus*.¹³ Gennadius wrote around the year 480.¹⁴ Under these conditions, it is quite possible that the *Indiculus* had been written earlier and could have been employed by St. Augustine.

¹² P. De Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme* (Paris and Fribourg 1913) p. cxxxiv.

¹³ G. Morin, "Le liber dogmatum de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s'y rattachent," *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907) 445-455.

¹⁴ O. Bardenhewer, IV 596.

As further proof of the earlier date of the *Indiculus*, Bardy cites the opinion of G. Krüger,¹⁵ who claims that the originality in the choice of sources employed in the *Indiculus*, the non-use of the *De viris illustribus* of St. Jerome for numerous passages, etc., all demand an ancient and well-informed author. Bardy then concludes that it is more probable to suppose that St. Augustine, as the latter states himself, took his information from an earlier work which treated of the Luciferians than to imagine a later writer taking his inspiration for a new catalogue of heresies from the *De haeresibus*.

In criticism of both Bardy and De Labriolle, it may be observed that they seem to ignore a fact that demands recognition, namely that Augustine and the author of the *Indiculus* could have had a common source from which they both drew independently. Both Bardy and De Labriolle speak of the *Indiculus* as though it were a composition possessing the unity demanded of high literary forms. But this is not true. Catalogues of heresies are by their nature works of compilation. In their chronology and reliability, even in their form and language, compilations will be strongly influenced by their sources. Without positive evidence, it would be extremely hazardous to claim that Augustine had used the *Indiculus*.

In Chapter 83 Augustine makes mention of Eusebius' *Church History* as a work which lay before him. Augustine's actual words are worth citing for the problem they raise:

Cum Eusebii historiam scrutatus essem, cui Rufinus a se in latinam linguam translatae subsequentium etiam temporum duos libros addidit, non inveni aliquam haeresim quam non legerim apud istos nisi quam in sexto libro ponit Eusebius, narrans eam exstitisse in Arabia. Itaque hos haereticos, quoniam nullum eorum ponit auctorem, Arabicos possumus nuncupare: qui dixerunt animas cum corporibus mori atque dissolvi et in fine saeculi utrumque resurgere. Sed hos disputatione Origenis praesentis et eos alloquentis celerrime dicit fuisse correctos.

Bardy states that Augustine's reference in these words is to the Greek text, or that at least we are not justified in maintaining that he used the translation of Rufinus.¹⁶ This conclusion seems hardly justifiable. Most scholars are of the opinion that Augustine's

¹⁵ *Luzifer, Bischof von Calaris und das Schisma der Luziferianer* (Leipzig 1886) 65.

¹⁶ Bardy, *op. cit.* 411.

knowledge of Greek was limited; therefore to conclude from the text cited that Augustine was using the Greek of Eusebius seems highly conjectural. Certainly Bardy's contention that the words of Augustine in this chapter: "dixerunt animas cum corporibus mori atque dissolvi" are closer to the Greek of Eusebius: τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν . . . συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι than to Rufinus' rendering: "animas hominum . . . cum corporibus interire pariter et corrumpi," cannot be maintained. On this point Bardy was justly criticized by B. Altaner,¹⁷ who states that it still remains to be proved that Augustine used the original Greek of Eusebius, and that this can be done only by a critical examination of the sources. On the basis of his own investigations, Altaner states that he can find no grounds for Bardy's supposition.

The *De haeresibus* of St. Augustine is not much more than a catalogue of the heresies from the time of Christ to his own days. Beginning with the Simonians and concluding with the Pelagians, Augustine counted eighty-eight heresies. For the most part, his descriptions are quite brief. But in writing of the Manicheans, Donatists, Pelagians, and several others with whom he had a personal familiarity, he goes into considerable detail, relying on his own knowledge and experience. The historical outline for his earlier heresies is based on Epiphanius. But it must be added that Augustine omits the first twenty heresies given by Epiphanius, beginning his own work with the Simonian, which is the twenty-first in the *Panarion*. The reason for this is evident enough. Augustine began his work with the errors that followed the Incarnation, whereas Epiphanius started with the Old Testament period. From this point on, however, the two lists do not differ except in very rare instances, e. g., after Chapter 22 Augustine omits Lucan, the disciple of Marcion, and in Chapter 25 unites the Tatians and Encratites, while Epiphanius treats them as two different sects. On the other hand Augustine gives Chapter 28 to the Artotyrites, though his model put them with the Pepuzians in his Chapter 49. Augustine omits the Marcellians who are numbered seventy-two in Epiphanius, and also the Collyridians, who hold seventy-ninth

¹⁷ "Augustinus und Eusebius von Kaisareia," in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 60 Geburtstag gewidmet) 44 (1950) 1-6.

place in the *Panarion*. He places the Photinians next to the Paulinists because these two taught the same doctrine, and in so doing he adopted the order of Filastrius in preference to that of Epiphanius. However, as previously noted, Augustine is rather free in his use of Filastrius. Always the careful writer, Augustine takes pains to inform the reader of his procedure. If he abandons the order used in the source, he makes note of this; if he disagrees with the opinion of an author, or prefers one to another, Augustine declares his stand, e. g., in 39, 49, 50, 51, 53, 57.

But we are not to think that where Augustine accepts Epiphanius he does so in servile fashion, for there is ample proof throughout his work that he exercised judgment and discernment in the use of this source. The word "perhibetur" or "traditur" is employed frequently whenever he wishes to cast some doubt on a categorical statement of the author of the *Panarion*. It is quite evident that Augustine was much stricter in treating unverifiable traditions, or materials on which he had no sure conviction. In various instances he adds to or substitutes for the testimony of Epiphanius information which he has garnered from other writers. In the first fifty-seven chapters, Eusebius is cited twice (10, 22); Filastrius quite often, either directly by name (41, 45, 53), or indirectly and anonymously (compare Aug. 23 with Fil. 47; 27 with 49; 52 with 67). At other times it is impossible to identify his source, but it seems certain that he was in some instances inspired by others than Epiphanius, Filastrius, or Eusebius, e. g., in Chapter 19.

G. THE *De haeresibus* AND ST. AUGUSTINE'S KNOWLEDGE OF GREEK

The question of St. Augustine's knowledge of Greek has occupied modern scholars considerably. The *De haeresibus* has an important bearing on this much discussed problem, for in this work we are confronted with St. Augustine's use of the Greek text of the abridgment of Epiphanius' *Panarion*, the *Anacephaleosis*. There cannot be much doubt that Augustine translated it from the Greek. Augustine had proposed sending Quodvultdeus Epiphanius' book on heresies, "Vide ergo ne forte librum sancti Epiphanii tibi mittere debeam . . . qui possit apud Carthaginem in latinam linguam verti facilius atque commodius, ut tu potius praestes nobis quod quaeris

a nobis.”¹ Evidently it was not an easy matter to have it translated in Hippo, for Augustine would have been happy to have Quodvultdeus procure him a translation of the work. But Quodvultdeus pleaded the same excuse and his own ignorance of Greek, “Frustra etiam homini qui latina non didici, Graeca facundia delegatur . . . quid autem Venerationem tuam de interpretum difficultate, sed etiam obscuritate admoneam, cum ipse hoc magis ac plene dijudices?”² The *De haeresibus* was Augustine’s answer to the appeal of Quodvultdeus. On his own admission Augustine drew heavily on Epiphanius for his first fifty-seven heresies.³ The most logical conclusion to be drawn is that Augustine translated Epiphanius himself. The *De haeresibus*, written about 428, is one of the writings of his old age and, therefore, can serve as valuable evidence for the extent of his knowledge of the Greek language.

But, before commenting on the material translated from the Greek which is employed in the *De haeresibus*, it would be well to review current opinions regarding Augustine’s knowledge of Greek. Marrou and Courcelle⁴ are the latest scholars to deal with the whole problem. According to Marrou it is quite certain that Augustine was not without some smattering of Greek. Throughout his various works we find him citing Greek terms and giving explanations of them. Quite often he refers to the Greek text of Holy Scripture in his commentaries on the Bible, either to clarify the sense of the Latin, to correct it, or to propose new translations made on the Greek.⁵ We even see him in the *Contra Julianum Pelagianum* 1.6 and 2.6 (PL 44.656) reporting on the original text of St. John Chrysostom’s *Homilies to the Neophytes* and giving a translation from the Greek. All of this presumes some knowledge of Greek, but certainly there is no justification for presuming that he had mastered the language. The Greek terms and explanations which Augustine gives are no indication of a firm grasp of the

¹ *Ep.* 222.2.

² [Aug.] *Ep.* 223.2.

³ *Haer.* 57.

⁴ H. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris 1938); P. Courcelle, “Saint Augustin et l’Hellénisme en Afrique,” Ch. 2 *Les lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (2nd ed. Paris 1948).

⁵ Cf. D. de Bruyne, “Saint Augustin Reviseur de la Bible.” *Misc. Agos.* II 521-606 for a detailed discussion of St. Augustine and the Bible.

language. For the most part they consist of elementary words and simple etymologies, technical terms of grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, which had long been common in the language of the West, and terms proper to the language of the Church. Augustine knew enough Greek to serve him in scholarly work, to enable him to verify Latin translations by referring to the Greek text, especially the Septuagint. Augustine knew Greek, but he did not know it well enough to have access to the treasures of Greek literature.⁶

After Marrou's book had appeared, Courcelle published a new study of the question of Augustine's knowledge of Greek and of his continuous progress, in his later years, in its study.⁷ We know from Augustine himself that he had studied Greek in his youth, but without much profit.⁸ But in his writings we find him making use of Greek with varying degrees of success. This is particularly noticeable in his commentaries on the Holy Scripture, a fact which led Courcelle to make a systematic investigation of these writings on a chronological basis. The results of his examination have given us a much clearer picture of Augustine's knowledge of Greek, and have strengthened the conviction that the learned bishop had made a determined effort to improve his grasp of the language in the later years of his life. A short résumé of Courcelle's work will be of great help to the understanding of the matter in reference to the *De haeresibus*.

The commentaries which employ no Greek or use it only exceptionally are the first in date, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (389-390), *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, *De sermone Domini in monte* and the three *Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul* (394-395), *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* (396-397), *Quaestiones Evangeliorum*, *Adnotationes in Job* and *De consensu Evangelistarum* (ca. 400), *De Genesi ad litteram* (401-415). The remarks which the Greek text of the Scriptures suggests to Augustine are those which could occur to anyone who knew at least the alphabet and the rudiments of Greek. But it seems incredible that anyone who really knew Greek would have limited himself to such simple applications and would not have used the Greek for expla-

⁶ Marrou, 27-46.

⁷ Courcelle, 137-209.

⁸ *Conf.* 1.14 (CSEL 33.20 f.).

nations of really difficult matters which the Greek could have solved. In his nonexegetical treatises of the same period we find a similar hesitancy and imperfection in the use of Greek which certainly indicates a very limited knowledge of the language.

In view of these facts the texts in which Augustine speaks of his ignorance of Greek and which have occasioned so much discussion become clear. In the *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (400)⁹ and the *Contra litteras Petiliani* (401-403)¹⁰ he puts himself in the category of those who know very little Greek. In 394 he urged St. Jerome¹¹ to make the work of the Greek commentators on Holy Scripture available to himself and the clergy of North Africa, who were unable to read those works in Greek—at least with any facility. In the *De trinitate*, begun in 400, he is still pleading the difficulty which Greek gives him, “. . . Graecae autem linguae non sit nobis tantus habitus, ut talium rerum libris legendis et intelligendis ullo modo reperiamur idonei . . .”¹²

Perhaps it was the lack of suitable translations of the Greek commentators and the criticism which his first books of the *De trinitate* and his first *Enarrationes in Psalmos* occasioned which determined Augustine to renew his study of Greek. At any rate, fifteen years later we find him declaring that Greek is the most beautiful language in the world.¹³ His progress in the language is attested by the publication of the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and the *Tractatus in Joannem* in 416, the *Quaestiones* and *Locutiones in Heptateuchum* in 419, where the recourse to the Greek is both frequent and habitual. In these works we find St. Augustine giving small essays on various aspects of the Greek language; case, gender, number, syntax, semantics, etc. He shows all the characteristics of a man filled with the natural enthusiasm and pride of learning newly acquired. He has become familiar enough with the Greek of the Scriptures (*ca.* 419) to compare the various passages where the word *πνοή* is taken in different senses.¹⁴ He judges that the Latin language is poor in comparison with the Greek (*Quaest. in*

⁹ 2.6 (CSEL 25.260 f.).

¹⁰ 2.38.91 (CSEL 52.75).

¹¹ *Ep.* 28.2 (CSEL 34.105-107).

¹² 3. prooem. 1 (PL 42.868).

¹³ *Quaes. in Heptat.* 7.37 (CSEL 28².470-472).

¹⁴ *De natura et origine animae* 1.14.19 (CSEL 60.319 f.).

Heptat. 2.116).¹⁵ He proposes his own views on the comparative grammar of the two languages (*En. in Ps.* 118.29.9).¹⁶ He has even progressed far enough to propose his own theory of translation.¹⁷

As Courcelle claims, we must agree that at this stage of his life Augustine is far from his earlier ignorance of Greek. He now has enough knowledge of the language to control a Latin translation with the intelligent use of the Septuagint. But we must admit that it is a very bookish knowledge, which leans heavily on the dictionary and grammar. He has no marked facility in the language and in difficulty has recourse to those who speak the language. His activity in the Pelagian controversy forced Augustine to refer constantly to the works of Greek theologians. In this way he continued to perfect his knowledge of Greek and gradually gained the reputation of being a Greek scholar among the clergy of North Africa. In the *Contra Julianum* 5.2.7¹⁸ he put himself in the category of those who know Greek. His attitude towards the Pelagians was that of a master correcting and interpreting the writings of the ecclesiastical writers. In these latter years of his life he had arrived at the position of being able to translate directly from the Greek not only the Scriptures, but also extracts of those ecclesiastical authors which appeared in the works he happened to be reading. Translations of this stage of his development give us a fairly clear idea of the Greek he had acquired. His translations are very literal and not very good. In many instances he is forced to transliterate a word, when he cannot get the Latin equivalent. On numerous occasions we see him groping for the right words to translate a Greek expression and not succeeding too well. It would seem that for St. Augustine Greek was never anything more than a language acquired from books.

Marrou's conclusions, as reviewed ten years after the publication of his thesis, and reflecting the different reactions to his earlier work, are substantially those of his earlier work. However, it is interesting to see Marrou's comments on Courcelle's discussion of

¹⁵ CSEL 28³.167 f.

¹⁶ PL 37.1588.

¹⁷ *Sermo* 319.3 (PL 38.1441); *En. in Ps.* 50.19 (PL 36.597 f); *En. in Ps.* 104.8 (PL 37.1394 f); *De civ. Dei* 14.9.4 (CSEL 40³.22).

¹⁸ PL 44.785.

Augustine's knowledge of Greek.¹⁹ In general he approves of Courcelle's arguments, but with certain reservations, which, to my own mind, are justified. We must admit that between 400 and 415 Augustine had succeeded in perfecting his knowledge of Greek, for about 415-416 we see in Augustine's works a practical mastery of Biblical Greek, a control which is really sufficient for the work in which he was then engaged. It is remarkable that in a life so occupied he had the determination and the power to perfect his knowledge of Greek. How he did it, we do not know. Marrou further observes there were Greeks in Hippo at the time from whom Augustine might have learned the language, but we have nothing to prove that any of them were living and working with Augustine. Finally, the extent of the improvement in Augustine's knowledge of Greek in his later years should not be exaggerated.

Admitting that Augustine had noticeably improved his working knowledge of Biblical Greek by 416-419, we must still recognize, according to Marrou, that he did not know Greek perfectly enough. Courcelle is the first to admit this. It appears very significant that in Augustine's *Ennaratio in Psalm. 118*, an elaborate work datable around 418, his recourse to the Greek is both irregular and hesitant. Normally Augustine works on the basis of the Latin Bible; when he does refer to the Greek text, it is with effort and not always with profit. It may be true that in the *De civitate Dei* he translated from the *Enneads* of Plotinus, but Courcelle is too enthusiastic in maintaining that Augustine had read them all in the original.²⁰ His knowledge of the Greek classics, philosophers, and Fathers was limited enough and was based essentially on Latin translations. It is exceptional to see Augustine attempt to translate a Greek text without the aid of a translation. The few instances which we have of this are confined to short and fairly easy texts, some lines of the *Sibylline Oracles* and the *Antiquities* of Josephus. It is true that the Pelagian controversy helped him to continue his progress, but even there he relied heavily on translations of the Greek Fathers. In one work only do we see him using an entire Greek work apparently without the aid of a translation, the *De*

¹⁹ *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique. "Retractatio"* (Paris 1949) 631-637.

²⁰ *Les Lettres grecques en Occident*, 161-162.

haeresibus, in which, as he tells us, Epiphanius is his primary source for the first fifty-seven heresies.

Courcelle on the other hand would leave us with the impression that Augustine acquired a considerable facility in Greek before the end of his life.²¹ This, however, does not appear justified by any of the texts cited, nor particularly by the one work which is in great part a translation from the Greek, the *De haeresibus*. Courcelle himself speaks of the Greek translated in Augustine's *De haeresibus* in uncomplimentary terms.²² We should, therefore, speak with more reserve of Augustine's final mastery of Greek, for the *De haeresibus* was one of his latest works and must certainly reveal the final stages of his knowledge of the language.

Marrou gives a very convenient summary of his view of the whole problem: ²³ By 415-416 St. Augustine had acquired enough Greek to be able to compare a Latin translation with its Greek text, to verify and correct it. He could even venture on occasion to read a Greek text without the help of a translation. But we can be sure of this only in regard to short and easy texts. His recourse to the Greek of the Scripture is not constant and regular, for his readings and verifications correspond to precise and definitely limited objects. His knowledge of Greek ecclesiastical writers and of profane Greek literature and philosophy was based primarily on translations.

In the light of this re-examination of the problem supplied by Marrou and Courcelle we can understand the way in which St. Augustine was brought to translate the work of Epiphanius, and something of the linguistic equipment he possessed. Through years of conscientious study and application he had perfected his knowledge of Greek to serve him in his theological studies. It was a limited knowledge, but sufficient for its purpose. As he was called upon to explain and interpret various passages in Greek works for the clergy of North Africa, Augustine acquired a reputation for his

²¹ *Ibid.* 182: "Pendant longtemps il semble continuer de les [auteurs grecs] lire en s'aidant au besoin d'une traduction; mais à la fin de sa vie, il n'a plus même ouvert." *Ibid.* 194: "Il lui faut attendre ses dernières années pour pouvoir lire et traduire couramment le grec."

²² *Ibid.* 152. "Sa traduction d'Épiphanes est aussi littéraire, mais n'est pas plus heureuse: elle recèle de véritables fauxsens, et l'on sent qu'Augustin a souvent cherché en vain l'équivalent du terme grec."

²³ *Retractatio* 637.

skill in that language. Hence it is not surprising to find Quodvult-deus urging him to a task which involved the translation of a Greek work. But with all due credit to the saint and scholar, it is commonly admitted that his translation is mediocre. St. Augustine has no grand facility in the language, as this work reveals. And he does experience difficulty in finding the right word and expression at times. As an example of this we may compare *De haeresibus* 3 with the corresponding passage of the *Anacephaleosis* (PG 42. 856B): “. . . mundum solos angelos septem praeter conscientiam Dei Patris fecisse dicebat.” *Sententiam*, not *conscientiam* would have been the better translation for γνώμην. *De haeresibus* 42 renders the corresponding passage of the *Anacephaleosis* (PG 42. 868A): “Turpis autem sunt operationis; isti sunt inenarrabilia facientes.” The expression “turpis operationis” is not the best translation for ἀσχηροποιόι and “nefanda,” not “inenarrabilia” [which is in the MSS. cf. Bened. text 8.12. n.h.], is the better word for ἀρρήτοποιούντες.²⁴ This work of Epiphanius is one of the short and fairly easy texts which Marrou admits Augustine could have handled, one which would not have strained his powers too much. It is a short and easy text, for the heresies which Augustine took from Epiphanius cover only ten columns in the Migne Edition (PG 42.854-874). The information given is brief and the Greek uncomplicated. Augustine certainly deserves credit for the work he did in this regard, but the difficulty he must have encountered in translating definitely indicates the sad condition to which the knowledge of Greek had sunk by the early fifth century. Augustine was a renowned scholar with the best of education the West could then afford and a man of the highest intellectual powers, yet he was capable of handling Greek only in limited and hesitant fashion and acquired even this restricted knowledge only late in life.

H. ST. AUGUSTINE'S CONCEPT OF HERESY

The term, *haeresis*, is of such obvious importance to the proper understanding of St. Augustine's *De haeresibus* that we must give some attention to the history of its usage. The term, *schisma*, will also enter into our consideration, but only in so far as an examination of its use will help us to define *haeresis* more precisely. Both

²⁴ Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident* 152, n. 7.

words, referring to ecclesiastical dissensions, are of Greek origin, but, though *haeresis* had already appeared in classical Latin,¹ *schisma* only entered the Latin language in Christian writers of the third century. As we shall see, *αἵρεσις* was used in a metaphorical sense. But *σχίσμα* was slow in coming into tropical use, the meaning of disunion, disagreement, appearing for the first time in the New Testament. However, the verb *σχίζειν*, to split or cleave had been used in the metaphorical sense by Herodotus² and Xenophon³ when speaking of division of opinions. *σχίσμα*, the corresponding noun, kept the simple meaning of its root⁴ until its use in St. John's Gospel⁵ and the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians⁶ to designate certain disturbances within the Church. It was still to be found in the simple meaning of tear or rent,⁷ but, when applied metaphorically, it was taken to signify a form of disagreement which had not yet resulted in complete separation.⁸ It did not mean a sect or body separated from the Church, but a party within the Christian community, a clique.

1. *The Meaning of αἵρεσις Prior to the New Testament*

In classical Greek the word *αἵρεσις*, derived from the active meaning of the verb *αἵρεῖν*, meant simply "a taking," as "the taking of Babylon" and "the taking by the king."⁹ But the word is used even more frequently in the sense obtained from the middle voice *αἵρεσθαι*, to take for oneself, to choose. On this basis we find *αἵρεσις* used for choice,¹⁰ choice in the election of magistrates,¹¹ choice in the sense of inclination, purpose, course of action or of thought.¹²

¹ Cic. *Paradoxa* 2.

² 7.219.

³ *Symp.* 4.59.

⁴ Aristotle *Historia animalium*, 499*27; Theophrastus *Historia plantarum* 3.11.1.

⁵ 7.43; 9.16; 10.19.

⁶ 1 Cor. 1.10; 11.18; 12.25.

⁷ Matt. 9.16; Mark 2.21.

⁸ F. Zorell, *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (2nd ed. Paris 1931) s.v. *σχίσμα*.

⁹ Herodotus 9.3.2 (cf. 4.1.1).

¹⁰ Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 779; Pindar, *Nemean* 10.82, etc.

¹¹ Thucydides 8.89; Aristotle, *Politica* 1266a26.

¹² Plato, *Phaedrus* 256c.

In Hellenistic Greek the objective meaning of the word becomes prominent, indicating the object of intellectual choice, that is, "teaching" or "school."¹³ The relation of this meaning of *αἵρεσις* to *αἵρεσθαι* can be easily seen, if we remember that the *αἵρεσις* of the philosopher, which in antiquity always included the choice of a given mode of life, applied also to his teachings to which others gave their consent. Implied in this concept was the notion of a community accepting the self-appointed authority of some teacher, the relative and private character of his teachings and their validity.¹⁴ In the Septuagint the word shows no departure in meaning from the figurative classical sense of "choice," "freewill."¹⁵ But, as the use of the word extended in Hellenistic Greek, we find Jewish writers in Greek reflecting the extensions in meaning. Hence it is not surprising to discover Philo using the word to describe the Therapeutae, a Jewish sect, as a noble, philosophical association.¹⁶ And Josephus viewed all the religious groups of the Jews in the light of the Greek philosophical school.¹⁷ It is quite possible that Josephus' liking for comparisons influenced him in the choice of this term, a choice which was justified by the actual similarity of the Jewish groups to the Greek in their fundamental structure. The corresponding term in Rabbinical language of the time was *minim*, and like *αἵρεσις* in Josephus, it was a general expression for the reform movements and party divisions in Judaism, without any note of disapproval or blame. But soon the word *minim*, probably because some of the groups began to stray from orthodox Rabbinical tradition, was used for the parties which were opposed by the Rabbis.¹⁸ It hereby gained the meaning of heterodox, a meaning which was certainly bound to influence its Greek counterpart *αἵρεσις* in the Judaeo-Hellenistic communities of the early Church.

¹³ Polybius 593.8; Diodorus Siculus 2.29.

¹⁴ Schlier in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, s.v. *αἵρεσις*, p. 180.

¹⁵ Gen. 49.5; Lev. 22.18, 21; 1 Mach. 8.30.

¹⁶ *Vit. Cont.* 29.

¹⁷ *BJ.* 2.8.1; *Vit.* 12, 191, 197; *Ant.* 13, 171 etc.

¹⁸ Schlier, *op. cit.* p. 181.

2. *aípeous* in the New Testament

In the Acts of the Apostles, the word is used in practically the same sense as it is in Josephus, that is, to designate a party or sect within Judaism. However, as Prat indicates,¹⁹ there is an unfavorable connotation in four of the six instances in which the word appears in Acts. "But the high priest rose up, and all those who were with him (that is the *party* of the Sadducees), and being filled with jealousy seized the Apostles and put them in the public prison."²⁰ "But some of the Pharisees' *sect*, who had accepted the Faith, got up and said, 'They must be circumcised and also told to observe the Law of Moses.'"²¹ In presenting the case of the Jews against Paul, Tertullus used these words, "We have found this man a pest, and a promoter of seditions among all the Jews throughout the world and a ringleader of the sedition of the Nazarene *sect*."²² Paul answered that the charges could not be proved against him and went on to indicate that their appellation of his religious practices as a *aípeous* was unjustified; "But this I admit to thee, that according to the Way, which they call a *sect*, so I serve the God of my fathers; believing all things that are written in the Law and the Prophets, having a hope in God which these men themselves also look for, that there be a resurrection of the just and the unjust; and in this I too strive always to have a clear conscience before God and before men."²³ The remaining two instances in which Acts employs the word, show it in the completely neutral sense of Josephus' sect, or school, and it is important to note that, while the Vulgate preserved the transliterated form, *haeresis*, for the first four uses of the term, these last two "according to the strictest *sect* of our religion I lived a Pharisee"; (*secundum certissimam sectam nostrae religionis vixi Pharisaeus*),²⁴ and "But we want to hear from thee what thy views are: for as regards this *sect*, we know that everywhere it is spoken against," (*Rogamus autem a te audire quae sentis: nam de secta hac notum est nobis quia ubique ei contradicitur.*),²⁵ were rendered in the Vulgate by *secta*. In view of the etymology of the word, the Hellenistic connotations of private

¹⁹ In *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Paris (1903) s.v. "Hérésie," p. 607.

²⁰ 5.17-18.

²¹ 24.5.

²² 26.5.

²³ 15.5

²⁴ 24.14-16.

²⁵ 28.22.

teaching and individual choice of doctrine, and the Rabbinical views of the unorthodoxy of such groups, it is not surprising to find St. Luke in Acts using the term in a pejorative reference to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who had opposed the teachings of Christ. Orthodoxy was being defined in terms of conformity with the law and its fulfillment in Christ: "Do not think that I have come to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I have come not to destroy, but to fulfill."²⁶ Moreover, the Divine Savior had already warned His disciples of the teachings of these groups, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. . . . Then they understood that he bade them beware not of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and the Sadducees."²⁷ It is quite evident that the word, *αἵρεσις*, had already begun to take on something of the meaning of heterodox in Christian terminology. The remaining three instances of the use of *αἵρεσις* in the New Testament—two from St. Paul, the third from the Second Epistle of Peter—serve to strengthen this conviction. "For first of all I hear that when you meet in church there are divisions (*σχίσματα*) among you, and in part I believe it. For there must be factions (*αἵρέσεις*), so that those who are approved may be made manifest among you."²⁸ It is possible that the two words are synonymous here, for the Greek commentators drew no distinction between the two in this passage. But the Latin Fathers and the majority of modern exegeses hold that the *σχίσματα* mentioned are passing differences, while *αἵρέσεις* signified more radical views affecting the whole conduct of life.²⁹ Allo, admitting that it is difficult to establish positively what St. Paul intended by *αἵρέσεις* in this passage, maintains that the divisions spoken of are more serious than mere "schisms." The "schisms" spoken of are the result of vanity, of egotism inconsistent with the life of humble Christians. But if allowed to progress they could develop into the systematic hostilities of opposing sects. Seeing in these words of St. Paul a grave threat, Allo considers the *αἵρέσεις* to be of the nature of real heresy, for the type of reproach directed to the proud Corinthians (especially in chapters 3, 4, 15) shows clearly enough that their pretensions

²⁶ Matt. 5.17.

²⁷ Matt. 16.6-12.

²⁸ 1 Cor. 11.18-19.

²⁹ Prat. *op. cit.* p. 608.

to knowledge could easily lead them into grave doctrinal errors.³⁰ The next use of the term appears in the Epistle to the Galatians 5.20: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are immorality, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, jealousies, anger, quarrels, factions, parties etc." This enumeration of the works contrary to charity begins with a general term and reaches a climax in the word "parties" (*αἵρεσις*). The position of the word in the ascending scale and a comparison with 1 Cor. 11.19, where *αἵρεσις* are graver than *σχίσματα*, indicate that we are again dealing with more serious breaches of union. Here the factions spoken of are clearly less serious than the parties. The factions could arise among those who have the same convictions; the parties suppose insurmountable intellectual differences.³¹ The last appearance of *αἵρεσις* in the New Testament is to be found in the Second Epistle of St. Peter 2.1. "But there were false prophets also among the people, just as among you there will be lying teachers who will bring in destructive *sects* (*αἵρεσις*)." Here we have to do not with mere coteries dividing the faithful, but with pernicious errors, spread by false teachers and leading to destruction, heresies in the full sense of the word.³²

To sum up, though the word is not actually defined nor used in an absolutely technical sense, it is evident that in the New Testament *αἵρεσις* is employed there to signify breaks in the Christian Community much more serious than the party strife, coteries or cliques of "schism." *Αἵρεσις* implied erroneous doctrine, introduced by men, who, in defiance of the authority of the Christian Community, arrogated to themselves the right to teach. This is the sense to be found in the writings of the Apostles, and the sense which becomes crystalized in the writings of the Fathers.

³⁰ E. B. Allo, O. P. *Saint Paul, Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris 1934) 270-271.

³¹ M. J. Lagrange, O. P. *Saint Paul, Épître aux Galates* (3rd ed. Paris 1926) 151.

³² J. Chaine, *Les Épîtres Catholiques*, "La Seconde Épître de Saint Pierre" (Paris 1939) 58-59.

3. *The Concept of Heresy in Ecclesiastical Writings from the Apostolic Fathers to Augustine*³³

We can see from the references of the Fathers to false teachings that the term "heresy" to signify perversion of true Christian belief was adopted and maintained from the close of the Apostolic Age. St. Ignatius quotes Onesimus as congratulating the Ephesians because they all live according to the truth and heresy (*αἵρεσις*) has no place among them.³⁴ He urged the Trallians to avoid Docetism "that strange herbage, which is a heresy (*αἵρεσις*)."³⁵ For St. Irenaeus, heretics falsify the word of God³⁶ and prefer their own personal views to the teaching of the Gospel.³⁷ Tertullian is still more precise: "He [the Apostle] . . . sharply condemns heresies [*haereses*], of which the practical effects are false doctrines called in Greek *αἵρεσις*, a word used in the sense of that choice which a man makes when he either teaches them or takes up with them";³⁸ "to innovate on the Faith, as was agreeable to their own pleasure."³⁹ Though the Fathers of the Church were more concerned with combatting heresies and false doctrines than they were with definitions of the same, we can see in their writings that they understood heresy to be a corruption of the true doctrine, proceeding from the fact that the heretic substitutes his own private judgment for the teachings of the Church. St. Ambrose calls heretics "enemies of the truth," "assailers of the Faith."⁴⁰ St. Jerome gives the etymology of heresy: "It is so called from the word 'choice' because each one chooses for himself that teaching which he prefers."⁴¹ He repeats in substance the same explanation in his commentary on the Epistle to Titus and distinguishes heresy from schism: "Inter haeresim et schisma hoc esse arbitran-

³³ Cf. Harry Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian* (Nijmegen 1938) 110-135.

³⁴ *Ad Eph.* 6.21 (PG 5.649).

³⁵ *Ad Trall.* 6.11 (PG 5.680B).

³⁶ *Contra haer.* 1. Prooem. 1.1; 3.11.9 (PG 7.438; 890).

³⁷ *Ibid.* 3.12.11 f (PG 7.905 f).

³⁸ *De Praescrip.* 6.2 (CSEL 70.8).

³⁹ *Ibid.* 42.8 (CSEL 70.54 f).

⁴⁰ *In Ps. 118, sermo 13.* 6 (CSEL 62.284).

⁴¹ *Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.* 3.19-21 (PL 26.417).

tur, quod haeresis *perversum dogma* habeat, schisma propter *episcopalem dissensionem ab ecclesia separetur*, quod quidem in principio aliqua ex parte intellegi potest. Ceterum nullum schisma non sibi aliquam confingit haeresim, ut recte ab ecclesia recississe videatur.”⁴² With St. Augustine we shall find the conviction that schism leads to heresy developed still further.

From the foregoing it is evident that in the centuries preceeding Augustine the Greek term, in its transliterated form *haeresis*, had been adopted by Christians employing the Latin language. Moreover, from the time of Tertullian to that of Jerome there had been no essential change in the meaning of the word. Its signification had become fixed for the Latins to designate a departure from doctrine. But it must be noted, however, that the word was not always employed in that strictly technical sense by all Christian authors, and that in less precise language it could be confused with “schism.”⁴³ This fact can be appreciated by a consideration of St. Cyprian’s usage of the two words. In Letters 69 and 70 (CSEL 3².749-770), Novatian and his followers are called heretics as often as they are called schismatics. Very often *haereses* and *schismata*, *haeretici* and *schismatici* are united in pairs.⁴⁴ On the basis of Cyprian’s oratorical practice, Watson attempted to prove that the two words were synonymous in the works of this author.⁴⁵ Bayard,⁴⁶ however, denies this conclusion, maintaining that in oratory a word can be used synonymously without need of absolute identity of the words so used. For St. Cyprian as well as for the African bishops of his time, there was this difference between heresy and schism, namely that heresy concerned the Faith, but schism did not. In proof of his statement, Bayard refers to Cyprian’s *Testimonia* 3. tit. 86: “That schism must not be made, even though he who secedes remain in one faith and in the same tradition.” He then points to Cyprian’s justification for the rejection of Marcionite

⁴² *Ep. Tit.* 3.10 f (PL 26.596 f).

⁴³ H. Pétré, “Haeresis, schisma et leurs synonymes latins,” *Revue des études latines* 15 (1937) 316-319.

⁴⁴ *Ep.* 3.3; 59.5; 66.5; etc. (CSEL 3².471.6; 671-673; 730).

⁴⁵ E. W. Watson, *The Style and Language of St. Cyprian* (Oxford 1896) 294.

⁴⁶ L. Bayard, *Le latin de saint Cyprien* (Paris 1902) 182 f.

baptism: "If we and heretics [*nobis et haereticis*] have one faith, it is also possible to have one grace." ⁴⁷

The fact that the two words are often found together or used one for the other lies in the fact that their etymological meaning was still quite apparent to Cyprian; schism had the notion of tear or rupture; heresy, that of choice, personal preference, or adhesion to a sect. A person could not become a heretic without breaking the bond of unity, without making a rupture in the Christian Community. In the same way the schismatic could not break with the Church without following his own personal preference or forming a party. Yet, in spite of this close connection between the two, heresy is more serious than schism, as we can see from the additional references given by Bayard to prove his contention: "errore deposito et schismatico, immo haeretico furore deserto;" ⁴⁸ "cum vero nulla omnino haeresis se neque [ne . . . quidem] aliquod schisma habere salutaris baptismi sanctificationem foris possit, in tantum Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura prorupti et etiam de Marcionis baptismo . . . contendebat filios Deo nasci." ⁴⁹

4. *St. Augustine's Use of the Term*

In considering St. Augustine's use of the term "haeresis" we find the same elements present in his concept which marked the use of the word from Apostolic times. For him heresy was an attack on the Faith, while schism was a violation of unity: "Heretics [*haeretici*] by holding false notions concerning God violate the Faith itself; and schismatics, on the other hand, by unrighteous rendings asunder, break away from brotherly love, although they believe the same things as ourselves." ⁵⁰ In this passage we have a definite application of the etymology of schism. Furthermore, in the *City of God* Augustine speaks of heresy with the *αἵρεσις* of the philosopher in mind: "But the devil seeing the temples of the demons deserted, and the human race running to the name of the liberating Mediator, has moved the heretics [*haereticos*] under the Christian name to resist the Christian doctrine, as if they could be kept in the City of God indifferently without any correction; just as the City of Confusion indifferently held the philosophers who

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 73.4. (CSEL 3^a.781). ⁴⁸ *Ep.* 74.7. (CSEL 3^a.804 f.).

⁴⁹ *Ep.* 51.1. (CSEL 3^a.614). ⁵⁰ *De fide et symbolo*, 21. (CSEL 41.27 f.).

were of diverse and adverse opinions. Those, therefore, in the Church of Christ who savor anything morbid and depraved, and on being corrected that they may savor what is wholesome and right, contumaciously resist, and will not amend their pestiferous and deadly dogmas, but persist in defending them, become heretics [*haeretici*], and, going without, are to be reckoned as enemies who serve for her discipline."⁵¹ Again we have the insistence on erroneous doctrine, even after correction. The same notion of error with the implication of self-choice is evident in the following: "It [*haeresis*] will try to do away with the doctrine of the Apostles, to which its own error is opposed."⁵² The traditional distinction between heresy and schism is clearly made in his attack on Gauden-
tius, the Donatist bishop: "Denique quando aliena peccata vos perverse devitanda esse censuistis, alia vestra fecistis, sacrilegum schisma populos dividendo, et sacrilegam haeresim contra Dei manifesta promissa et impleta de Ecclesia toto orbe diffusa nefario spiritu sentiendo."⁵³

But what has been said of the synonymous use of the terms "heresy" and "schism" in the works of St. Cyprian and other Fathers of the Church can also be applied to St. Augustine. Both heresy and schism were attacks on the unity of the Church; schism, being a more general term, could include the division occasioned by heresy. Therefore, it is not surprising to find St. Augustine using them interchangeably at times, particularly in passages marked by rhetorical style. But it does not seem correct to speak of a fluctuation in Augustine's notion of heresy, or to say that the difference between heresy and schism was not too precise for him. Guibert, in support of this view, refers to *Sermo* 37.27 f. in which Augustine in speaking against the Donatists compares the heretics to the Church and admits that they have the same sacraments, the same Scriptures—for the most part, the same Creed and practically the same Baptism. What they lack is charity. Heresies are the fruit of the flesh, charity is the fruit of the Spirit.⁵⁴ Certainly

⁵¹ *De civitate Dei*, 18.51 (CSEL 40².351 f.).

⁵² *C. Faust. Man.* 32.17 (CSEL 25.777 f.).

⁵³ *C. Gaud.* 2.9.10 (CSEL 53.266).

⁵⁴ "La notion d'hérésie chez St. Augustine," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 21 (1920) 374. This position is also held by Silvia Jannaccone, *La dottrina eresiologicala di S. Agostino*. 15.

this cannot be construed as a rejection of his former notion of heresy. He is using rhetorical language in speaking of the Donatists, whose errors were not glaringly manifest, as they would have been, had they been directed against specific points of the Creed. These heretics did have much in common with the Catholic Church in belief and ritual. Their basic errors concerned the constitution of the Church.

Another key passage for this discussion appears in the *Contra Cresconium*, 2.3.4: "You only have heresy," claimed Cresconius, "when people follow divergent views." Then he gave definitions of heresy and schism: "Heresy is a sect of men who follow different opinions. . . . Between us, then, for whom Christ died and rose again, there is but one religion and the same sacraments; there is no diversity in our Christian observances. Ours, then, is a schism, not a heresy." Augustine accepted this distinction, and then applied it point by point to the Donatists. In 2.7.9 of the same work, Augustine says: "As a matter of fact, I rather prefer that distinction between heresy and schism which regards the latter as a recent split in a community owing to some difference of opinion (for, of course, you cannot have a schism unless those who cause it adhere to divergent opinions) whereas *heresy is a schism grown old*. But why should I labor this point when the definition you have offered me is such a priceless gift that if you and yours will agree to stand by it I would prefer to call you schismatics rather than heretics." This passage is used by Guibert to substantiate his claim that Augustine's notions of the distinction between heresy and schism were not too clear.⁶⁵ However, there does not seem to be anything lacking in clarity here. Augustine has accepted a definition which he himself has often used, and in the case of the Donatists in North Africa added a new definition which peculiarly fits their case—a definition which corresponds with the feeling of St. Jerome in his commentary on the *Ep. Tit.* 3.11: "Nullum schisma non sibi aliquam confingit haeresim." (There is no schism which does not fashion some heresy for itself.)

Miss Mohrmann maintains that Augustine rejected the definitions and distinction made by Cresconius and that, though some difference in the two concepts existed for Augustine, the difference

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.* 375.

was not clear and distinct: "Hieraus ergibt sich, dass der Unterschied zwischen Haeresis als dogmatische Uneinigkeit und Schisma als Uneinigkeit disziplinärer Art zu Augustins Zeiten zwar gemacht wurde, dass Augustin diesem aber nicht beipflichtete. Wir gewinnen den Eindruck, dass für Augustins Sprachgefühl allerdings ein gewisser Unterschied zwischen beiden Wörtern existiere, . . . dass dieser Unterschied aber keineswegs klar und scharf war . . ." ⁵⁶ In view of the circumstances, this conclusion of Miss Mohrmann seems hardly justified. Augustine's words "*magis enim distincti-onem approbem*" do not have to be taken in the sense of a complete rejection of the older, traditional distinction. The fact that Augustine had used it himself on numerous occasions and that in his *De haeresibus* he clearly distinguishes the heretical from the non-heretical militates against this. It would seem that his new distinction could be explained on the grounds of a special application of terms to the Donatists. Augustine had been dealing with the Donatists for many years. Though their heresy had not been formally assessed and condemned by the Church, still theirs was a schism which had much of the heretical about it: The sacraments could be conferred only by worthy ministers, baptism outside their church had to be renewed, only the good could truly be members of the Church. The first two points were at least suspect of heresy, for they entailed a denial of the *ex opere operato* nature of the sacraments, the last was a misunderstanding of the nature of the Church. Therefore, Augustine was convinced of the heretical nature of this so-called schism. Two facts seem to have lead to the *Contra Cresconium* definition: (1) Augustine knew well that schism is not heresy, but his experience with the Donatists led him to recognize that schism leads to heresy. Perhaps he had in mind St. Paul's admonition to the Corinthians, "I hear that when you meet in Church there are divisions among you, and in part I believe it. For there must be factions, so that those who are approved may be made manifest among you." ⁵⁷ The Apostle had already pointed the way in which unrestrained divisions could develop into more serious breaches. (2) In the latter days of Donatism severe penal

⁵⁶ *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin* Erster Teil (Nijmegen 1932) 153.

⁵⁷ 1 Cor. 11.18-19. Cf. *supra alpeis* in the New Testament," p. 40-42.

laws had been enacted against heresy. The members of this sect wished by no means to fall under the penalties. Without doubt this was the reason why Cresconius was so emphatic in his protest against the term "heretics" applied to the members of his sect. Augustine, trying to win the Donatists by reason and charitable admonition, sought to point out the nature and inevitable course of schism. His "*haeresis autem schisma inveteratum*" was both explanation and warning.

The element of error, as we have seen, is basic to the concept of heresy. At the beginning of the *De haeresibus* Augustine states that there is no heresy without some error, but not every error is necessarily heresy. In the *De gest. Pelag.* 6.16-18 (CSEL 42.68-71) we have an explanation of this: Errors in natural science could not be considered heretical, for they are indifferent in reference to matters of faith. Such errors could only be heretical if theological conclusions were drawn from them, e. g., if a person were to claim that the eagle tests its young by making them gaze at the sun, he could not be convicted of heresy, only of foolishness. But if he were to conclude from this that birds have rationality because of the transmigration of human souls to animals, he certainly would be in theological error. But, on the other hand, "There are a great many foolish things said by foolish and ignorant persons, which yet fail to prove them heretics." (*Multa vero etiam stulta dicuntur ab imperitis et vanis nec tamen haereticis.*) In such cases men err through frivolity, not obstinacy. Obstinacy and bad will are necessary for heresy. The Pelagians tried to confuse this issue by refusing to see the Faith involved in the discussions they had provoked.⁵⁸ Augustine allowed for discussions in theological matters, admitting that there were points concerning which one could remain in ignorance or propose inexact conjectures without danger to the Faith.⁵⁹ But, whoever, like the Pelagians, attacks specific articles of faith "in ipsa regula fidei, qua Christiani sumus" has overstepped the limits which Revelation has set to human discussion.⁶⁰ There is no need of the decision of a Church Council to put the brand of heresy on a false dogma, as the Pelagians claimed;

⁵⁸ *De peccato originali* 23.26 f (CSEL 42.184-186).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.* 29.34 (193 f).

conflict with ordinary teaching of the Church and its Fathers suffices.⁶¹

In the struggles of Augustine against the two great heresies of his day, Donatism and Pelagianism, two methods of determining theological error are evident. Some errors are immediately recognizable as heretical, for they attack the foundations of the Faith and the accepted teachings of the Church, as Pelagianism did. Others are not quite as apparent, for instance, the rebaptism of the Donatists. For these we must await the reaction of the Church, either in conciliar decrees or in the universal teaching of its bishops.⁶²

The *De haeresibus* itself is of great importance in determining Augustine's concept of "heresy." It was written in the last years of a life continuously occupied in clarifying the Faith and analyzing error. It is the fruit of Augustine's mature judgment in the study of "heresy." He intended no mere compilation based on the works of former writers, but a critical dogmatic work in which, as he tells us himself, he tried to single out individuals or groups regarded as really heretical.⁶³ It becomes evident immediately in the *De haeresibus* that Augustine envisioned a heresy as a concrete sect, not a heretical proposition, since he speaks of the individual members of the sect rather than of the tenets they hold. This, perhaps, can explain why Augustine does not seem at pains to detail each and every error of the individual heresy. The particular error or errors which distinguish the one heresy from others and give it its individuality are presented, but with the omission of many points which are to be found in his sources.

We are given his reasons for considering certain groups as heretics in Chapters 40, 43, 50, 57, 68, 81, 86. Let us consider them in order:

Chapter 40: "The Apostolici are heretics, because, separating themselves from the Church, they think that they who make use of the things from which they themselves abstain have no hope of salvation." They teach doctrines which are contrary to the "regula fidei."

⁶¹ *Contra duas epp. Pelag.* 4.12.34 (CSEL 60.569 f.).

⁶² Guibert, *op. cit.* 34.

⁶³ Cf. *De haeres.* Chapters 40, 50, 57, 68, 81.

Chapter 43: "But there are other teachings of this Origen which the Catholic Church does not accept at all." Again, we have errors against the faith, justifying the application of the term heresy.

Chapter 50: "Epiphanius intends those whom he called Vadianites to be regarded as schismatics, not heretics. Others call them Anthropomorphites because in their material-mindedness, they fashion a god for themselves in the likeness of mortal men. Epiphanius attributes this to their ignorance, thus saving them from being called heretics." This group is heretical because of their errors on the nature of God. But it is important to note that they were saved from the title of heresy through their ignorance. This is an indication that Augustine has "formal heresy" in mind.

Chapter 57: "They go to such extremes in this prayer that they are thereby judged worthy of being named among the heretics." Extraordinary departure from common practice indicates an heretical interpretation of Christian belief.

Chapter 68: "Therefore, this is a heresy, because they do not walk this way for bodily mortification, but because they interpret Divine Revelation in such fashion." Their heresy is due to faulty exegesis in serious matter.

Chapter 81: "Now, whether he believed, and rightly believed that they should be listed among the heretics for what they believe concerning the soul, if they really hold such an opinion; or again whether they are still heretics, even if they did not or do not hold such an opinion, because they maintain their schism with stubborn animosity, is another question, and as far as I can see, it is not to be treated here."

Guibert takes this passage as another justification for his stand that Augustine has the definition "schisma inveteratum" in mind.⁶⁴ It does not seem to be so as far as I can determine. Here Augustine is faced with a problem which he has not yet settled for himself—the origin of the human soul;⁶⁵ and he would still like to investigate the implications of stubborn animosity in regard to dissensions. Quite characteristically, he considers the problems in relation to the work at hand and decides against the advisability of

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.* 379.

⁶⁵ *De anima et eius origine*, 4.24.38 (CSEL 60.417-419).

treating them at this time. There is the indication that they must receive further study.

Chapter 86: "Tertullian became a heretic because in joining the Cataphrygians, whom he had earlier demolished, he also began to condemn, contrary to Apostolic teaching, second marriage as debauchery." The reason for this heresy was teachings contrary to ecclesiastical doctrine and tradition.

On the basis of the material cited we can agree with Batiffol that for St. Augustine "heresy" consisted in the formal and obstinate negation of a truth, the profession of which is, in the judgment of the Church, a condition of unity.⁶⁶ Specht has formulated a similar concept in his definition of Augustine's "heretic": "A heretic in the genuine and strict sense, or a formal heretic, is one who, under the cloak of the Christian name, obstinately and knowingly maintains an error concerning Christian teaching." It is clear that the emphasis is given to the deliberate and stubborn maintenance of error. Where these elements are not present, we can have no question of heresy. Only he is a heretic, says Augustine, who, though the truth of Catholic doctrine has been presented to him, still prefers to oppose his own objections to it.⁶⁷ Specht is speaking of the individual heretic, but he does present faithfully the basic elements in the Augustinian concept of heresy.⁶⁸ In the *De haeresibus*, then, we are to expect the treatment of sects which taught essential errors radically opposed to Christian dogmas or which obstinately maintained extreme practices despite ecclesiastical condemnation.

⁶⁶ *Le Catholicisme de saint Augustin* (Paris 1920) 240.

⁶⁷ *De bapt. c. Don.* 4.16.23. Cf. *De gest. Pel.* 6.18; *De anima et eius orig.*, 3, 15, 23. etc.

⁶⁸ Thomas Specht, *Die Lehre von der Kirche nach dem H. Augustin* (Paderborn 1892) 95-97. Cf. p. 273.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

SANCTI AURELII AUGUSTINI
HIPPONENSIS EPISCOPI
DE HAERESIBUS AD QUODVULTDEUM LIBER UNUS

<PRAEFATIO>

Quod petis saepissime atque instantissime, sancte fili Quod-
vultdeus, ut de haeresibus aliquid scribam dignum lectione
cupientium dogmata devitare contraria fidei Christianae et
Christiani nominis obumbratione fallentia, scias me olim longe
5 antequam peteres facere cogitasse, atque fuisse facturum, nisi
diligenter considerans quale quantumque id esset, ultra vires
meas esse sentirem. Sed quoniam fateor nullum mihi ut te
instituisse poscendo, in ipsa tam molesta instantia tua etiam
tuum nomen attendi et dixi, "Aggrediar et faciam quod vult
10 Deus." Hoc enim Deum velle confido, si me ad huius operis
terminum misericordiae favore perduxerit, ut per ministerium
linguae meae tanta huius rei difficultas aut ostendatur tantum-
modo aut, ipso etiam plenius adiuvante, tollatur. Quorum
duorum quod priore loco posui, iam diu est ut animo volvo
15 ac revolve, et quadam meditatione contueor. Quod autem postea
dixi, non me accepisse confiteor. Et utrum dum hoc ago ut
efficiam, dum peto, dum quaero, dum pulso, sim fortasse accep-
turus ignoro. Scio me tamen nec petiturum nec quaesiturum
ac pulsaturum quantum sat est, nisi et hunc affectum munere
20 divinae inspirationis accepero.

In hoc igitur opere, quod te vehementer urgente in Dei
voluntate suscepi, cernis me ut id peragam non tam crebre-
scentibus ad me tuis petitionibus esse cogendum, quam piis ad
Deum non solum tuis, verum et aliorum fratrum quos tibi
25 in hanc rem fideles socios potueris invenire orationibus adiu-
vandum. Quod ut fiat, has ipsas primas huius laboris mei

THE BOOK OF ST. AUGUSTINE, BISHOP OF HIPPO,
TO QUODVULTDEUS ON HERESIES

PREFACE

My dear son, Quodvultdeus, in reference to your frequent and persistent requests for a book on heresies, appropriate for the reading of those who are anxious to shun teachings contrary to the Christian faith yet capable of deceiving because of the misappropriation of the name Christian, I would like you to know that long before you asked me, I had contemplated doing this, and would have done it had I not, after due consideration of its nature and magnitude, believed it beyond my powers. But since I must admit that no one has been so insistent in their requests of me as you have, I gave heed to your name as well as to your incessant demands and said to myself, "I shall try, and I shall do what God wills." Now, this, I am sure, is the will of God if with His tender solicitude He brings me to the successful completion of this task, that through my words a simple demonstration of the immense difficulty of this project may be achieved, or, even more, that with His fuller assistance the difficulty may be surmounted. Of these two aims, the first one mentioned I have been turning over and over in my mind for a long time, and after considerable thought I am beginning to get some comprehension of it. But the second, I must admit, has not been granted me. Whether, while I am working to bring the first to completion, while I am begging, seeking, knocking, the second shall be granted me, I do not know. Moreover, I realize that I shall not be able to beg, seek, or knock availingly, unless I also receive this favor by gift of divine inspiration.

Now then, in this work which I have undertaken at your earnest solicitation and in accordance with the will of God, you can see that there is not so much need of forcing me to its accomplishment by your frequent petitions as there is of aiding me by pious prayers to God, not only by your prayers, but also by the prayers of other brethren whom you have been able to make your faithful associates in this matter. For this purpose I have taken the trouble, with the help of God, to make haste in sending you, dearly beloved, the first

partes ubi est ista praelocutio curavi tuae Caritati in auxilio Domini accelerare mittendas, ut propter illa quae restant noveritis quantum pro me orare debeatis, quicumque nosse
 30 potueritis a me iam fuisse susceptum hoc tam grande negotium quod a me desideratis impleri.

Petis ergo, quod tuae indicant litterae quas ad me dedisti cum primum a me petere ista coepisti, ut exponam "breviter, perstricte atque summatim, ex quo Christiana religio hereditatis promissae nomen accepit, quae haereses fuerint, sint; quos
 35 errores intulerint, inferant; quid adversus Catholicam ecclesiam senserint, sentiant de fide, de Trinitate, de baptismo, de paenitentia, de homine Christo, de Deo Christo, de resurrectione, de novo et vetere testamento." Istas autem inquisitiones tuas
 40 in immensum procedere cum videres, putasti cuiusdam generalitatis adhibendum esse compendium, atque dixisti, "et omnia omnino quibus a veritate dissentiunt." Deinde addidisti, "quae etiam baptismum habeant, quaeve non habeant; et post quas baptizet nec tamen rebaptizet ecclesia; qualiter suscipiat veni-
 45 entes, et quid singulis lege, auctoritate atque ratione respondeat."

Haec omnia cum quaeris ut exponantur a me, miror luculentum ingenium tuum tot tantarumque rerum et sitire veritatem, et fastidium iam timendo poscere brevitem. Sed vidisti
 50 etiam ipse quid hoc loco possem tuae huius epistolae cogitare, et quasi vigilanter occurristi cogitationi meae dicens, "Nec me tantae Beatitudo tua credat ineptiae ut non inspiciam quantis et quam ingentibus voluminibus opus sit ut possint ista dissolvi. Verum hoc ego fieri non expecto, id enim multipliciter
 55 factum esse non dubito." Et tanquam consilium subiiciens quomodo possit et servari brevis et veritas pandi, adiungis ea verba quae paulo ante iam posui et dicis, "Sed breviter, perstricte atque summatim opiniones rogo cuiuslibet haeresis poni et, quid contra teneat ecclesia Catholica, quantum instructioni satis
 60 est, subdi." Ecce iterum mittis in longum, non quia dici ista breviter sive non valent, sive non debent, sed quia tam multa sunt ut, quamlibet breviter dicenda, multas litteras flagitent.

sections of my work which contains the preface, that all of you, realizing that this vast project which you want me to discharge has been started, may understand how much you ought to aid me to its completion by your prayers.

Well then, as the letter expressing your first requests states, you ask me to set forth "briefly, concisely and summarily, beginning with the time when the Christian religion received its title to the promised inheritance, what heresies have existed and still do; what errors they have introduced and still do; what opinions they have held **in opposition to the Catholic Church** and still do, on faith, on the Trinity, on baptism, on penance, on the humanity of Christ, on the divinity of Christ, on the Resurrection, on the New and the Old Testament." Then, realizing that your questions were running on without limit, it seemed to you that some general summary had to be employed, and you said, "and absolutely everything in which they oppose the truth." Then you added, "Those, too, that recognize baptism, and those that do not; and those after which the Church baptizes, and yet does not rebaptize; in what manner she receives those who come to her from these heresies, and what answer she gives them individually in law, authority, and reason."

In your appeal for an exposition of all these points, I admire the keenness of your mind thirsting after so many important matters, yet from the beginning, in fear of boredom, requesting brevity. However, you yourself, foreseeing what I might think in relation to this point of your letter and vigilantly anticipating my thought, said, "Let not your Beatitude think that I am so stupid that I cannot perceive how many vast volumes are needed for the treatment of these matters. But I do not expect you to do this, for I have no doubt that this has been done many times." And as if offering suggestions as to how I might maintain brevity and yet reveal truth, you append those words which I quoted a little while ago, saying, "**But I ask that the tenets of each heresy be set down, briefly, concisely, and summarily, and that enough be added in the way of enlightenment on what the Catholic Church holds in opposition.**" Here you are putting me to a lengthy task again, not because it is impossible or improper to speak of these matters briefly, but because their number is so great that no matter how briefly they are to be treated they demand extensive writing. More-

Tu autem, "ut velut quodam," inquis, "ex omnibus concepto
 commonitorio, si quis aliquam objectionem aut convictionem
 65 uberius, plenius ac planius nosse voluerit, ad opulenta et mag-
 nifica volumina transmittatur, quibus a diversis et praecipue,"
 inquis, "a Veneratione tua in hoc ipsum constat esse elabor-
 atum." Quae cum dicis, unum quasi commonitorium de his
 omnibus te desiderare significas. Audi ergo unde commonearis
 70 quid petas.

Opiniones omnium philosophorum qui sectas varias condi-
 derunt usque ad tempora sua (neque enim plus poterat) sex
 non parvis voluminibus quidam Celsus absolvit. Nec redarguit
 aliquem, sed tantum quid sentirent aperuit ea brevitate sermonis,
 75 ut tantum adhiberet eloquii, quantum rei nec laudandae nec
 vituperandae, nec affirmandae aut defendendae, sed aperiendae
 indicandaeque sufficeret; cum ferme centum philosophos nomi-
 nasset quorum non omnes instituerunt haereses proprias quoniam
 nec illos tacendos putavit qui suos magistros sine ulla dissen-
 80 sione secuti sunt.

Noster vero Epiphanius, Cyprius episcopus, abhinc non longe
 humanis rebus exemptus, de octoginta haeresibus loquens, sex
 libros etiam ipse conscripsit, historica narratione memorans
 omnia, nulla disputatione adversus falsitatem pro veritate decer-
 85 tans. Breves sane sunt hi libelli, et si in unum librum redigan-
 tur, nec ipse erit nostris vel aliorum quibusdam libris longitu-
 dine comparandus. Huius brevitatem si fuero in commemorandis
 haeresibus imitatus, quid a me brevius postulare vel expectare
 debeas non habebis. Sed non ibi huius mei laboris summa
 90 consistit, quod et tibi, vel me demonstrante vel etiam te prae-
 currente, poterit apparere cum hoc fecero. Videbis enim in eo
 quod supradictus episcopus fecit quantum desit operi quod ipse
 vis fieri quanto magis quod ego! Tu namque quamvis "breviter,
 perstricte atque summatim," tamen vis etiam responderi com-
 95 memoratis haeresibus, quod ille non fecit.

Ego vero hoc magis volo facere, si et deus velit, unde possit
 omnis haeresis, et quae nota est et quae ignota, vitari, et unde
 recte possit quaecumque innotuerit iudicari. Non enim omnis

over, you say, "so that by a kind of comprehensive handbook whoever wishes to know some objection or proof more amply, more profoundly, more clearly, can be referred to the full and imposing volumes in which, as we all know, by various writers and especially," you say, "by Your Reverence, great pains have been taken towards this very end." In saying this, you imply that you desire a single handbook to deal with all these. Now then, let me describe the kind of reference book you are seeking.

A certain Celsus comprised in six large volumes the opinions of all philosophers who had founded various schools up to his own times (for he could do no more than that). He did not refute any of these but gave a simple explanation of the tenets of each, treating each one briefly but adequately, neither praising nor censuring, neither affirming nor defending, but merely setting them forth and describing them; for he had named nearly a hundred philosophers, not all of whom had founded their own individual sects, convinced that he should not pass over in silence even those who followed their masters without disagreement.

Furthermore, our own Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, who died not long ago, in treating of eighty heresies also wrote six books, narrating everything in historical fashion without any refutation of error nor defense of the truth. These books of Epiphanius are really short, and if they were to be incorporated into one book, it could not even be compared in length to certain books of our own or of others. If I imitated his brevity in my treatment of heresies, you would have nothing from me that you could properly ask or expect to be shorter. But the chief aim of my work does not consist in this, as I myself will show you, or as it will become clear to you when you peruse what I have written. You will certainly see how much the above-mentioned bishop falls short respecting the kind of work which you desire in comparison with my own more ambitious aims. Now you still wish a refutation of the heresies mentioned, though it be brief, concise, and summary, but Epiphanius made no such refutation.

As for myself, I want to do more than this: I want to furnish a means, if it is also God's will, of avoiding every heresy, be it known or unknown; and likewise the means of judging each one as it makes its appearance. For not every error is a heresy, although

error haeresis est, quamvis omnis haeresis quae in vitio ponitur
 100 nisi errore aliquo haeresis esse non possit. Quid ergo faciat
 haereticum regulari quadam definitione comprehendi, sicut ego
 existimo, aut omnino non potest aut difficillime potest. Quod
 in processu huius operis declarabitur, si Deus rexerit atque ad
 id quod intendo perduxerit disputationem meam. Quid autem
 105 prosit ipsa inquisitio, etiamsi non potuerimus comprehendere
 quomodo sit definiendus haereticus, suo loco videndum atque
 dicendum est. Nam si hoc comprehendi potuerit, quis non videat
 utilitas quanta sit? Erunt ergo primae partes operis huius de
 haeresibus quae post Christi adventum et ascensum adversus
 110 doctrinam ipsius exstiterunt, et utcumque nobis innotescere
 potuerunt. In posterioribus autem partibus, quid faciat haereti-
 cum disputabitur. Cum ergo Dominus ascendisset in caelum,
 hi haeretici exorti sunt:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Simoniani. | 23. Apellitae. |
| 2. Menandriani. | 24. Severiani. |
| 3. Saturniniani. | 25. Tatiani, vel Encratitae. |
| 4. Basilidiani. | 26. Cataphryges. |
| 5. Nicolaïtae. | 27. Pepuziani, alias Quintiliani. |
| 6. Gnostici. | 28. Artotyritae. |
| 7. Carpocratiani. | 29. Tessarescaedecatitae. |
| 8. Cerinthiani, vel Merinthisani. | 30. Alogii. |
| 9. Nazaraei. | 31. Adamiani. |
| 10. Ebionaei. | 32. Elcesaei, et Sampsaei. |
| 11. Valentiniani. | 33. Theodotiani. |
| 12. Secundiani. | 34. Melchisedeciani. |
| 13. Ptolemaei. | 35. Bardesanistae. |
| 14. Marcitae. | 36. Noëtiani. |
| 15. Colorbasii. | 37. Valesii. |
| 16. Heracleonitae. | 38. Cathari, sive Novatiani. |
| 17. Ophitae. | 39. Angelici. |
| 18. Caiani. | 40. Apostolici. |
| 19. Sethiani. | 41. Sabelliani, sive Patripassiani. |
| 20. Archontici. | 42. Origeniani. |
| 21. Cerdoniani. | |
| 22. Marcionitae. | |

every heresy which is grounded in vice cannot be a heresy except because of some error. Therefore, in my opinion, it is absolutely impossible, or exceedingly difficult, to comprise in any strict definition what constitutes a heretic. This I shall demonstrate in the course of this work if God guides and brings my discussions to the conclusion I hope for. The usefulness of this inquiry, even though we be unable to know how to define a heretic, must be seen and discussed in its own proper place. Now, if this is understood, is there anyone who cannot perceive its great worth? Therefore, the first part of this work will be devoted to the heresies contrary to the doctrines of Christ which have come into existence since His Birth and Ascension, insofar as we have been able to gain knowledge of them. In the second part, we shall discuss what constitutes a heretic. Now then, since the Ascension of the Lord into heaven, these heretics have arisen :

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. The Simonians. | 23. The Apellitae. |
| 2. The Menandrians. | 24. The Severians. |
| 3. The Saturninians. | 25. The Tatians or Encratites. |
| 4. The Basilidians. | 26. The Cataphrygians. |
| 5. The Nicolaïtes. | 27. The Pepuzians or Quintil- |
| 6. The Gnostics. | lians. |
| 7. The Carpocratians. | 28. The Artotyrites. |
| 8. The Cerinthians or Merin- | 29. The Tessarescedecatitae. |
| thians. | 30. The Alogi. |
| 9. The Nazarenes. | 31. The Adamites. |
| 10. The Ebionites. | 32. The Elcesaites and Samp- |
| 11. The Valentinians. | saeans. |
| 12. The Secundiani. | 33. The Theodotians. |
| 13. The Ptolemaei. | 34. The Melchisedechians. |
| 14. The Marcosians. | 35. The Bardesanists. |
| 15. The Colorbasii. | 36. The Noëtians. |
| 16. The Heracleonites. | 37. The Valesians. |
| 17. The Ophites. | 38. The Cathari or Novatians. |
| 18. The Cainites. | 39. The Angelici. |
| 19. The Sethians. | 40. The Apostolici. |
| 20. The Archontics. | 41. The Sabellians or Patripas- |
| 21. The Cerdonians. | sianists. |
| 22. The Marcionites. | 42. The Origenists. |

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 43. Alii Origeniani. | 73. Christi divinitatem passibilem dicentes. |
| 44. Pauliani. | 74. Triformem Deum putantes. |
| 45. Photiniani. | 75. Aquam Deo coaeternam dicentes. |
| 46. Manichaei. | 76. Imaginem Dei non esse animam dicentes. |
| 47. Hieracitae. | 77. Innumerabiles mundos opinantes. |
| 48. Meletiani. | 78. Animas converti in daemones et in quaecumque animalia existimantes. |
| 49. Ariani. | 79. Liberationem omnium apud inferos factam Christi descensione credentes. |
| 50. Vadiani, sive Anthropomorphitae. | 80. Christi de Patre nativitati initium temporis dantes. |
| 51. Semiariani. | 81. Luciferiani. |
| 52. Macedoniani. | 82. Iovinianistae. |
| 53. Aëriani. | 83. Arabici. |
| 54. Aëtiani, qui et Eunomiani. | 84. Helvidiani. |
| 55. Apollinaristae. | 85. Paterniani, sive Venustiani. |
| 56. Antidicomaritae. | 86. Tertullianistae. |
| 57. Massaliani, sive Euchitae. | 87. Abeloitae. |
| 58. Metangismonitae. | 88. Pelagiani, qui et Caelestiani. |
| 59. Seleuciani, vel Hermiani. | |
| 60. Proclianitae. | |
| 61. Patriciani. | |
| 62. Ascitae. | |
| 63. Passalorynchitae. | |
| 64. Aquarii. | |
| 65. Coluthiani. | |
| 66. Floriniani. | |
| 67. De mundi statu dissidentes. | |
| 68. Nudis pedibus ambulantes. | |
| 69. Donatistae, sive Donatiani. | |
| 70. Priscillianistae. | |
| 71. Cum hominibus non manducantes. | |
| 72. Rhetoriani. | |

Cap. 1. SIMONIANI a Simone Mago, qui baptizatus a Philippo diacono, sicut in Actibus Apostolorum legitur, pecunia voluit a sanctis Apostolis emere ut etiam per impositionem manus eius daretur Spiritus Sanctus. Hic magicis fallaciis

- | | |
|--|--|
| 43. Other Origenists. | 73. Those who maintain that Christ's Divinity was passible. |
| 44. The Paulianists. | |
| 45. The Photinians. | 74. Those who believe that God is of three natures. |
| 46. The Manichaeans. | 75. Those who maintain that water is co-eternal with God. |
| 47. The Hieracites. | 76. Those who maintain that the soul is not the image of God. |
| 48. The Meletians. | 77. Those who believe that there are innumerable worlds. |
| 49. The Arians. | 78. Those who believe that souls are changed into demons and certain animals. |
| 50. The Vadiani or Anthropomorphitae. | 79. Those who believe in the liberation of all souls in hell by the descent of Christ. |
| 51. The Semi-Arians. | 80. Those who ascribe a temporal beginning to the Nativity of Christ from the Father. |
| 52. The Macedonians. | 81. The Luciferians. |
| 53. The Aërians. | 82. The Jovinianists. |
| 54. The Aëtians or Eunomians. | 83. The Arabici. |
| 55. The Apollinarists. | 84. The Helvidians. |
| 56. The Antidicomarianites. | 85. The Paterniani or Venustiani. |
| 57. The Massalians or Euchites. | 86. The Tertullianists. |
| 58. The Metangismonites. | 87. The Abelites. |
| 59. The Seleucians or Hermians. | 88. The Pelagians, who are also called the Celestines. |
| 60. The Proclianitae. | |
| 61. The Patriciani. | |
| 62. The Ascitae. | |
| 63. The Passalorynchitae. | |
| 64. The Aquarians. | |
| 65. The Coluthiani. | |
| 66. The Floriniani. | |
| 67. Those who disagree on the condition of the universe. | |
| 68. Those who walk barefoot. | |
| 69. The Donatists or Donatians. | |
| 70. The Priscillianists. | |
| 71. Those who do not eat with men. | |
| 72. The Rhetoriani. | |

Chap. 1. The Simonians were named from Simon Magus, who upon his baptism by Philip the deacon, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, wanted to buy the power from the Holy Apostles to confer the Holy Spirit with his own hands also. He had deceived

- 5 deceperat multos. Docebat autem detestandam turpitudinem indifferenter utendi feminis. Nec Deum fecisse mundum dicebat, negabat etiam carnis resurrectionem. Et asserebat se esse Christum; idemque Iovem se credi volebat Minervam vero meretricem quamdam Helenen, quam sibi sociam scelerum
 10 fecerat. Imaginesque et suam et eiusdem meretricis discipulis suis praebebat adorandas. Quas et Romae tanquam deorum simulacra auctoritate publica constituerat. In qua urbe apostolus Petrus eum vera virtute Dei omnipotentis exstinxit.

Cap. 2. MENANDRIANI, a Menandro etiam ipso mago discipulo eius, qui mundum asserebat non a Deo, sed ab angelis factum.

Cap. 3. SATURNINIANI a quodam Saturnino qui turpitudinem Simonianam in Syria confirmasse perhibetur, qui etiam mundum solos angelos septem praeter conscientiam Dei Patris fecisse dicebat.

- Cap. 4. BASILIDIANI a Basilide qui hoc distabat a Simonianis, quod trecentos sexaginta quinque caelos esse dicebat quo numero annus includitur. Unde etiam quasi sanctum nomen commendabat, quod est $\alpha\beta\rho\sigma\alpha\xi$. Cuius nominis litterae secundum Graecam supputationem eundem numerum complent, sunt
 5 enim septem, α et β et ρ et α et σ et α et ξ id est unum et duo et centum et unum et ducenta et unum et sexaginta quae fiunt in summa trecenta sexaginta quinque.

- Cap. 5. NICOLAÏTAE a Nicolao nominati sunt, uno, ut perhibetur, ex illis septem quos Apostoli diaconos ordinaverunt. Iste cum de zelo pulcherrimae coniugis culparetur, velut purgandi se causa, permisisse fertur ut ea qui vellet uteretur. Quod
 5 eius factum in sectam turpissimam versum est, qua placet usus indifferens feminarum. Hi nec ab iis quae idolis immolantur cibos suos separant, et alios ritus gentilium superstitionum non aversantur. Narrant etiam quaedam fabulosa de mundo, nescio quae barbara principum nomina miscentes disputationibus suis

many by his sorcerer's craft, and taught the abominable practice of possessing women in common. He also maintained that God had not made the world, and he denied the resurrection of the body. He asserted that he was Christ and likewise desired to be considered Jupiter, while a certain harlot, Helen, whom he had made an accomplice in his crimes, was to be considered Minerva. Images of himself and of this harlot he offered to his disciples for adoration. Even at Rome, with public authorization, he set up these images as likenesses of gods. In this city the Apostle Peter destroyed him by the true power of Almighty God.

Chap. 2. The Menandrians were named from Menander, also a magician and a disciple of the former, who maintained that the world was made not by God, but by angels.

Chap. 3. The Saturniniani were named from a certain Saturninus, who is said to have established the shameful doctrine of Simon in Syria; he also stated that seven angels had made the world by themselves without the knowledge of God the Father.

Chap. 4. The Basilidians were named from Basilides, who differed in this point from the Simonians: he said that there were 365 heavens, this being the number of days which compose the year. For this reason he recommended as a sort of sacred name the word $\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\sigma\alpha\xi$. In the Greek system of computation the letters of this word add up to the same number, for there are seven: α plus β plus ρ plus α plus σ plus α plus ξ , that is, one plus two plus a hundred plus one plus two hundred plus one plus sixty, which give the sum of 365.

Chap. 5. The Nicolaïtes received their name from Nicolaus, who is said to be one of the seven deacons ordained by the Apostles. The story is told that, to clear himself from the charge of jealousy, he permitted anyone who would to enjoy the favors of his wife, a very beautiful woman. This example of his was made the basis of an abominable sect, one which advocates promiscuous relations with women. In partaking of food they make no distinction of things offered to idols, and they do not reject other pagan rites and superstitions. Moreover, they give certain fabulous accounts of the world, interspersing some outlandish names of princes in their discussions

- 10 quibus terreant auditores, quae prudentibus risum potius faciunt quam timorem. Intelliguntur autem etiam isti non Deo tribuere creaturam, sed quibusdam potestatibus quas mirabili vel fingunt vanitate vel credunt.

Cap. 6. GNOSTICI propter excellentiam scientiae sic se appellatos esse vel apellari debuisse gloriantur, cum sint superioribus omnibus vaniores atque turpiores. Denique cum ab aliis atque aliis per diversas terrarum partes aliter atque aliter
 5 nuncupentur, nonnulli eos etiam Borboritas vocant, quasi caenosos, propter nimiam turpitudinem quam in suis mysteriis exercere dicuntur. Aliqui eos a Nicolaïtis exortos putant, aliqui a Carpocrate de quo post loquemur. Tradunt autem dogmata fabulosissimis plena figmentis. Etiam ipsi principum vel
 10 angelorum nominibus terribilibus infirmas animas capiunt, et de Deo rerumque natura fabulosa et a sanitate veritatis aliena multa contextunt. Animarum substantiam Dei dicunt esse naturam, earumque adventum in haec corpora et reditum ad Deum iisdem suis fabulis longissimis et stultissimis secundum
 15 suos errores inserunt. Et illos qui eis credunt faciunt non multa, ut putant, scientia praepollere, sed multa, ut ita dicam, fabulositate vanescere. Dicuntur quoque bonum deum et malum deum in suis habere dogmatibus.

Cap. 7. CARPOCRATIANI sunt a Carpocrate, qui docebat omnem turpem operationem omnemque adinventionem peccati nec aliter evadi atque transiri principatus et potestates quibus haec placent ut possit ad caelum superius perveniri. Hic etiam
 5 Iesum hominem tantummodo et de utroque sexu natum putasse perhibetur, sed accepisse talem animam qua sciret ea quae superna essent atque nuntiaret. Resurrectionem corporis simul cum Lege abiiciebat. Negabat a Deo factum, sed a nescio quibus virtutibus mundum. Sectae ipsius fuisse traditur quaedam
 10 Marcellina, quae colebat imagines Iesu et Pauli et Homeri et Pythagorae adorando incensumque ponendo.

to terrify their auditors, and these names occasion laughter rather than fear among those having good sense. Moreover, they too are understood to attribute creation not to God, but to certain powers which they imagine, or believe in, through their strange folly.

Chap. 6. The Gnostics boast that they are so named, or should have been so named, because of the excellence of their knowledge, though they are more foolish and more depraved than those already mentioned. Accordingly, though they are variously named by various people in the different parts of the world, some even call them Borborites, which means "the filthy ones," because of the extreme foulness which they are reported to employ in their mysteries. Some think that they stemmed from the Nicolaïtes; others from Carpocrates, of whom we shall speak later. Moreover, they teach beliefs which contain the most fantastic fictions. They, too, attempt to seize upon the weak-minded with frightfully named princes or angels, and they devise many explanations of God and the nature of the world which are incredible and contrary to sound truth. They say that the substance of souls belongs to the Nature of God, and they describe the coming of these souls into these bodies of ours and their return to God in these same most tedious and foolish stories in accordance with their errors. They cause their believers not to be renowned for their great learning, as they think, but to be recognized as futile for their lying tales, if I may say so. They also are said to admit a good god and an evil god in their doctrines.

Chap. 7. The Carpocratians take their name from Carpocrates, who advocated every shameful deed and every experience of sin as the only way to evade and pass through the principalities and powers to whom these things are pleasing in order to arrive at the higher heaven. It is stated, moreover, that he considered Jesus merely a man and to have been born of a human father and mother, but endowed with such a mind that He was capable of knowing and imparting the supernatural. He rejected both the resurrection of the body and the Law. He asserted that the world was created, not by God, but by some powers or other. A certain Marcellina, who honored images of Jesus, Paul, Homer, and Pythagoras with adoration and offerings of incense, is said to have been a member of this sect.

Cap. 8. CERINTHIANI a Cerintho iidemque Merinthiani a Merintho, mundum ab angelis factum esse dicentes, et carne circumcidi oportere, atque alia huiusmodi Legis praecepta servari; Iesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec resurrexisse,
 5 sed resurrecturum asseverantes. Mille quoque annos post resurrectionem in terreno regno Christi, secundum carnales ventris et libidinis voluptates, futuros fabulantur, unde etiam Chiliastae sunt appellati.

Cap. 9. NAZARAEI, cum Dei Filium confiteantur esse Christum, omnia tamen Veteris Legis observant, quae Christiani per apostolicam traditionem non observare carnaliter, sed spiritualiter intelligere didicerunt.

Cap. 10. EBIONAEI Christum etiam ipsi tantummodo hominem dicunt. Mandata carnalia Legis observant, circumcisionem scilicet carnis, et cetera a quorum oneribus per novum testamentum liberati sumus. Huic haeresi Epiphanius Sam-
 5 paeos et Elcesaeos ita copulat ut sub eodem numero tamquam una sit haeresis ponat, aliquid tamen interesse significans. Quamvis et in consequentibus loquatur de illis, ponens eos sub numero suo. Eusebius vero Elcesaitarum sectam commemorans fidem in persecutione dicit negandam docuisse et in corde
 10 servandam.

Cap. 11. VALENTINIANI a Valentino, qui de natura rerum multa fabulosa confinxit, triginta Aeonas, id est saecula, asserens exstitisse quorum principium esse profundum et silentium, quod profundum etiam patrem appellat. Ex quibus duobus
 5 velut ex coniugio processisse perhibet intellectum et veritatem, et protulisse in honorem patris Aeonas octo; de intellectu autem et veritate processisse verbum et vitam, et protulisse Aeonas decem; porro de verbo et vita processisse hominem et ecclesiam, et protulisse Aeonas duodecim; itaque octo et decem et duodecim
 10 fieri triginta Aeonas, habentes, ut diximus, primum principium de profundo et silentio; Christum autem a Patre missum, id est a profundo, spiritale vel caeleste corpus secum attulisse

Chap. 8. The Cerinthians, so named after Cerinthus, and likewise the Merinthiani, named after Merinthus, claim that the world was created by angels; that circumcision is necessary and that other precepts of this sort contained in the Law are to be observed. They claimed that Jesus was only a human being and that He had not risen from the dead, but would do so. And they said that for a thousand years after the Resurrection they would live in an earthly kingdom of Christ with carnal enjoyment of food and sex; this is the reason they are called Chiliasts.

Chap. 9. The Nazarenes, though they admit that Christ is the Son of God, nevertheless observe all the precepts of the Old Law. But Christians have been instructed through Apostolic tradition not to observe these carnally, but to understand them spiritually.

Chap. 10. The Ebionites likewise maintain that Christ is only human. They observe the carnal precepts of the Law, that is, circumcision and all the other burdens from which we have been liberated by the New Testament. Epiphanius unites the Sampsaean and the Elcesaites with this heresy to such an extent that he lists them in the same place as one heresy, though he does imply that there are some differences. But he also speaks of them later, ascribing them a place of their own. Eusebius, however, in his treatment of the Elcesaites says that they taught that the Faith should be denied under persecution and kept in the heart.

Chap. 11. The Valentinians were named from Valentinus, who invented many fables regarding the nature of the universe, claiming the existence of thirty Aeons, that is, Ages. Their source of origin was the Bottomless Deep and Silence. He also called the Bottomless Deep the Father. From these two as from husband and wife he claims were born Understanding and Truth, and they produced eight Aeons to honor the Father. Then, from Understanding and Truth proceeded Word and Life, and they produced ten Aeons. Then from Word and Life proceeded Man and the Church, and they produced twelve Aeons. Accordingly, eight, ten, and twelve make thirty Aeons, which had their first beginnings, as we have said, with the Bottomless Deep and Silence. Christ, moreover, was sent by the Father, that is, the Bottomless Deep; He brought with Him a spiritual or celestial body. He assumed nothing from the

nihilque assumpsisse de virgine Maria, sed per illam tamquam per rivum aut per fistulam sine ulla de illa assumpta carne
15 transisse. Negat etiam resurrectionem carnis, solum per Christum spiritum et animam salutem accipere affirmans.

Cap. 12. SECUNDIANI hoc a Valentinianis distare dicuntur quod addunt opera turpitudinis.

Cap. 13. PTOLEMAEUS, quoque discipulus Valentini, haeresim novam condere cupiens, quatuor Aeonas et alios quatuor asserere maluit.

Cap. 14. MARCUS etiam nescio quis haeresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non vere, sed putative passum asseverans. Duo quoque opinatus est ex adverso sibi esse principia, quiddam tale de Aeonibus quale Valentinus
5 affirmans.

Cap. 15. COLORBASUS secutus est istos non multum aliter sentiens, vitam omnium hominum et generationem in septem sideribus consistere affirmans.

Cap. 16. HERACLEONITAE, ab Heracleone discipulo superiorum, duo asserunt principia, unum ex altero, et ex his duobus alia plurima. Feruntur autem suos morientes novo modo quasi redimere, id est, per oleum, balsamum et aquam, et invocationes, quas Hebraicis verbis dicunt super capita eorum.

Cap. 17. OPHITAE a colubro nominati sunt, coluber enim Graece ὄφις dicitur. Hunc autem Christum arbitrantur; sed habent etiam verum colubrum assuetum eorum panes lambere, atque ita eis velut eucharistiam sanctificare. Quidam dicunt
5 istos Ophitas ex Nicolaïtis sive Gnosticis exstissee, et per eorum fabulosa figmenta ad colubrum colendum fuisse perventum.

Cap. 18. CAIANI propterea sic appellati quoniam Cain honorant dicentes eum fortissimae esse virtutis. Simul et Iudam traditorem divinum aliquid putant, et scelus eius beneficium deputant, asserentes eum praescisse quantum esset generi

Virgin Mary, passing through her body as through a channel or conduit, without assuming any flesh from her. He denies the resurrection of the body, holding that only the spirit and the soul gain salvation through Christ.

Chap. 12. The Secundiani are said to differ from the Valentini-ans in that they admit in addition evil actions.

Chap. 13. Ptolemaeus, who was also a disciple of Valentinus, desiring to found a new sect, preferred to maintain that there were four Aeons and an additional four Aeons.

Chap. 14. Some Marcus or other also founded a heresy by denying the resurrection of the body and by claiming that Christ had not suffered in reality, but only in appearance. He also believed that there were two mutually opposing principles, and maintained some such doctrine as Valentinus on the Aeons.

Chap. 15. Colorbasus followed the above-mentioned [Valentini-ans] without much difference in doctrine, maintaining that the life and generation of all men depend upon seven stars.

Chap. 16. The Heracleonites, who received their name from Heracleon, a disciple of the aforementioned heretics, maintain that there are two principles, that one proceeds from the other, and that numerous others proceed from these two. They are said moreover, to redeem, as it were, their dying adherents in a novel manner, that is, by the use of oil, balsam, water, and invocations, which they utter in the Hebrew language over their heads.

Chap. 17. The Ophites get their name from the serpent, for the Greek word for serpent is *ὄφις*. They regard this serpent as Christ; but also keep a real serpent, which has been trained to lick their bread, and so to sanctify a eucharist for them, as it were. Some people maintain that these Ophites grew out of the Nicolaïtes or Gnostics, and that it was through their fantastic inventions they arrived at the worship of the serpent.

Chap. 18. The Cainites are so called because they honor Cain, who they say was a man of the greatest courage. At the same time they believe the traitor Judas to be of divine nature, and consider his crime a benefit, arguing that he foreknew what a great blessing

5 humano Christi passio profutura, et occidendum Iudaeis propterea tradidisse. Illos etiam qui schisma facientes in primo populo Dei terra dehiscente perierunt et Sodomitas colere perhibentur. Blasphemant Legem et Deum Legis auctorem, carnisque resurrectionem negant.

Cap. 19. SETHIANI nomen acceperunt a filio Adae, qui vocatus est Seth; eum quippe honorant, sed fabulosa et haeretica vanitate. Dicunt enim eum de superna matre natum, quam perhibent convenisse cum superno patre, unde divinum semen
5 aliud nasceretur, tamquam filiorum Dei. Hi quoque multa de principatibus et potestatibus vanissima fabulantur. Quidam eos dicunt Sem filium Noë Christum putare.

Cap. 20. ARCHONTICI a principibus appellati universitatem, quam Deus condidit, opera esse principum dicunt. Operantur etiam quandam turpitudinem. Resurrectionem carnis negant.

Cap. 21. CERDONIANI a Cerdone nominati qui duo principia sibi adversantia dogmatizavit, Deumque Legis ac Prophetarum non esse patrem Christi, nec bonum Deum esse sed iustum, patrem vero Christi bonum; Christumque ipsum neque
5 natum ex femina neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quidquam passum, sed simulasse passionem. Quidam vero in duobus principiis suis duos deos ita eum dixisse perhibent, ut unus eorum esset bonus, alter autem malus. Resurrectionem mortuorum negat, spernens etiam testamentum vetus.

Cap. 22. MARCION quoque, a quo Marcionitae appellati sunt, Cerdonis secutus est dogmata de duobus principiis; quamvis Epiphanius eum tria dicat asseruisse principia, bonum, iustum, pravum, sed Eusebius Synerum quendam, non Mar-
5 cionem, trium principiorum atque naturarum scribit auctorem.

Cap. 23. APELLITAE sunt quorum Apelles est princeps qui duos quidem deos introducit, unum bonum, alterum malum; non tamen in duobus diversis atque inter se adversis esse prin-

Christ's Passion was to be for the human race, and for that reason had handed Him over to the Jews to be put to death. Moreover, they are said to reverence those who made a schism among the first people of God and perished in the gaping of the earth, as well as the Sodomites. They blaspheme the Law and God, the author of the Law, and deny the resurrection of the body.

Chap. 19. The Sethians received their name from the son of Adam, who was called Seth. Indeed they honor him, but with a lying and a heretical folly. For they say that he was born of a celestial mother, whom they claim united with a celestial father to produce another divine race, the sons of God, as it were. They also invent many and fantastic tales about principalities and powers. Some say that they believe that Sem, the son of Noe, was Christ.

Chap. 20. The Archontics, so called from Princes, say that the universe which God created is the work of the Princes. They also carry on certain shameful practices. They deny the resurrection of the body.

Chap. 21. The Cerdonians get their name from Cerdo, who taught that there are two principles which are in mutual opposition; that the God of the Law and the Prophets is not the Father of Christ; that God is not good but just, but that the Father of Christ is good; that Christ Himself was not born of woman, and had no human nature, nor did He truly die or suffer at all, but simulated His Passion. Some claim that in reference to his two principles he had spoken as if there were two gods, one good and one evil. He denies the resurrection of the dead, rejecting also the Old Testament.

Chap. 22. Marcion, from whom the Marcionites are named, also accepted the teachings of Cerdo on the two principles. Now although Epiphanius says that he declared that there were three principles, the Good, the Just, and the Evil, Eusebius writes that a certain Sinerus, not Marcion, was the author of three principles and natures.

Chap. 23. The Apellitae are those whose leader was Apelles. He proposes two gods, one good and the other evil; yet he does not maintain that they exist in two different and mutually adverse

cipiis, sed unum esse principium, deum scilicet bonum, et ab
 5 illo factum alterum, qui cum malignus esset inventus est in
 sua mundum malignitate fecisse. Hunc Apellem dicunt quidam
 etiam de Christo tam falsa sensisse ut diceret eum non quidem
 carnem deposuisse de caelo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse,
 quam mundo reddidit, cum sine carne resurgens ascendit in
 10 caelum.

Cap. 24. SEVERIANI a Severo exorti vinum non bibunt
 eo quod fabulosa vanitate de Satana et terra germinasse
 asserant vitem. Etiam ipsi non sanam doctrinam suam, quibus
 volunt, infant, nominibus principum, carnis resurrectionem
 5 cum vetere testamento respuentes.

Cap. 25. TATIANI a Tatiano quodam instituti, qui et
 Encratitae appellati sunt, nuptias damnant, atque omnino pares
 eas fornicationibus aliisque corruptionibus faciunt, nec reci-
 piunt in suorum numerum coniugio utentem, sive marem sive
 5 feminam. Non vescuntur carnibus, easque omnes abominantur.
 Prolationes quasdam fabulosas saeculorum etiam isti sapiunt.
 Saluti primi hominis contradicunt. Epiphanius Tatianos et
 Encratitas ita discernit ut Encratitas Tatiani schismaticos
 dicat.

Cap. 26. CATAPHRYGES sunt quorum auctores fuerunt
 Montanus tamquam paraclitus et duae prophetissae ipsius,
 Prisca et Maximilla. His nomen provincia Phrygia dedit quia
 ibi exstiterunt ibique vixerunt, et etiam nunc in eisdem parti-
 5 bus populos habent. Adventum Spiritus Sancti a Domino
 promissum in se potius quam in Apostolis fuisse asserunt reddi-
 tum. Secundas nuptias pro fornicationibus habent, et ideo
 dicunt eas permisisse apostolum Paulum quia ex parte sciebat,
 et ex parte prophetabat, nondum enim venerat quod perfectum
 10 est. Hoc autem perfectum in Montanum et in eius prophetissas
 venisse delirant. Sacramenta perhibentur habere funesta, nam
 de infantis anniculi sanguine quem de toto eius corpore minutis
 punctiunculis vulneribus extorquent, quasi eucharistiam suam
 conficere perhibentur, miscentes eum farinae, panemque inde
 15 facientes. Qui puer si mortuus fuerint, habetur apud eos pro
 martyre; si autem vixerit, pro magno sacerdote.

principles, but that there is one principle, namely a good god, and a second created by him. But it is maintained that the latter, since he was evil, in his malice created the world. Some say that this Apelles reasoned so falsely also about Christ that he said that He did not bring down His flesh from heaven, but received it from elements of the world and returned this to the world, when, in rising without His flesh, He ascended into Heaven.

Chap. 24. The Severians, who sprung from Severus, do not drink wine, because in lying folly they claim that the vine has sprung from the union of Satan and the earth. Moreover, they puff up their insane teaching with whatever names of princes they choose, and reject along with the Old Testament the resurrection of the body.

Chap. 25. The Tatians, instituted by a certain Tatian, who are also called Encratites, condemn marriage, making it the absolute equal of fornication and other corrupt practices. They receive into their number no man or woman who makes use of the rights of marriage. They do not eat flesh meat, abominating all kinds of it. They also have some belief in mythical emanations of Aeons. They deny the salvation of the First Man. Epiphanius distinguishes the Tatians from the Encratites by calling the latter schismatic Tatians.

Chap. 26. The Cataphrygians are those whose founders were Montanus in his role of Paraclete, and his two prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla. The province of Phrygia gave them their name because they were born there and lived there. Even to this day, they have congregations in those regions. They maintain that the coming of the Holy Spirit, promised by the Lord, had been renewed more completely in them than in the Apostles. They consider second marriage as fornication, and claim that the Apostle Paul allowed it because he knew in part, and he prophesied in part, for perfection had not yet come. But they maintain in their madness that this perfection had come upon Montanus and his prophetesses. They are said to have gruesome mysteries, for the report goes that by draining the blood from the entire body of a year old infant by minute punctures and by mixing it with wheat, they make bread from it and perform their eucharist. If the child dies, he is regarded as a martyr among them; but if he lives, a great priest.

Cap. 27. PEPUZIANI, sive Quintilliani, a loco quodam nominati sunt quam civitatem desertam dicit Epiphanius. Hanc autem isti, divinum aliquid esse arbitantes, Ierusalem vocant; tantum dantes mulieribus principatum, ut sacerdotio quoque
 5 apud eos honorentur, dicunt enim Quintillae et Priscillae in eadem civitate Pepuza Christum specie feminae revelatum; unde ab hac Quintilliani etiam nuncupantur. Faciunt et ipsi de sanguine infantis quod Cataphryges facere supra diximus, nam et ab eis perhibentur exorti. Denique alii hanc Pepuzam
 10 non esse civitatem, sed villam dicunt fuisse Montani et prophetissarum eius Prisciae et Maximillae, et quia ibi vixerunt ideo locum meruisse appellari Ierusalem.

Cap. 28. ARTOTYRITAE sunt quibus oblatio eorum hoc nomen dedit. Offerunt enim panem et caseum dicentes a primis hominibus oblationes de fructibus terrae et ovium fuisse celebratas. Hos Pepuzianis iungit Epiphanius.

Cap. 29. TESSARESCAEDECATITAE hinc appellati sunt, quod non nisi quartadecima luna Pascha celebrant, quilibet septem dierum occurrat dies, et si dies Dominicus occurrerit, ipso die ieiunant et vigilant.

Cap. 30. ALOGI propterea sic vocantur tamquam sine verbo (*λόγος* enim Graece verbum dicitur), quia Deum Verbum recipere noluerunt, Iohannis Evangelium respuentes; cuius nec Apocalypsin accipiunt, has videlicet scripturas negantes esse
 5 ipsius.

Cap. 31. ADAMIANI ex Adam dicti cuius imitantur in paradiso nuditatem quae fuit ante peccatum. Unde et nuptias aversantur, quia nec prius quam peccasset Adam nec priusquam dimissus esset de paradiso, cognovit uxorem. Credunt ergo quod
 5 nuptiae futurae non fuissent si nemo peccasset. Nudi itaque mares feminaeque conveniunt, nudi lectiones audiunt, nudi orant, nudi celebrant sacramenta, et ex hoc paradisum suam arbitrantur ecclesiam.

Chap. 27. The Pepuzians, or the Quintillians, get their name from a certain place which Epiphanius says is a deserted city. They, considering this to be something divine, call it Jerusalem. They grant leadership only to women so that among them women receive the dignity of the priesthood, for they say that Christ was revealed to Quintilla and Priscilla under the appearance of a woman in that same city of Pepuza; for this reason they are also called Quintillians after her. And they too make use of the blood of an infant in the same way as we said above that the Cataphrygians do, for they are also said to have sprung from them. Then there are others who say that this Pepuza is not a city, but was the estate of Montanus and his prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla, and, since they lived there, the place was, for this reason, called Jerusalem.

Chap. 28. The Artotyrites have been given this name from the nature of their sacrificial offerings; for they make their oblations of bread and cheese, claiming that it had been the custom of the first men to offer their sacrifices from the fruits of the field and their flocks. Epiphanius connects them with the Pepuzians.

Chap. 29. The Tessarescedecatitae are so called because they celebrate the Pasch only on the fourteenth day of the new moon, no matter on what day of the week it occurs. Even if it falls on Sunday, they make it a day of fast and vigil.

Chap. 30. The Alogi are called "Those without the Word," for λόγος is the Greek for Word, because they refuse to accept God the Word, rejecting the Gospel of John. They do not accept his Apocalypse either, claiming that these writings are not his.

Chap. 31. The Adamites get their name from Adam and they imitate the nakedness which was his condition in Paradise before sin. They also are opposed to marriage, because Adam did not know his wife carnally before he had sinned and been dismissed from Paradise. They believe therefore that marriage would not have come into existence if no one had sinned. Accordingly, men and women assemble naked, listen to readings naked, pray naked, and celebrate their rites naked. And for this reason they consider their church Paradise.

Cap. 32. **ELCESAEOS** et **SAMPSAEOS** hic tamquam ordine suo commemorat Epiphanius, quos dicit a quodam pseudopropheta esse deceptos qui vocabatur Elci, ex cuius genere duas mulieres tamquam deas ab eis perhibet adoratas. Cetera
5 Ebionaeis tenere similia.

Cap. 33. **THEODOTIANI** a Theodoto quodam instituti hominem tantummodo Christum asseverant. Quod dicitur idem Theodotus propterea docuisse quia in persecutione lapsus isto modo se casus sui devitare putabat opprobrium, si non Deum
5 negasse, sed hominem videretur.

Cap. 34. **MELCHISEDECIANI** Melchisedec, sacerdotem Dei excelsi, non hominem fuisse, sed virtutem Dei esse arbitrantur.

Cap. 35. **BARDESANISTAE** a quodam Bardesane qui in doctrina Christi prius exstitisse perhibetur insignis. Sed postea, quamvis non per omnia, in Valentini haeresim lapsus est.

Cap. 36. **NOËTIANI** a quodam Noëto qui dicebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum.

Cap. 37. **VALESII** et seipsos castrant et hospites suos, hoc modo existimantes Deo se debere servire. Alia quoque haeretica docere dicuntur et turpia, sed quae illa sint nec ipse commemoravit Epiphanius, nec uspiam potui reperire.

Cap. 38. **CATHARI**, qui seipsos isto nomine quasi propter munditiam superbissime atque odiosissime nominant, secundas nuptias non admittunt, paenitentiam denegant, Novatum sectantes haeticum; unde etiam Novatiani appellantur.

Cap. 39. **ANGELICI**, in angelorum cultum inclinati, quos Epiphanius iam omnino defecisse testatur.

Cap. 40. **APOSTOLICI** qui se isto nomine arrogantissime vocaverunt eo quod in suam communionem non recipiunt utentes coniugibus et res proprias possidentes. Quales habet Catholica et monachos et clericos plurimos. Sed ideo isti haere-

Chap. 32. The Elcesaites and Sampsaeans are treated at this point by Epiphanius as if this were their proper place. He says that they were lead astray by a certain false-prophet, who was called Elci, and that two women, members of his family, were held in adoration by them. In all other respects their tenets resemble those of the Ebionites.

Chap. 33. The Theodotians, founded by a certain Theodotus, maintain that Christ was only human. The same Theodotus is said to have taught this because he apostatized in persecution and thought that he would escape the disgrace of his fall, if it seemed that he had denied not God, but man.

Chap. 34. The Melchisedechians believe that Melchisedech, the priest of the most high God, was not a man, but is a power of God.

Chap. 35. The Bardesanists were named from a certain Bardesanes, who they say was at first pre-eminent in Christian learning. But afterwards he fell into the Valentinian heresy, though not in all points.

Chap. 36. The Noetians were named from a Noetus, who claimed that Christ was identical with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Chap. 37. The Valesians castrate both themselves and their guests, thinking that in this way they ought to serve God. There is also the report that they propound other heretical and depraved doctrines, but Epiphanius does not mention what they are, and I could gain information nowhere else.

Chap. 38. The Cathari, who designate themselves thus in their loathsome pride, as if on account of their purity, do not allow second marriage and refuse penance, following the heretic, Novatus. For this reason they are also called Novatians.

Chap. 39. The Angelici, who were devoted to the cult of angels, Epiphanius tells us, have now completely disappeared.

Chap. 40. The Apostolici have given themselves that name, with great arrogance, because they refuse to admit into their membership people who make use of marriage and those who possess private property. The Catholic [church] has very many monks and clerics

5 tici sunt quoniam se ab ecclesia separantes nullam spem putant eos habere qui utuntur his rebus quibus ipsi carent. Encratitis isti similes sunt; nam et Apotactitae appellantur. Sed et alia nescio quae propria haeretica docere perhibentur.

Cap. 41. SABELLIANI ab illo Noëto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. Nam et discipulum eius quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas haereses eas Epiphanius computet nescio, cum fieri potuisse videamus ut
 5 fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, et ideo ex illo celebrius haec haeresis nomen acceperit. Noëtiani enim difficile ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum. Nam et Praxeanos eos a Praxea quidam vocant, et Hermogeniani vocare ab Hermogene potuerunt, qui Praxeas et Hermogenes eadem sen-
 10 tientes in Africa fuisse dicuntur. Nec tamen istae plures sectae sunt, sed unius sectae plura nomina, ex his hominibus qui in ea maxime innotuerunt, sicut Donatistae iidem Parmenianistae, sicut Pelagiani iidem Caelestiani. Unde ergo sit factum ut Noëtianos et Sabellianos non unius haeresis duo nomina, sed
 15 tamquam duas haereses supradictus Epiphanius poneret, liquido invenire non potui; quia si quid inter se differunt, tam obscure dixit, studio forsitan brevitatis, ut non intelligam. Loco quippe isto, quo et nos, tam longe a Noëtianis Sabellianos commemorans, "Sabelliani," inquit, "similia Noëto dogmatizantes praeter
 20 hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum." Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani crebrius nuncupentur? Aut si forte in eo quod ait, "praeter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum," Noëtianos hoc dicere intelligi voluit, quis
 25 eos in hac ambiguitate discernat? Vel quomodo possunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem passum fuisse non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipsum esse et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? Philaster autem Brixianus episcopus in prolixissimo libro quem

who live this type of life. But the Apostolici are heretics because, separating themselves from the Church, they think that they who make use of the things from which they themselves abstain have no hope for salvation. They resemble the Encratites and are also called Apotactitae. But they also teach some heretical doctrines or other of their own.

Chap. 41. The Sabellians, they say, sprung from the Noetus I mentioned already, for, according to some, Sabellius was also a disciple of his. But why Epiphanius counts them as two heresies I do not know, though I am aware of the possibility that Sabellius was better known and that, therefore, this heresy perhaps received wider renown through him. For the Noetians are hardly known by anyone, but the Sabellians are familiar to many. Now some call them the Praxeans after Praxeas; they could also have been called the Hermogenians after Hermogenes. Praxeas and Hermogenes are said to have taught these doctrines in Africa. Nevertheless, these are not different sects, but different names for the same sect, received from the men who were best known in the heresy, as is the case of the Donatists and the Parmenianists, the Pelagians and the Caelestians. Now, why it happened that Epiphanius did not list the Noetians and Sabellians as two names for the same heresy, but as two heresies, I could not clearly discover; for, if they do differ in any way from one another, he put it so obscurely—in his desire for brevity, I suppose—that I cannot understand it. In fact, though he treats of the Sabellians in the same order as I do, so far away from the Noetians, he states that the Sabellians teach the same things as Noetus except for this, that they say the Father did not suffer. But how can this be understood of the Sabellians, since they are so well known for maintaining that the Father suffered that they are more frequently called Patripassianists than Sabellians? But if it was his intention that the Noetians be understood when he said, “except for this, that they say the Father has not suffered,” who can distinguish them in the light of such ambiguity? How is it possible to understand that anyone of them does not maintain that the father suffered, when they claim that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the same? Moreover, Filastrius, bishop of Brescia, in the lengthy volume which he produced on heresies, gave his estimate of the number of heresies at

de haeresibus condidit et 128 haereses arbitratus est comp-
 30 tandas, Sabellianos continuo post Noëtianos ponens, "Sabel-
 lius," inquit, "discipulus eius, qui similitudinem sui doctoris
 itidem secutus est, unde et Sabelliani postea sunt appellati, qui
 et Patripassiani; et Praxeani a Praxeas, et Hermogeniani ab
 Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa; qui et ita sentientes abiecti
 35 sunt ab ecclesia Catholica." Certe iste eosdem postea Sabel-
 lianos dixit appellatos qui ea quae Noëtus sentiebant, et alia
 nomina eiusdem sectae commemoravit. Et tamen Noëtianos et
 Sabellianos sub duobus numeris tamquam duas haereses posuit;
 qua causa, ipse viderit.

Cap. 42. ORIGENIANI a quodam Origene dicti sunt, non
 illo qui fere omnibus notus est, sed ab alio nescio quo, de quo
 vel sectatoribus eius Epiphanius loquens, "Origeniani," inquit,
 "cuiusdam Origenis, turpis autem sunt operationis, isti sunt
 5 nefanda facientes, sua corpora corruptioni tradentes," alios
 autem Origenianos continuo subiiciens.

Cap. 43. "ORIGENIANI," inquit, "alii, qui et Adamantii
 tractatoris, qui et mortuorum resurrectionem repellunt, Christum
 autem creaturam et Spiritum Sanctum introducentes, paradisum
 autem et caelos et alia omnia allegorizantes." Haec quidem
 5 de Origene Epiphanius. Sed qui eum defendunt unius eius-
 demque substantiae esse dicunt docuisse Patrem et Filium et
 Spiritum Sanctum, neque resurrectionem reppulisse mortuorum;
 quamvis et in istis eum convincere studeant qui eius plura
 legerunt. Sed sunt huius Origenis alia dogmata quae Catholica
 10 ecclesia omnino non recipit. In quibus nec ipsum falso arguit,
 nec potest ab eius defensoribus falli, maxime de purgatione
 et liberatione, ac rursus post longum tempus ad eadem mala
 revolutione rationalis universae creaturae. Quis enim Catholicus
 Christianus vel doctus vel indoctus non vehementer exhorreat
 15 eam quam dicit purgationem malorum, id est, etiam eos qui
 hanc vitam in flagitiis et facinoribus et sacrilegiis atque impie-
 tatibus quamlibet maximis finierunt, ipsum etiam postremo
 diabolum atque angelos eius, quamvis post longissima tempora,

a hundred and twenty-eight, and placed the Sabellians immediately after the Noetians with the words: "Sabellius, his disciple, who likewise followed his master's pattern; for this reason they were later also called Sabellians and again the Patripassianists. From Praxeas and Hermogenes, who lived in Africa, the same heretics are given the names Praxeani and Hermogeniani. These and those of similar convictions have been excluded from the Catholic Church." He certainly states that those who held the same opinions as Noetus were later called Sabellians, and he gives the other names for this same sect. Still, he put the Noetians and the Sabellians under two headings as if they were two heresies. Let it be for him to say why.

Chap. 42. The Origenists are named after a certain Origen, not the famous one who is known to practically everyone, but some other of that name of whom, or rather of whose followers, Epiphanius speaks in these terms, "The Origenists, founded by a certain Origen, a sect given over to shameful conduct, for they commit shameful acts and surrender their bodies to vice." But he immediately introduces the other Origenists.

Chap. 43. "There are other Origenists," he says, "followers of the writer Adamantius, who reject the resurrection of the dead, maintain that Christ and the Holy Spirit are creatures, and interpret paradise, heaven and all other things in allegorical fashion." This, at least, is Epiphanius' opinion of Origen. But his defenders maintain that he taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of one and the same substance, and that he did not reject the resurrection of the dead. Yet those who have read much of his work try to convict him on these very points also. **But there are other teachings of this Origen which the Catholic Church does not accept at all.** On these matters, she does not accuse him unwarrantably, and cannot herself be deceived by his defenders. Specifically, they are his teachings on purgation, liberation, and the return of all rational creation to the same trials after a long interval. **Now what Catholic Christian, learned or otherwise, would not shrink in horror from what Origen calls the purgation of evils?** According to him, even they who die in infamy, crime, sacrilege and the greatest possible impiety, and at last even the devil himself and his angels, though after very long periods of time, will be

purgatos atque liberatos regno Dei lucique restitui, et rursus
 20 post longissima tempora omnes qui liberati sunt ad haec mala
 denuo relabi et reverti, et has vices alternantes beatitudinum
 et miseriarum rationalis creaturae semper fuisse, semper fore?
 De qua vanissima impietate adversus philosophos a quibus
 ista didicit Origenes in libris *De civitate Dei* diligentissime
 25 disputavi.

Cap. 44. PAULIANI, a Paulo Samosateno, Christum non
 semper fuisse dicunt, sed eius initium ex quo de Maria natus
 est asseverant; nec eum aliquid amplius quam hominem putant.
 Ista haeresis aliquando cuiusdam Artemonis fuit, sed cum
 5 defecisset, instaurata est a Paulo; et postea sic a Photino con-
 firmata, ut Photiniani quam Pauliani celebrius nuncupentur.
 Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in ecclesia Catholica
 Nicaeno concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est eos
 regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi haeretici
 10 cum de Catholica discederent abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.

Cap. 45. PHOTINUS ab Epiphanio non continuo post
 Paulum sive cum Paulo, sed aliis interpositis ponitur. Non
 tacetur sane similia credidisse, secundum aliquid tamen adver-
 satus ei dicitur; sed quid sit ipsum aliquid omnino non dicitur.
 5 Philaster autem continuatim ponit ambos sub singulis et pro-
 priis numeris quasi haereses duas, cum dicat Photinum in
 omnibus Pauli secutum fuisse doctrinam.

Cap. 46. MANICHAEI a quodam Persa exstiterunt qui vo-
 cabatur Manes; quamvis et ipsum, cum eius insana doctrina
 coepisset in Graecia praedicari, Manichaeum discipuli eius
 appellare maluerunt devitantes nomen insaniae. Unde quidam
 5 eorum quasi doctiores et eo ipso mendaciores, geminata *N* lit-
 tera, Mannicheum vocant, quasi manna fundentem.

Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque ae-
 terna et coaeterna, hoc est semper fuisse, composuit; duasque
 naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios
 10 antiquos haereticos, opinatus est. Quarum inter se pugnam et

purged, liberated and restored to the kingdom of God and of light. Then, again, after very long periods of time all who have been liberated will fall and return a second time to these miseries. Moreover, these vicissitudes of happiness and misery have been and always will be the lot of rational creation. In my *City of God*, I have argued most carefully in the matter of this senseless blasphemy against the philosophers from whom Origen derived these teachings.

Chap. 44. The Paulianists, who get their name from Paul of Samosata, assert that Christ has not always existed, but had His beginning at the time when He was born of Mary. They consider Him nothing more than man. This was once the heresy of a certain Artemon, but after his death it was renewed by Paul. Later it was so strengthened by Photinus that its members are now more often called Photinians rather than Paulianists. The Council of Nicaea decreed that these Paulianists must certainly be baptized in the Catholic Church. For this reason it is to be believed that they do not observe the rule of baptism, though many heretics took it with them upon their departure from the Catholic Church, and still observe it.

Chap. 45. Photinus is not placed by Epiphanius immediately after Paul nor by his side, but other names are placed in between them. Indeed, he does not fail to say that they held similar beliefs, but he says they are in opposition on some point, but precisely in what way he does not say. However, Filastrius places them in immediate succession under their own separate headings as if they were two heresies, though he does say that Photinus had followed the teaching of Paul in all things.

Chap. 46. The Manichaeans sprang from a certain Persian called Manes, but when they began to publish his mad doctrine in Greece, his disciples chose to call him Manichaeus to avoid the word for "madness." For the same reason some of them, somewhat more learned and therefore more deceitful, called him Mannicheus, doubling the letter "n," as if he were one who pours out manna.

He invented two principles, different from and opposed to each other, both eternal and co-eternal, that is, he imagined they have always been. Following other ancient heretics, he also believed

commixtionem, et boni a malo purgationem, et boni quod purgari non poterit cum malo in aeternum damnationem, secundum sua dogmata asseverantes, multa fabulantur, quae cuncta intexere huic operi nimis longum est.

- 15 Ex his autem suis fabulis vanis atque impiis coguntur dicere animas bonas, quas censent ab animarum malarum naturae scilicet contrariae commixtione liberandas, eius cuius Deus est esse naturae.

- Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est, a natura Dei, factum
20 confitentur quidem, sed de commixtione boni et mali quae facta est quando inter se utraque natura pugnavit.

- Ipsam vero boni a malo purgationem ac liberationem, non solum per totum mundum et de omnibus eius elementis virtutes Dei facere dicunt, verum etiam Electos suos per alimenta quae
25 sumunt. Et eis quippe alimentis, sicut universo mundo, Dei substantiam perhibent esse commixtam, quam purgari putant in Electis suis eo genere vitae quo vivunt Electi Manichaeorum velut sanctius et excellentius Auditoribus suis. Nam his duabus professionibus, hoc est Electorum et Auditorum, ecclesiam suam
30 constare voluerunt.

- In ceteris autem hominibus, etiam in ipsis Auditoribus suis, hanc partem bonae divinaeque substantiae quae mixta et colligata in escis et potibus detinetur, maximeque in eis qui generant filios, artius et inquinatius colligare putant. Quidquid vero
35 undique purgatur luminis, per quasdam naves, quas esse lunam et solem volunt, regno Dei tamquam propriis sedibus reddi. Quas itidem naves de substantia Dei pura perhibent fabricatas.

- Lucemque istam corpoream animantium mortalium oculis adiacentem, non solum in his navibus ubi eam purissimam credunt, verum etiam in aliis quibusque lucidis rebus, ubi secundum
40 ipsos tenetur admixta crediturque purganda, Dei dicunt esse naturam. Quinque enim elementa quae genuerunt principes

that there were two natures and substances, that is, one good and one evil. Proclaiming, on the basis of their teachings, a mutual strife and commingling of the two natures, a purgation of good from evil, and eternal damnation, along with the evil, of the good which cannot be purged, these heretics devise many myths. It would be too tiresome to treat all their doctrines in this work.

As a consequence of these ridiculous and unholy fables, they are forced to say that both God and the good souls, which they believe have to be freed from their admixture with the contrary nature of the evil souls, are of one and the same nature.

Then they declare that the world has been made by the nature of the good, that is, by the nature of God, but yet that it was formed of a mixture of good and evil which resulted when these two natures fought among themselves.

However, they claim that not only do the powers of God effect this purgation and liberation of good and evil throughout the whole universe and of all its elements, but also that their own Elect achieve the same results by means of the food of which they partake. And they state that the divine substance is intermingled with this food just as it is with the whole universe, and imagine that it is purified in their Elect by the mode of life which the Manichæan Elect live, as if their mode of life were holier and more excellent than that of their Auditors. For they would have their church consist of those two classes, Elect and Auditors.

Moreover, they believe that this portion of the good and divine substance which is held mixed and imprisoned in food and drink is more strongly and foully bound in the rest of men, even their own Auditors, but particularly in those who propagate offspring. Now whenever any portion of the light is completely purified, it returns to the kingdom of God, to its own proper abode, as it were, on certain vessels, which are, according to them, the moon and the sun. In addition, they maintain that these vessels are likewise fashioned from the pure substance of God.

They also state that this physical light, which lies before the gaze of mortal eyes, not only in those vessels where they believe it to exist in its purest state, but also in certain other bright objects where they consider it held in admixture and needing purification, is the Divine nature. For they ascribe five elements which have

proprios genti tribuunt tenebrarum, eaque elementa his nomini-
 bus nuncupant: fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam, ventum. In
 45 fumo nata animalia bipedia, unde homines ducere originem
 censent; in tenebris serpentina, in igne quadrupedia, in aquis
 natatilia, in vento volatilia. His quinque elementis malis de-
 bellandis alia quinque elementa de regno et substantia Dei missa
 esse, et in illa pugna fuisse permixta fumo aëra, tenebris lucem,
 50 igni malo ignem bonum, aquae malae aquam bonam, vento malo
 ventum bonum. Naves autem illas, id est, duo caeli luminaria,
 ita distinguunt ut lunam dicant factam ex bona aqua, solem
 vero ex igne bono.

Esse autem in eis navibus sanctas virtutes, quae se in mas-
 55 culos transfigurant ut illiciant feminas gentis adversae, et rursus
 in feminas ut illiciant masculos eiusdem gentis adversae. Et
 per hanc illecebram commota eorum concupiscentia fugiat de
 illis lumen quod membris suis permixtum tenebant, et pur-
 gandum suscipiatur ab angelis lucis, purgatumque illis navibus
 60 imponatur ad regna propria reportandum.

Qua occasione, vel potius execrabilis superstitionis quadam
 necessitate, coguntur Electi eorum velut eucharistiam consper-
 sam cum semine humano sumere ut etiam inde, sicut de aliis
 cibis quos accipiunt, substantia illa divina purgetur. Sed hoc
 65 se facere negant, et alios nescio quos sub nomine Manichaeorum
 facere affirmant. Detecti sunt tamen in ecclesia, sicut scis, apud
 Carthaginem, iam te ibi diacono constituto, quando instante
 Urso tribuno, qui tunc domui regiae praefuit, aliqui adducti
 sunt. Ubi puella nomine Margarita istam nefarium turpitudi-
 70 nem prodidit, quae cum esset annorum nondum duodecim,
 propter hoc sclestum mysterium se dicebat esse vitiatam. Tunc
 Eusebiam quandam Manichaeam quasi sanctimonialem, idipsum
 propter hoc ipsum passam, vix compulsi confiteri, cum primo

generated their own princes to the people of darkness and give to these elements the names: smoke, darkness, fire, water, and wind. Two-footed animals were generated in smoke, and from this source they believe men to take their beginnings; serpents were generated in darkness; quadrupeds in fire; swimming creatures in the waters; flying creatures in the wind. Five other elements have been sent from the kingdom and substance of God to conquer the five evil elements, and in that struggle air has become mixed with fire, light with darkness, good fire with bad fire, good water with bad water, good wind with bad wind. They make this distinction between the two vessels, that is, the two lights of heaven, saying that the moon has been made of good water, and the sun has been made of good fire.

Moreover, on those vessels there are holy powers, which at one time change themselves into males to attract females of the opposing faction, and at another into females to attract males of that same opposite faction. The purpose of this is to enable the light which they have intermingled in their members to escape when their passions are aroused by this attraction, and to allow it to be taken up by the angels of light for purification, and when purified to be placed aboard those vessels to be carried back to their proper realm.

In this circumstance, or rather because of some demand of their detestable superstition, their Elect are forced to consume a sort of eucharist sprinkled with human seed in order that the divine substance may be freed even from that, just as it is from other foods of which they partake. However, they deny that they do this, claiming that some others do it, using the name of the Manichaeans. But they were exposed in the Church at Carthage, as you know, for you were a deacon there at the time when, under the prosecution of Ursus the tribune, who was then prefect of the palace, some of them were brought to trial. At this time a girl by the name of Margaret gave evidence of their obscene practices and claimed, though she was not yet twelve years old, that she had been violated in the performance of this criminal rite. Then with difficulty he compelled Eusebia, some kind of Manichaean nun, to admit that she had undergone the same treatment in this regard, though at first, she maintained that she was a virgin and insisted on being

illa se asseruisset integram, atque ab obstetrice inspicere postu-
 75 lasset. Quae inspecta et quid esset inventa, totum illud turpissi-
 mum scelus, ubi ad excipiendum et commiscendum concum-
 bentium semen farina substernitur, (quod Margarita indicante
 absens non audierat) similiter indicavit. Et recenti tempore
 80 palia quae nobis misistis ostendunt hoc non sacramentum, sed
 exsecramentum, sub diligenti interrogatione confessi sunt.

Quorum unus nomine Viator eos qui ista faciunt proprie
 Catharistas vocari dicens, cum alias eiusdem Manichaeae sectae
 partes in Mattarios et specialiter Manichaeos distribui perhi-
 85 beret, omnes tamen has tres formas ab uno auctore propagatas,
 et omnes generaliter Manichaeos esse negare non potuit. Et
 certe illi libri Manichaei sunt omnibus sine dubitatione com-
 munes, in quibus libris illa portenta ad illiciendos et per con-
 cupiscentiam dissolvendos utriusque sexus principes tenebrarum
 90 ut liberata fugiat ab eis quae captivata tenebatur in eis divina
 substantia, de masculorum in feminas et feminarum in mas-
 culos transfiguratione conscripta sunt; unde ista, quam quilibet
 eorum negant ad se pertinere, turpitudine defluxit. Divinas enim
 virtutes quantum possunt imitari se putant ut purgent Dei sui
 95 partem; quam profecto, sicut in omnibus corporibus caelestibus
 et terrestribus atque in omnium rerum seminibus, ita et in
 hominis semine teneri existimant inquinatam. Ac per hoc
 sequitur eos, ut sic eam etiam de semine humano, quemad-
 modum de aliis seminibus quae in alimentis sumunt, debeant
 100 manducando purgare. Unde etiam Catharistae appellantur,
 quasi purgatores, tanta eam purgantes diligentia ut se nec ab
 hac tam horrenda cibi turpitudine abstineant.

Nec vescuntur tamen carnibus tamquam de mortuis vel
 occisis fugerit divina substantia, tantumque ac tale inde reman-
 105 serit quod iam digum non sit in Electorum ventre purgari. Nec
 ova saltem sumunt quasi et ipsa cum franguntur expirent, nec

examined by a midwife. When she was examined and when her true condition was discovered, she likewise gave information on that whole loathsome business at which flour is sprinkled beneath a couple in sexual intercourse to receive and commingle with their seed. This she had not heard when Margaret gave her testimony, for she had not been present. Even in recent times some of them have been exposed and brought before ecclesiastical authority, as the "Episcopal Acts" which you have sent us show. Under careful examination, they admitted that this is no sacrament, but a sacrilege.

One of them, whose name is Viator, claimed that those who commit such acts are properly called Catharists. Nevertheless, though he asserted that there are other groups of the Manichæan sect divided into Mattarii and especially Manichæans, he could not deny that all of these three forms were propagated by the same founder and that all of them are, generally speaking, Manichæans. Surely the Manichæan books are unquestionably common to all of them, and in these books are described these dreadful things relating to the transformation of males into females, and of females into males to attract and to loosen through concupiscence the princes of darkness of both sexes so that the divine substance which is imprisoned in them may be set free and escape. This is the source of the obscene practices which some of the Manichæans refuse to admit pertain to them. For they imagine that they are imitating divine powers to the highest degree and so they attempt to purge a part of their god, which they really believe is held befouled just as much in human seed as it is in all celestial and terrestrial bodies, and in the seeds of all things. And for this reason, it follows that they are just as much obliged to purge it from human seed by eating, as they are in reference to other seed which they consume in their food. This is the reason they are also called Catharists, that is, Purifiers, for they are so attentive to purifying this part that they do not refrain even from such horrifying food as this.

Yet they do not eat meat either, on the grounds that the divine substance has fled from the dead or slain bodies, and what little remains there is of such quality and quantity that it does not merit being purified in the stomachs of the Elect. They do not even eat eggs, claiming that they too die when they are broken, and it is

oporteat ullis mortuis corporibus vesci, et hoc solum vivat ex carne quod farina, ne moriatur, excipitur. Sed nec alimonia lactis utuntur, quamvis de corpore animantis vivente mulgeatur
 110 sive sugatur; non quia putant divinae substantiae nihil ibi esse permixtum, sed quia sibi error ipse non constat. Nam et vinum non bibunt, dicentes fel esse principum tenebrarum, cum vescantur uvis. Nec musti aliquid, vel recentissimi, sorbent.

Animas Auditorum suorum in Electos revolvī arbitrantur, aut
 115 feliciores compendio in escas Electorum suorum, ut iam inde purgatae in nulla corpora revertantur. Ceteras autem animas et in pecora redire putant et in omnia quae radicibus fixa sunt atque aluntur in terra. Herbas enim atque arbores sic putant vivere ut vitam quae illis inest et sentire credant et dolere cum
 120 laeduntur, nec aliquid inde sine cruciatu eorum quemquam posse vellere aut carpere. Propter quod agrum etiam spinis purgare nefas habent. Unde agriculturam, quae omnium artium est innocentissima, tanquam plurium homicidiorum ream dementer accusant. Suisque Auditoribus ideo haec arbitrantur
 125 ignosci quia praebent inde alimenta Electis suis ut divina illa substantia in eorum ventre purgata impetret eis veniam quorum traditur oblatione purganda. Itaque ipsi Electi nihil in agris operantes, nec poma carpentes, nec saltem folia ulla vellentes, expectant haec afferri usibus suis ab Auditoribus suis, viventes
 130 de tot act tantis secundum suam vanitatem homicidiis alienis. Monent etiam eosdem Auditores suos ut, si vescuntur carnibus, animalia non occidant, ne offendant principes tenebrarum in caelestibus colligatos, a quibus omnem carnem dicunt originem ducere.

135 Et si utuntur coniugibus, conceptum tamen generationemque devitent ne divina substantia, quae in eos per alimenta ingreditur, vinculis carnis ligetur in prole. Sic quippe in omnem carnem, id est, per escas et potus venire animas credunt. Unde nuptias sine dubitatione condemnant et, quantum in ipsis est,

not fitting to feed on any dead bodies; only that portion of flesh can live which is picked up by flour to prevent its death. Moreover, they do not use milk for food although it is drawn or milked from the live body of an animal, not with the conviction that there is nothing of the divine substance intermingled with it, but because error itself is inconsistent. For they do not drink wine either, claiming that bitterness is a property of the princes of darkness, though they do eat grapes. They do not even drink must, even the most freshly pressed.

They believe that the souls of their Auditors are returned to the Elect, or by a happier short-cut to the food of their Elect so that, already purged, they would then not have to transmigrate into other bodies. On the other hand, they believe that other souls pass into cattle and into everything that is rooted in and supported on the earth. For they are convinced that plants and trees possess sentient life and can feel pain when injured, and therefore that no one can pull or pluck them without torturing them. Therefore, they consider it wrong to clear a field even of thorns. Hence, in their madness they make agriculture, the most innocent of occupations, guilty of multiple murder. On the other hand, they believe that these crimes are forgiven their Auditors because the latter offer food of this sort to their Elect in order that the divine substance, on being purged in their stomachs, may obtain pardon for those through whose offering it is given to be purged. And so the Elect themselves perform no labors in the field, pluck no fruit, pick not even a leaf, but expect all these things to be brought for their use by their Auditors, living all the while, according to their own foolish thinking, on innumerable and horrible murders committed by others. They caution their same Auditors, furthermore, when they eat meat, not to kill the animals, to avoid offending the princes of darkness who are bound in the celestials. From them, they claim, all flesh has its origin.

And if they make use of marriage, they should, however, avoid conception and birth to prevent the divine substance, which has entered into them through food, from being bound by chains of flesh in their offspring. For this is the way, indeed, they believe that souls come into all flesh, that is, through food and drink. Hence, without doubt, they condemn marriage and forbid it as

140 prohibent, quando generare prohibent, propter quod coniugia
coplanda sunt.

Adam et Evam ex parentibus principibus fumi asserunt natos,
cum pater eorum nomine Saclas sociorum suorum fetus omnium
devorasset, et quidquid inde commixtum divinae substantiae
145 ceperat, cum uxore concumbens in carne prolis tamquam tenacissimo vinculo colligasset.

Christum autem fuisse affirmant, quem dicit nostra Scriptura
serpentem, a quo illuminatos asserunt ut cognitionis oculos
aperirent, et bonum malumque dignoscerent; eumque Christum
150 novissimis temporibus venisse ad animas, non ad corpora liberanda; nec fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus prae buisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur; Deum qui Legem per Moysen dedit, et in Hebraeis Prophetis locutus est,
155 non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebrarum. Ipsiusque testamenti novi scripturas tamquam infalsatas ita legunt, ut quod volunt inde accipiant, quod nolunt reiiciant; eisque tamquam totum verum habentes nonnullas apocryphas anteponant.

160 Promissionem Domini Iesu Christi de Paraclito Spiritu Sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam. Unde se in suis litteris Iesu Christi apostolum dicit, eo quod Iesus Christus se missurum esse promiserit, atque in illo miserit Spiritum Sanctum. Propter quod etiam ipse Manichaeus duo-
165 decim discipulos habuit ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichaei hodieque custodiunt. Nam ex Electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros, et tertium decimum principem ipsorum; episcopos autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis.
170 Habent etiam episcopi diaconos. Iam ceteri tantummodo Electi vocantur. Sed mittuntur etiam ipsi qui videntur idonei ad hunc errorem vel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, vel ubi non est etiam seminandum.

Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre,
175 nec quemquam eorum quos decipiunt baptizandum putant.

much as is in their power, since they forbid the propagation of offspring, the reason for marriage.

They assert that Adam and Eve had as their parents princes of Smoke, since their father, whose name was Saclas, had devoured the children of all his associates and in lying with his wife had, as if with the strongest of chains, bound in the flesh of his offspring whatever he had received mixed with the divine substance.

They maintain that the serpent of whom our Scriptures speak was Christ, and they say that our first parents were illuminated by the latter so that they might open the eyes of knowledge, and discern good and evil; further, that this Christ came in recent times to set souls free, not bodies; and that He did not come in real flesh, but presented the simulated appearance of flesh to deceive human perception, and therein he feigned not only death, but resurrection as well. They assert that the god who gave the Law through Moses, and who spoke in the Hebrew prophets is not the true God, but one of the princes of darkness. Even in the New Testament they, claiming falsification, choose among the various books, and thus they accept what they like from it and reject what they do not like. They prefer certain apocryphal writings to the Scriptures, as if they contained the whole truth.

They claim that the promise of the Lord Jesus Christ regarding the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, was fulfilled in their heresiarch Manichaeus. For this reason, in his writings he calls himself the apostle of Jesus Christ, in that Christ had promised to send him and had sent the Holy Spirit in him.

For the same reason Manichaeus also had twelve disciples in imitation of the twelve Apostles. The Manichaeans keep this number even today. For they have twelve of their Elect whom they call Masters, and a thirteenth who is their chief, seventy-two bishops who receive their orders from the Masters, and priests who are ordained by the bishops. The bishops also have deacons. The rest are called merely the Elect. But even any of their members who seem suitable are sent to strengthen and support this error where it exists, or to plant it where it does not.

They allege that baptism in water grants no salvation to anyone, and do not believe that they have to baptize any of those whom they deceive.

Orationes faciunt ad solem per diem, quaquaversum circuit; ad lunam per noctem, si apparet; si autem non apparet, ad Aquiloniam partem qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem revertitur. Stant orantes.

- 180 Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, sed substantiae tribuunt gentis adversae, quam dogmatizantes esse hominibus mixtam. Omnem carnem non Dei, sed malae mentis perhibent esse opificium, quae a contrario principio Deo coaeterna est. Carnalem concupiscentiam, qua caro concupiscit
 185 adversus spiritum, non ex vitiata in primo homine natura nobis inesse infirmitatem, sed substantiam volunt esse contrariam sic nobis adhaerentem ut quando liberamur atque purgamur, separetur a nobis, et in sua natura etiam ipsa immortaliter vivat; easque duas animas, vel duas mentes, unam bonam, alteram
 190 malam, in uno homine inter se habere conflictum, quando caro concupiscit adversus spiritum, et spiritus adversus carnem; nec in nobis sanatum hoc vitium, sicuti nos dicimus, nunquam futurum, sed a nobis seiunctam atque seclusam substantiam istam mali, et finito isto saeculo post conflagrationem mundi
 195 in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere sempiterno, esse victuram. Cui globo affirmant accessurum semper et adhaesurum quasi coopertorium atque tectorium ex animabus natura quidem bonis, sed tamen quae non potuerint a naturae malae contagione mundari.

Cap. 47. **HIERACITAE**, quorum auctor Hieraca nuncupatur, resurrectionem carnis negant. Monachos tantum et monachas et coniugia non habentes in communionem recipiunt. Ad regnum caelorum non pertinere parvulos dicunt, quia non sunt
 5 eis ulla merita certaminis quo vitia superantur.

Cap. 48. **MELETIANI** a Meletio nuncupati, nolentes orare cum conversis, id est, eis qui in persecutione ceciderunt, schisma fecerunt. Nunc autem dicuntur Arianis esse coniuncti.

Cap. 49. **ARIANI** ab Ario in eo sunt notissimi errore quo Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum nolunt esse unius eius-

In the daytime they offer their prayers toward the sun, wherever it goes in its orbit; at night, they offer them toward the moon, if it appears; if it does not, they direct them toward the North, by which the sun, when it has set, returns to the East. They stand while praying.

They ascribe the origin of sin not to a free choice of the will, but to the nature of the opposing element, which they hold is intermingled in man. For they assert that all flesh is the work, not of God, but of an evil mind, which emanating from the opposite principle, is coeternal with God. As they will have it, carnal concupiscence, by which the flesh lusts against the spirit, is not an infirmity engendered in us by the corruption of our nature in the first man, but a contrary substance which clings to us in such a way that if we are freed and purged, it can be removed from us, and can live, even alone, immortally in its own nature. These two souls, or two minds, the one good, the other evil, are in conflict with one another in man, when the flesh lusts against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. This defect in our nature has not been healed, as we say it has, nor will it ever be healed. But that substance of evil, after being disjoined and separated from us, even at the end of this world, upon the conflagration of the universe, will live in a kind of globe, as if in an eternal prison. They claim that a sort of envelope or covering, composed of souls which are good by nature, but which, nevertheless, have not been able to be purged from the contagion of the evil nature, will continually come and cling to this globe.

Chap. 47. The Hieracites, whose founder is called Hieraca, deny the resurrection of the body. They receive only monks, nuns, and the unmarried into communion with them. They say that children do not belong to the kingdom of heaven, for they have gained no merit by struggling against sin.

Chap. 48. The Meletians, named after Meletius, formed a schism because they refused to pray with the "conversi," that is, those who fell away from the Church under persecution. At the present time, they are said to be united with the Arians.

Chap. 49. The Arians, who take their name from Arius, are the most widely recognized adherents of that error which denies that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of one and the same nature

demque naturae atque substantiae, aut ut expressius dicatur, essentiae, quae οὐσία Graece appellatur; sed esse Filium creaturam; Spiritum vero Sanctum creaturam creaturae, hoc est, ab ipso Filio creatum volunt. In eo autem quod Christum sine anima solam carnem suscepisse arbitrantur, minus noti sunt. Nec adversus eos ab aliquo inveni de hac re aliquando fuisse certatum. Sed hoc verum esse et Epiphanius non tacuit, et ego
 10 ex eorum quibusdam scriptis et collocationibus certissime comperi. Rebaptizari quoque ab his Catholicos novimus; utrum et non Catholicos, nescio.

Cap. 50. VADIANOS quos appellat Epiphanius, et schismaticos non haereticos vult videri. Alii vocant Anthropomorphitas, quoniam Deum sibi fingunt cogitatione carnali in similitudinem hominis corruptibilis, quod rusticitati eorum
 5 tribuit Epiphanius, parcens eis ne dicantur haeretici. Eos autem separasse se dicit a communione nostra culpando episcopos divites et pascha cum Iudaeis celebrando. Quamvis sint qui eos in Aegypto ecclesiae Catholicae communicare asseverent. De Photinianis autem, quos isto loco Epiphanius commemorat, iam
 10 superius satis locutus sum.

Cap. 51. SEMIARIANOS Epiphanius dicit qui similis essentiae dicunt filium, tamquam non plenos Arianos; quasi Ariani nec similem velint, cum hoc Eunomiani dicere celebrentur.

Cap. 52. MACEDONIANI sunt a Macedonio, quos et Πνευματομάχους Graeci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigent. Nam de Patre et Filio recte sentiunt quod unius sint eiusdemque substantiae vel essentiae, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt
 5 credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes. Hos potius quidam Semiarianos vocant, quod in hac quaestione ex parte cum illis sint, ex parte nobiscum. Quamvis a nonnullis perhibeantur non Deum, sed deitatem Patris et Filii dicere Spiritum Sanctum et nullam propriam habere substantiam.

and substance; or, to put it more expressly, of one and the same essence, which in Greek is *οὐσία*. But they claim that the Son is a creature, while the Holy Spirit is a creation of the creature, that is, they would have it that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son Himself. They are less known for maintaining this error: that Christ assumed flesh alone, without a soul. I did not find this argued against them at any time by anyone. But Epiphanius testified to the truth of this, and I have certainly determined it from some of their writings and discourses. We also know that they rebaptize Catholics, but I do not know if they rebaptize non-Catholics.

Chap. 50. Epiphanius intends those whom he called Vadiani to be regarded in fact as schismatics, not heretics. Others call them the Anthropomorphitae because in their material-mindedness they fashion a god for themselves in the likeness of mortal man. Epiphanius attributes this to their ignorance, thus saving them from being called heretics. He says that they separated from communion with us because of their disapproval of wealthy bishops and their desire to celebrate the Pasch along with the Jews. Yet there are those who claim that they are in communion with the Catholic Church in Egypt.

Now, of the Photinians, whom Epiphanius treats here, I have already spoken *supra*.

Chap. 51. Epiphanius calls those the Semi-Arians, that is, not full Arians, who say that the Son is of like essence, as if the Arians themselves do not intend like essence. But the common opinion is that the Eunomians hold this doctrine.

Chap. 52. The Macedonians derive their name from Macedonius. The Greeks also call them *πνευματομάχοι*, because they quarrel regarding the Holy Spirit. They have a proper understanding of the Father and the Son, believing that They are of one and the same essence or substance, but they refuse to believe the same thing of the Holy Spirit, for they claim that He is a creature. It is these that some people choose to call Semi-Arians, since in this question they agree in part with the Arians and in part with us. However, others assert that they say the Holy Spirit is not God, but the Deity of the Father and the Son without possessing any substance of His own.

Cap. 53. AËRIANI ab Aërio quodam sunt qui, cum esset presbyter, doluisse fertur quod episcopus non potuit ordinari; et in Arianorum haeresim lapsus propria quoque dogmata addidisse nonnulla, dicens offerri pro dormientibus non oportere, 5 nec statuta solemniiter celebranda esse ieiunia; sed cum quisque voluerit, ieiunandum, ne videatur esse sub lege. Dicebat etiam presbyterum ab episcopo nulla differentia debere discerni. Quidam perhibent istos, sicut Encratitas vel Apotactitas, non admittere ad communionem suam nisi continentes et eos qui 10 saeculo ita renuntiaverint ut propria nulla possideant. Ab escatamen carnum non eos abstinere dicit Epiphanius, Philaster vero et hanc eis tribuit abstinentiam.

Cap. 54. AËTIANI ab Aëtio sunt vocati, iidemque Eunomiani ab Eunomio Aëtii discipulo, quo nomine magis innotuerunt. Eunomius quippe in dialectica praevalens, acutius et celebrius defendit hanc haeresim, dissimilem per omnia Patri 5 asserens Filium, et Filio Spiritum Sanctum. Fertur etiam usque adeo fuisse bonis moribus inimicus ut asseveraret quod nihil cuique obesset quorumlibet perpetratio ac perseverantia peccatorum, si huius quae ab illo docebatur fidei particeps esset.

Cap. 55. APOLLINARISTAS Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi a Catholica dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua quaestione testimoniis evangelicis victi, mentem qua rationalis est 5 anima hominis defuisse animae Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse dixerunt. De ipsa vero eius carne sic a recta fide dissensisse perhibentur, ut dicerent carnem illam et Verbum unius eiusdemque substantiae, contentiosissime asseverantes Verbum carnem factum, hoc est, Verbi aliquid in 10 carnem fuisse conversum atque mutatum, non autem carnem de Mariae carne fuisse susceptam.

Cap. 56. ANTIDICOMARITAE appellati sunt haeretici qui

Chap. 53. The Aërians are named after a certain Aërius. The story is that though he was a priest, he deeply regretted the fact that he could not be made a bishop. He fell into the Arian heresy and added some teachings of his own, stating that the Holy Sacrifice ought not be offered for the dead, and that regularly instituted fasts are not to be formally observed, but each man should fast when he wishes lest he seems to be under obligation. He maintained also that there should be no difference between priest and bishop. Some people claim that the Aërians, like the Encratites or Apotactitae, admit to communion with them only the continent and those who have so completely renounced the world that they possess nothing of their own. Epiphanius says that they do not abstain from eating meat, but Filastrius ascribes this form of abstinence also to them.

Chap. 54. The Aëtians get their name from Aëtius, but are also called the Eunomians after Eunomius, a disciple of Aëtius, and under this name are better known. Indeed Eunomius, who was skilled in dialectics, defended this heresy with considerable acuteness and fame. He asserted that the Son is dissimilar to the Father in everything, as is the Holy Spirit in respect to the Son. He is said to have been such an enemy to good morals that he claimed that the commission of, and the continuation in, any kind of sin would not harm anyone who was a member of the religion which he taught.

Chap. 55. Apollinaris founded the Apollinarists, who dissented from the teaching of the Catholic Church on the soul of Christ. Like the Arians, they said that Christ had assumed flesh, but not a soul. Vanquished on this point by proofs from Scripture, they said that the mind, which gives rationality to man, was absent from the soul of Christ, and that in Christ its place was taken by the Word itself. In reference to the flesh of Christ, it is claimed that they departed from the true Faith so much that they stated that His flesh and the Word were of one and the same substance, asserting most vehemently that the Word was made flesh, that is, something of the Word had been converted and changed into flesh; but that the flesh, however, had not been assumed from Mary's flesh.

Chap. 56. The Antidicomarianites are heretics who take their

Mariae virginitati usque adeo contradicunt ut affirmant eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam.

- Cap. 57. Postremam ponit Epiphanius Massalianorum haeresim, quod nomen ex lingua Syra est. Graece autem dicuntur *Εβχίται*, ab orando sic appellati. Tantum enim orant ut eis qui hoc de illis audiunt incredibile videatur. Nam cum Dominus
 5 dixerit: *oportet semper orare et non deficere*,¹ et Apostolus
*"Sine intermissione orate"*² quod sanissime sic accipitur, ut nullo die intermittantur certa tempora orandi, isti ita nimis hoc faciunt ut hinc iudicarentur inter haereticos nominandi. Quamvis nonnulli eos dicant de purgatione animarum nescio
 10 quam phantasticam et ridiculam fabulam narrare, porcam scilicet cum porcellis videri exire de ore hominis quando purgatur, et in eum visibili similiter specie ignem qui non comburat intrare. His adiungit Epiphanius Euphemitas, Martyrianos et Satanianos, et hos omnes cum illis tamquam unam haeresim
 15 ponit. Dicuntur Euchitae opinari monachis non licere sustentandae vitae suae causa aliquid operari, atque ita se ipsos monachos profiteri ut omnino ab operibus vacent.

-
- Usque ad istos ergo de haeresibus opus suum perduxit supradictus episcopus Cyprius, apud Graecos inter magnos habitus, et a multis in Catholicae fidei sanitate laudatus. Cuius ego in commemorandis haereticis non modum, sed ordinem sum
 5 secutus. Nam et aliqua ex aliis posui quae ipse non posuit, et aliqua non posui quae ipse posuit. Itaque alia latius quam ipse, alia etiam brevius explicavi, paremque in nonnullis exhibui breviter, omnia moderans sicut intentionis meae ratio postulabat. Proinde ille de octoginta haeresibus, separatim viginti
 10 quas ante Domini adventum exstitisse, sicut ei visum est, computavit; reliquas post Domini ascensum natas sexaginta brevis-

¹ Lk. 18. 1.

² 1 Thess. 5. 17.

name from the fact that they are so opposed to the virginity of Mary that they maintain that after the birth of Christ she had relations with her husband.

Chap. 57. Epiphanius places the heresy of the Massalians last. Their name comes from the Syrian tongue. In Greek, however, they are called *Εὐχῖται* because of their praying. They pray so much that it seems incredible to those who hear of them. For although the Lord said that we must always pray and not lose heart, and the Apostle, "Pray without ceasing," this is most sensibly interpreted to mean that set times for prayer should not be missed on any day, yet they go to such extremes in this that they are thereby judged worthy of being named among the heretics. However, some say that they tell some fantastic and ridiculous tale or other about the purification of souls: that a sow along with her sucklings is seen to leave the mouth of man when he is purified, and, likewise in visible form, a flame, which does not burn, enters into him. With these, Epiphanius connects the Euphemites, the Martyriani, and the Sataniani, and places all of them together as one heresy. They say that the Euchites believe that monks should not be allowed to do any work to support themselves, and that accordingly they proclaim themselves monks in order to be completely free from labor.

With these heretics, then, the bishop of Cyprus, just mentioned, who enjoyed great reputation among the Greeks, and who was praised by many for his soundness in the Catholic Faith, brought his work on heresies to a conclusion. In my treatment of the heretics, I followed his order, but not his method. For, on the one hand, I included some information from other authors, which he did not give; and on the other, I omitted some which he furnished. Consequently, I explained some points in more detail than he and some in less, while in others, I exhibited identical brevity, regulating everything in accordance with the demands of my plan. Furthermore, according to his manner of reckoning, he counted eighty heresies, separating for special treatment twenty which had existed before the birth of the Lord. The remaining sixty which arose after the Ascension of the Lord, he comprised in five very short books. All in all, he completed his work in six books. But

simis libris quinque comprehendit; atque omnes sex libros totius eiusdem sui operis fecit. Ego autem, quia secundum petitionem tuam eas haereses memorare institui, quae post
 15 glorificationem Christi se adversus doctrinam Christi, etiam sub velamine Christiani nominis extulerunt, quinquaginta septem ex Epiphanii ipsius opere in meum transtuli, duas in unam referens ubi nullam differentiam potui reperire; et rursus ubi ille ex duabus unam facere voluit, sub numeris suis singulas
 20 posui. Sed adhuc commemorare debeo sive quas apud alios reperi, sive quas ipse reminiscor. Nunc ergo addo quas Philaster posuit, nec posuit Epiphanius.

Cap. 58. METANGISMONITAE dici possunt qui Metangismon asserunt, dicentes sic esse in Patre Filium quomodo vas in vase, quasi duo corpora carnaliter opinantes, ita ut Filius intret in Patrem tamquam vas minus in vas maius. Unde et tale nomen
 5 hic error accepit, ut μεταγγισμός Graece diceretur; ἀγγείον quippe illa lingua vas dicitur, sed introitus unius vasis in alterum Latine uno nomine non potest dici sicut Graece potuit μεταγγισμός.

Cap. 59. SELEUCIANI sunt vel Hermiani ab auctoribus Seleuco vel Hermia, qui elementorum materiam, de qua factus est mundus, non a Deo factam dicunt, sed Deo coaeternam. Nec animam Deo tribuunt creatori, sed creatores esse animarum
 5 angelos volunt de igne et spiritu. Malum autem asserunt esse aliquando a Deo, aliquando a materia. Negant Salvatorem in carne sedere ad dexteram Patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eamque in sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de psalmo ubi legitur: *In sole posuit tabernaculum suum.*¹ Negant etiam visi-
 10 bilem paradisum, baptismum in aqua non accipiunt, resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum.

Cap. 60. PROCLIANITAE secuti sunt istos, et addiderunt Christum non in carne venisse.

Cap. 61. PATRICIANI, a Patricio nuncupati, substantiam carnis humanae non a Deo, sed a diabolo conditam dicunt,

¹ Ps. 18. 6.

since I, complying with your wishes, decided to review the heresies which, since the day of His Glorification, have risen to oppose the doctrines of Christ even under cover of the Christian name, took fifty-seven from the work of Epiphanius into my own, presenting two in one where I could find no difference. Again, where he wanted to make one out of two, I gave them each a number and treated them separately. But in addition to all of these I ought now to treat of those heresies which I found in other authors or which I can recall myself. Now then, I shall present the ones which Filastrius gives, but which are not found in Epiphanius.

Chap. 58. The Metangismonites is a name that can be given to those who maintain the doctrine of Metangismos. They say that the Son dwells within the Father, like one vase within another. They think of Them in the physical fashion as two bodies, as if the Son enters into the Father like a smaller vase into a larger one. This is the reason why this error is called μεταγγισμός, in Greek, for in that language ἀγγεῖον is the word for vase, but the entrance of one vessel into another cannot be expressed by one word in Latin as it could in the Greek μεταγγισμός.

Chap. 59. The Seleucians or Hermians, disciples of Seleucus or Hermias, say that the matter of the elements from which the world was made was not created by God, but is coeternal with Him. They do not ascribe the creation of the soul to God, but, as they will have it, souls are the creation of angels, who made them out of fire and air. Evil, they assert, proceeds sometimes from God, sometimes from matter. They deny that the Saviour sits in the flesh at the right hand of the Father. They maintain that He stripped Himself of the flesh and placed it in the sun, taking their proof for this from the words of the Psalm, "He hath set His tabernacle in the sun." They also deny a visible paradise, do not accept baptism in water, and do not believe in a future resurrection, but maintain that this takes place every day in the propagation of offspring.

Chap. 60. The Proclinianitae followed their teachings and denied, in addition, that Christ came in the flesh.

Chap. 61. The Patriciani, named after Patricius, say that the substance of human flesh was created, not by God, but by the devil.

eamque sic fugiendam et detestandam putant ut quidam eorum perhibeantur etiam morte sibi illata carere carne voluisse.

Cap. 62. ASCITAE ab utre appellati sunt (*ἀσκός* enim Graece Latine uter dicitur), quem perhibentur inflatum et opertum circuire bacchantes tamquam ipsi sint evangelici utres novi novo vino repleti.

Cap. 63. PASSALORYNCHITAE in tantum silentio student ut naribus et labiis suis digitum opponant, ne vel ipsam taciturnitatem voce praeripiant, quando tacendum sibi esse arbitrantur, unde etiam illis est nomen inditum; *πάσσαλος* enim
 5 Graece dicitur palus, et *ρύγχος* nasus. Cur autem per palum digitum significare maluerint a quibus hoc nomen compositum est nescio, cum Graece et dicatur digitus *δάκτυλος*, et possint utique Dactylorynchitae multo evidentius nuncupari.

Cap. 64. AQUARII ex hoc appellati sunt quod aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti, non illud quod omnis ecclesia.

Cap. 65. COLUTHIANI a quodam Colutho qui dicebat Deum non facere mala contra illud quod scriptus est, Ego Deus creans mala.

Cap. 66. FLORINIANI a Florino qui e contrario dicebat Deum creasse mala contra id quod scriptum est, fecit Deus omnia, et ecce bona valde. Ac per hoc quamvis contraria inter se dicentes, tamen ambo divinis eloquiis resistebant. Creat enim
 5 Deus mala, poenas iustissimas irrogando, quod Coluthus non videbat, non autem malas creando naturas atque substantias in quantum sunt naturae atque substantiae, ubi Florinus errabat.

Cap. 67. Haeresim quandam sine auctore et sine nomine Philaster commemorat quae dicit hunc mundum etiam post resurrectionem mortuorum in eodem statu in quo nunc est esse mansurum, neque ita esse mutandum ut sit caelum novum
 5 et terra nova sicut sancta Scriptura promittit.

They are so firmly convinced that it should be shunned and detested, that some of them are reported to have sought freedom from the flesh even by suicide.

Chap. 62. The Ascitae get their name from the leather bottle, for *ἄσκος* is the Greek for what we call "leather bottle" in Latin. For they are said to dance with Bacchic abandon around a veiled, inflated leather bottle, convinced that they are the Gospel's new skins, filled with new wine.

Chap. 63. The Passalorynchitae are so devoted to silence that they place the finger upon their lips and nose to avoid even breaking silence at all when they judge that they should be silent. This is the reason they are given that name, *πάσσαλος* being the Greek for stake and *ῥύγχος* for nose. But why they who invented the name preferred to use the word "stake" for finger, I do not know. For there is the Greek word *δάκτυλος* for finger. And certainly they could be called the Dactylorynchitae with greater clarity.

Chap. 64. The Aquarians get their name from the fact that they offer water in the sacramental chalice, instead of following the custom of the whole Church.

Chap. 65. The Coluthiani originated from a certain Coluthus. He said that God is the author of no evil, taking exception to what has been written, "I am God, creating evil."

Chap. 66. The Florinians got their name from Florinus. He, on the contrary, said that God was the author of evil, taking exception to what has been written, "God made all things and behold, they were very good." Consequently both of these groups, though mutually contradictory in their utterances, were opposed to the word of God. For God created evil by imposing just penalties. Coluthus did not perceive this. God does not do so, however, by creating evil natures and substances, insofar as they are natures and substances. This is where Florinus erred.

Chap. 67. Filastrius treats of a certain heresy without giving it a name or an author. It says that this world will continue in the same state in which it now is, even after the resurrection of the dead. It will not undergo such a change that there will be a new heaven and a new earth as Holy Scripture declares.

Cap. 68. Est alia haeresis nudis pedibus semper ambulantium eo quod Dominus dixerit ad Moysen vel ad Iosue: *Solve calceamentum de pedibus tuis*,¹ et quod propheta Isaias nudis pedibus iussus fuerit ambulare. Ideo ergo haeresis est quia
 5 non propter corporis afflictionem sic ambulant, sed quia testimonia divina taliter intelligunt.

Cap 69. DONATIANI vel DONATISTAE sunt qui primum propter ordinatum contra suam voluntatem Caecilianum ecclesiae Carthaginensis episcopum schisma fecerunt, obiiicientes ei crimina non probata, et maxime quod a traditoribus divinarum scripturarum fuerit ordinatus. Sed post causam cum eo
 5 dictam atque finitam falsitatis rei deprehensi, pertinaci dissensione firmata, in haeresim schisma verterunt, tamquam ecclesia Christi propter crimina Caeciliani, seu vera, seu, quod magis iudicibus apparuit, falsa, de toto terrarum orbe perierit, ubi
 10 futura promissa est; atque in Africana Donati parte remanserit, in aliis terrarum partibus quasi contagione communionis extincta. Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos, ubi se amplius haereticos esse firmarunt, cum ecclesiae Catholicae universae placuerit nec in ipsis haereticis baptismum commune rescindere.

15 Huius haeresis principem accipimus fuisse Donatum, qui de Numidia veniens, et contra Caecilianum Christianam dividens plebem, adiunctis sibi eiusdem factionis episcopis, Maiorinum apud Carthaginem ordinavit episcopum. Cui Maiorino Donatus alius in eadem divisione successit, qui eloquentia sua sic con-
 20 firmavit hanc haeresim ut multi existiment propter ipsum potius eos Dontatistas vocari. Exstant scripta eius ubi apparet eum etiam non Catholicam de Trinitate habuisse sententiam, sed quamvis eiusdem substantiae, minorem tamen Patre Filium, et minorem Filio putasse Spiritum Sanctum. Verum in hunc
 25 quem de Trinitate habuit eius errorem Donatistarum multitudo intenta non fuit, nec facile in eis quisquam, qui hoc illum sensisse noverit, invenitur.

Isti haeretici in urbe Roma Montenses vocantur, quibus hinc

¹ Jos. 5. 16.

Chap. 68. Another group of heretics always goes barefooted because of what the Lord said to Moses and to Josue, "Put off the shoes from thy feet," and because the prophet Isaías had been ordered to walk barefoot. Therefore, this is a heresy because they do not walk this way for bodily mortification, but because they interpret Divine Revelation in such fashion.

Chap. 69. The Donatists or Donatians at first created a schism because Caecilianus had been consecrated bishop of the Church of Carthage contrary to their wishes. They charged him with crimes that were not proved and in particular that he had been consecrated by men who had surrendered the Scriptures. But after their case against him had been presented and completed, they were found guilty of misrepresentation. But confirmed in their stubborn opposition, they turned their schism into heresy, as if the Church of Christ could have perished from the whole earth, where it had been guaranteed to last, because of the crimes of Caecilianus, whether they were true, or, as appeared more probable to the judges, false; and could have continued on in the African sect of Donatus, after being destroyed in all parts of the world, through a common contagion. Moreover, they have the affrontery to rebaptize Catholics. In so doing, they establish their heretical position more firmly, since the entire Catholic Church agrees on not repeating baptism when it is conferred in proper fashion, even by heretics.

We understand that Donatus was the leader of this heresy. He came from Numidia, aroused Christians against Caecilianus and, uniting bishops of this faction to him, consecrated Maiorinus bishop at Carthage. A second Donatus succeeded Maiorinus in this schism. He established this heresy so firmly through his eloquence that many believe that the Donatist get their name rather from him. There are writings of his available in which it appears that he did not hold to the Catholic belief on the Trinity, but he considered the Son inferior to the Father, though granting that he was of the same substance, and the Holy Spirit inferior to the Son. But in this doctrinal error of his on the Trinity the mass of the Donatists were not involved. Indeed, it is not easy to find anyone among them who knows that he held this opinion.

At Rome, these heretics are called the Montenses. It is the Donatist custom to send the latter a bishop from Africa, or for

ex Africa solent episcopum mittere, aut hinc illuc Afri episcopi
30 eorum pergere, si forte ibi eum ordinare placuisset.

Ad hanc haeresim in Africa et illi pertinent qui appellantur
Circumcelliones, genus hominum agreste et famosissimae auda-
ciae, non solum in alios immania facinora perpetrando, sed
nec sibi eadem insana feritate parcendo. Nam per mortes varias,
35 maximeque praecipitiorum et aquarum et ignium, seipsos necare
consuerunt, et in istum furorem alios quos potuerint sexus
utriusque seducere, aliquando ut occidantur ab aliis, mortem
nisi fecerint comminantes. Verumtamen plerisque Donatis-
tarum displicent tales, nec eorum communione contaminari se
40 putant, qui Christiano orbi terrarum dementer obiciunt ignoto-
rum crimen Afrorum.

Multa et inter ipsos facta sunt schismata, et ab iis se diversis
coetibus alii atque alii separarunt, quorum separationem cetera
grandis multitudo non sensit. Sed apud Carthaginem Maxi-
45 mianus contra Primianum ab eiusdem erroris centum ferme
episcopis ordinatus, et, a reliquis trecentis decem, cum eis duo-
decim qui ordinationi eius etiam praesentia corporali inter-
fuerunt atrocissima criminatione damnatus, compulit eos nosse
etiam extra ecclesiam dari posse baptismum Christi. Nam quos-
50 dam ex eis cum eis quos extra eorum ecclesiam baptizaverant in
suis honoribus sine ulla in quoquam repetitione baptismatis rece-
perunt. Nec eos ut corrigerent per publicas potestates agere
destiterunt, nec eorum criminibus per sui concilii sententiam
vehementer exaggeratis communionem suam contaminare ti-
55 muerunt.

Cap. 70. PRISCILLIANISTAE, quos in Hispania Priscil-
lianus instituit, maxime Gnosticorum et Manichaeorum dog-
mata permixta sectantur, quamvis et ex aliis haeresibus in eos
sordes tamquam in sentinam quandam horribili confusione
5 fluxerint. Propter occultandas autem contaminationes et turpi-
tudines suas habent in suis dogmatibus et haec verba: "Iura,
periura, secretum prodere noli." Hi animas dicunt eiusdem

their African bishops to go to Rome, if it has been decided to consecrate a bishop there.

In Africa a group which is known as the Circumcelliones also belong to this heresy. These are rude country people, notorious in their insolence, who not only perpetrate savage crimes against others, but do not spare the members of their own sect in their mad fury. It is their practice to commit suicide in various ways, particularly by leaping off cliffs, by drowning, or by fire, and they seduce others whom they can, men or women, to follow the same madness; and at times, in order that they themselves may be killed by others, they threaten the latter with death, unless they do what they are bidden. Nevertheless, most of the Donatists abhor these extremists and do not believe that their society is befouled with the membership of such men, foolishly charging the whole Christian world, instead, with the crime of these unknown Africans.

Many schisms have arisen even among the Donatists themselves, this group or that group breaking off from them to form different congregations. But the great mass of the sect is not aware of these divisions. At Carthage, Maximianus was ordained in opposition to Primianus by nearly a hundred bishops of that heresy. The remaining three hundred and ten, along with twelve who had also been bodily present at his ordination, charged him with the blackest of crimes. But he forced them to recognize that the baptism of Christ can be given even outside the Church. For they took back into their community some of their own schismatics in their full dignity, along with those that these persons had baptized outside the Donatist Church, without rebaptizing any of them. They did not cease acting through public authority to correct them, and yet, at the same time, they did not fear to contaminate their communion with crimes that had been violently censured by the judgment of their own council.

Chap. 70. The Priscillianists, instituted in Spain by Priscillianus, follow, for the most part, a mixture of Gnostic and Manichaean doctrine, although filth from other heresies flowed in horrible confusion into their teachings as into some sort of cesspool. And, to hide their corruption and filth, they also have as part of their doctrine these words: "Swear, perjure yourself, but do not betray the secret." These men say that souls are of the same nature and

naturae atque substantiae cuius est Deus; ad agonem quandam spontaneum in terris exercendum, per septem caelos et per quosdam gradatim descendere principatus; et in malignum principem incurrere a quo istum mundum factum volunt atque ab hoc principe per diversa carnis corpora seminari. Astruunt etiam fatalibus stellis homines colligatos, ipsumque corpus nostrum secundum duodecim signa caeli esse compositum, sicut hi qui mathematici vulgo appellantur, constituentes in capite Arietem, Taurum in cervice, Geminos in humeris, Cancrum in pectore, et cetera nominatim signa percurrentes ad plantas usque perveniunt, quas Piscibus tribuunt, quod ultimum signum ab astrologis nuncupatur. Haec et alia fabulosa, vana, sacrilega, quae persequi longum est, haeresis ista contextit.

Carnes tamquam immundas escas etiam ipsa devitat; coniuges quibus hoc malum potuerit persuadere disiungens, et viros a nolentibus feminis, et feminas a nolentibus viris. Opificium quippe omnis carnis non Deo bono et vero, sed malignis angelis tribuunt; hoc versutiores etiam Manichaeis quod nihil Scripturarum canonicarum repudiant, simul cum apocryphis legentes omnia et in auctoritatem sumentes, sed in suos sensus allegorizando vertentes quicquid in sanctis Libris est quod eorum evertat errorem. De Christo Sabellianam sectam tenent, eundem ipsum esse dicentes, non solum Filium, sed etiam Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum.

Cap. 71. Dicit Philaster esse alios haereticos qui cum hominibus non sumunt escas. Sed utrum cum aliis qui eiusdem sectae non sunt, an etiam inter seipsos id faciant, non exprimit. Dicit etiam eos de Patre et Filio recte, de Spiritu autem Sancto non Catholice sapere, quod eum opinentur esse creaturam.

Cap. 72. A RHETORIO quodam exortam haeresim dicit nimium mirabilis vanitatis, quae omnes haereticos recte ambulare et vera dicere affirmat; quod ita est absurdum ut mihi incredibile videatur.

substance as God. To undergo some sort of a voluntary test on earth, souls descend by grades through seven heavens and through certain principalities. They meet with an evil prince, by whom the Priscillianists would have it the world has been made, and are by this prince sown through various carnal bodies. They maintain, moreover, that men are bound by stars governing their fate, and that our body itself is composed in accordance with the twelve signs of the zodiac. Like those who are ordinarily called astrologers, they set the Ram at the head, the Bull at the neck, the Twins on the shoulders, the Crab at the breast, and running through the rest of the signs, they come to the feet, ascribing them to the Fish, which is called the last sign by the astrologers. That heresy has fabricated these and other foolish, empty and sacrilegious tales, which would be tedious to pursue in detail.

This heresy, likewise, shuns meat as unclean food. They separate spouses whom they have succeeded in convincing of this evil, husbands from wives who refuse to accept this, wives from husbands who likewise refuse to accept it. They ascribe the creation of all flesh, not to the good and true God, but to evil angels. Moreover, they are more cunning than the Manichaeans in this respect, that they reject nothing of the canonical Scriptures, but accept all of them, along with Apocrypha, as authoritative. Whatever there is in the holy Books that would destroy their error, they transform to their own sense by means of allegory. Concerning Christ, they hold the Sabellian opinion, claiming that He is the same, not only as the Son, but also as the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Chap. 71. Filastrius says that there are other heretics who do not eat in the company of human beings. But he does not explain whether this is their conduct with men who are not of the same sect, or whether it applied among themselves too. Moreover, he says that they have a correct knowledge of the Father and the Son, but they do not understand the Holy Spirit in the Catholic sense because they consider Him a creature.

Chap. 72. He says that from some Rhetorius or other, a heresy arose which is quite fantastic in its folly. It maintains that all heretics are following the right path and speak the truth. This is so absurd that it seems incredible to me.

Cap. 73. Alia est haeresis quae dicit in Christo divinitatem doluisse cum figeretur caro eius in cruce.

Cap. 74. Est alia quae triformem sic asserit Deum, ut quaedam pars eius sit Pater, quaedam Filius, quaedam Spiritus Sanctus, hoc est, quod Dei unius partes sint, quae istam faciunt Trinitatem, velut ex his tribus partibus compleatur Deus, nec
5 sit perfectus in se ipso vel Pater, vel Filius, vel Spiritus Sanctus.

Cap. 75. Alia est quae dicit aquam non a Deo creatam, sed ei semper fuisse coaeternam.

Cap. 76. Alia dicit corpus hominis, non animam, esse imaginem Dei.

Cap. 77. Alia dicit esse innumerabiles mundos, sicut opinati sunt quidam philosophi gentium.

Cap. 78. Alia sceleratorum animas converti in daemones dicit et in quaeque animalia suis meritis congrua.

Cap. 79. Alia descendente ad inferos Christo credidisse incredulos et omnes exinde existimat liberatos.

Cap. 80. Alia, sempiternae natiuitatis non intelligens Filium, putat illam natiuitatem sumpsisse a tempore initium. Et tamen volens coaeternum Patri Filium confiteri, apud illum fuisse antequam de illo nasceretur existimat, hoc est, semper eum
5 fuisse; verumtamen semper eum Filium non fuisse, sed ex quo de illo natus est Filium esse coepisse.

Has haereses putavi in hoc opus meum de Philastri opere transferendas. Et alias quidem ipse commemorat, sed mihi
10 appellandae haereses non videntur. Quaecumque autem sine nominibus posui, nec ipse earum nomina memoravit.

Cap. 81. LUCIFERIANOS, a Lucifero Caralitano episcopo

Chap. 73. There is another heresy which states that the Divinity in Christ suffered when His flesh was transfixed to the cross.

Chap. 74. There is another heresy that asserts that God is of three forms in such a way that one part is the Father, the second, the Son, and the third, the Holy Spirit; that is to say that there are three parts in the one God and that these compose the Trinity, as if God were made up of these three parts, and as if the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit were not perfect in Himself.

Chap. 75. There is another heresy which states that water was not created by God, but that it has always been coeternal with Him.

Chap. 76. Another heresy claims that it is the body of man which is the image of God, not his soul.

Chap. 77. Another heresy says that there are innumerable worlds, just as some pagan philosophers have taught.

Chap. 78. Another claims that the souls of the wicked are changed into demons and into certain kinds of animals, in accordance with their deeds.

Chap. 79. Another heresy believes that upon Christ's descent into Hell the unbelievers believed and all were liberated from Hell.

Chap. 80. Another heresy, not understanding that the Son has been born from all eternity, thinks that His birth took its beginning in time. But, nevertheless, desiring to hold that the Son is coeternal with the Father, it believes that He was with the Father before His birth from Him, that is, that the Son has always existed. Nevertheless, he has not always been the Son, but began to be the Son when He was born of the Father.

These heresies I decided to transfer from Filastrius' work to my own. Indeed, he also mentions others, but in my opinion, it does not seem right to call them heresies. In the case of those heresies which I have mentioned without names, I should observe that he does not give them names either.

Chap. 81. Neither Epiphanius nor Filastrius have placed the

exortos et celebriter nominatos, nec Epiphanius nec Philaster inter haereticos posuit. Credo tantummodo schisma, non haeresim eos condidisse credentes. Apud quendam tamen cuius
 5 nomen in eodem eius opusculo non inveni in haereticis Luciferianos positos legi per haec verba, "Luciferiani," inquit, "cum teneant in omnibus Catholicam veritatem, in hunc errorem stultissimum prolabantur, ut animam dicant ex transfusione generari, eandemque dicunt et de carne et de carnis esse substantia." Utrum ergo iste propter hoc quod de anima ita sentiunt (si tamen vere ita sentiunt), eos inter haereticos ponendos esse crediderit recteque crediderit, an etiam si id non sentirent sive non sentiunt ideo tamen sint haeretici, quia dissensionem suam pertinaci animositate firmarunt, alia quaestio est, neque
 10 hoc loco mihi videtur esse tractanda.

Cap. 82. IOVINIANISTAS quoque apud istum reperi quos iam noveram. A Ioviniano quodam monacho ista haeresis orta est aetate nostra, cum adhuc iuvenes essemus. Hic omnia peccata, sicut Stoici philosophi, paria esse dicebat, nec posse peccare
 5 hominem lavacro regenerationis accepto, nec aliquid prodesse ieiunia vel a cibis aliquibus abstinentiam. Virginitatem Mariae destruebat dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam. Virginitatem etiam sanctimonialium et continentiam sexus virilis in sanctis eligentibus caelibem vitam coniugiorum castorum atque fidelium
 10 meritis adaequabat, ita ut quaedam virgines sacrae provectae iam aetatis in urbe Roma, ubi haec docebat, eo audito nupsisse dicantur. Non sane ipse vel habebat vel habere volebat uxorem, quod non propter aliquod apud Deum maius meritum in regno vitae perpetuae profuturum, sed propter praesentem prodesse
 15 necessitatem, hoc est, ne homo coniugales patiatur molestias, disputabat. Cito tamen ista haeresis oppressa et extincta est, nec usque ad deceptionem aliquorum sacerdotum potuit pervenire.

Cap. 83. Cum Eusebii historiam scrutatus essem, cui Rufinus a se in Latinam linguam translatae subsequentium etiam tem-

Luciferians, who originated from Lucifer of Calaris and who are widely known, among the heretics. I believe [that they omitted them from their lists] because they were convinced that they were founders of a schism, not a heresy. Yet in a certain author I have read the name of the Luciferians listed among the heretics in these words: "Though the Luciferians hold the Catholic Faith in all things," he says, "they fall into this very foolish error, for they say that the soul comes into being by transfusion, and that it comes from the flesh itself and from the substance of the flesh." Now, whether this writer believed and rightly believed, that they should be listed among the heretics for what they believed concerning the soul (if they really hold such an opinion) or, again, whether they are still heretics, even if they did not or do not hold such an opinion, because they maintain their schism with stubborn animosity, is another question; and this does not seem to me to be the place to deal with it.

Chap. 82. I also found the Jovinianists, whom I already knew, in this same writer. This heresy rose in our own times, when we were still young, from a certain monk Jovinian. He maintained, as did the Stoic philosophers, that all sins are equal, that it is impossible for man to sin after baptism, and that fasts and abstinence from certain kinds of food avail nothing. He attempted to destroy the virginity of Mary by claiming that it had been impaired in parturition. The virginity of nuns and the chastity of men among the faithful who choose the celibate life he put on an equal basis with the merits of chaste and faithful married people to such a degree that in Rome, where he taught his doctrines, some holy virgins, already of advanced age, on hearing this, are said to have married. But he himself neither had, nor desired to have, a wife, maintaining the usefulness of his action, not on the ground of any future greater reward before God in the kingdom of eternal life, but on the basis of advantage in our present condition, that is, that man would not have to endure the trials of matrimony. However, that heresy was immediately suppressed and extinguished, nor did it succeed in deceiving any priests.

Chap. 83. Upon a careful perusal of Eusebius' history, which Rufinus had translated into Latin and to which he had also added

porum duos libros addidit, non inveni aliquam haeresim quam non legerim apud istos, nisi quam in sexto libro ponit Eusebius, 5 narrans eam exstitisse in Arabia. Itaque hos haereticos, quoniam nullum eorum ponit auctorem, Arabicos possumus nuncupare qui dixerunt animas cum corporibus mori atque dissolvi et in fine saeculi utrumque resurgere. Sed hos disputatione Origenis praesentis et eos alloquentis celerrime dicit fuisse correctos.

Iam nunc illae commemorandae sunt haereses quae a nobis non apud istos repertae sunt, sed in recordationem nostram quomodocumque venerunt.

Cap. 84. HELVIDIANI, exorti ab Helvidio, ita virginitati Mariae contradicunt, ut eam post Christum alios etiam filios de viro suo Ioseph peperisse contendunt. Sed mirum ni istos, praetermisso Helvidii nomine, Antidicomaritas Epiphanius appellavit.

Cap. 85. PATERNIANI inferiores partes humani corporis non a Deo, sed a diabolo factas opinantur, et omnium ex illis partibus flagitiorum licentiam tribuentes impurissime vivunt. Hos etiam Venustianos quidam vocant.

Cap. 86. TERTULLIANISTAE a Tertulliano, cuius multa leguntur opuscula eloquentissime scripta, usque ad nostrum tempus paulatim deficientes, in extremis reliquiis durare poterunt in urbe Carthaginensi. Me autem ibi posito ante aliquot 5 annos, quod etiam te meminisse arbitror, omni ex parte consumpti sunt. Paucissimi enim qui remanserant in Catholicam transierunt, suamque basilicam, quae nunc etiam notissima est, Catholicae tradiderunt. Tertullianus ergo, sicut scripta eius indicant, animam dicit immortalem quidem, sed eam corpus 10 esse contendit, neque hanc tantum, sed ipsum etiam Deum. Nec tamen hinc haereticus dicitur factus. Posset enim quoquo modo putare ipsam naturam substantiamque divinam corpus

two books of subsequent events, I found no heresy which I had not read in the former writers, with the exception of one which Eusebius places in his sixth book, and says that it had existed in Arabia. Accordingly we can call these heretics the "Arabici" since there is no founder given for them. They said that souls die and are dissolved along with bodies and both will experience resurrection at the end of time. But he says that they were quickly disabused of their error by personal discussion and by the exhortation of Origen.

Now I must discuss those heresies which I learned of, not from others, but by myself; those which have come to my attention in any way.

Chap. 84. The Helvidians, who arose from Helvidius, attacked the virginity of Mary to such a degree that they contend that after the birth of Christ, she bore other children also to her husband Joseph. I should be surprised if it were not these that Epiphanius called Antidicomarians, omitting the name of Helvidius.

Chap. 85. The Paterniani think that the lower parts of the human body were created not by God but by the devil. Granting licence to all shameful deeds that proceed from those parts, they live lives of flagrant impurity. Some people also call them the Venustiani.

Chap. 86. The Tertullianists take their name from Tertullian, whose many eloquent works are still read. Though steadily diminishing in numbers up to our time, they managed to survive to the last remnants in the city of Carthage. But when I found myself there several years ago, as I think you also remember, they disappeared completely. For the very few who were left passed into the Catholic Church and surrendered their basilica, which is now even a very famous one, to the Catholic Church. Now, then, as his writings indicate, Tertullian says that the soul is indeed immortal, but contends that it is a body. He maintains that this is true not only of the soul, but also of God Himself. However, they say that this is not the reason why he became a heretic. We might imagine that he calls the divine nature and substance a body in some way, without meaning the kind of a body whose various parts

vocare, non tale corpus cuius partes aliae maiores, aliae minores
 valeant vel debeant cogitari, qualia sunt omnia quae proprie
 15 dicimus corpora, quamvis de anima tale aliquid sentiat. Sed
 potuit, ut dixi, propterea putari corpus Deum dicere, quia non
 est nihil, non est inanitas, non est corporis vel animae qualitas,
 sed ubique totus, et per locorum spatia nulla partitus, in sua
 tamen natura atque substantia immutabiliter permanet. Non
 20 ergo ideo est Tertullianus factus haereticus, sed quia transiens
 ad Cataphrygas, quos ante destruxerat, coepit etiam secundas
 nuptias contra apostolicam doctrinam tamquam stupra damnare,
 et postmodum etiam ab ipsis divisus sua conventicula propa-
 gavit. Dicit sane etiam ipse animas hominum pessimas post
 25 mortem in daemones verti.

Cap. 87. Est quaedam haeresis rusticana in campo nostro,
 id est Hipponensi, vel potius fuit; paulatim enim diminuta in
 una exigua villa remanserat, in qua quidem paucissimi, sed
 omnes hoc fuerunt. Qui omnes modo correcti et Catholici facti
 5 sunt, nec aliquis illius supersedit erroris. Abelonii vocabantur,
 Punica declinatione nominis. Hos nonnulli dicunt ex filio Adae
 fuisse nominatos qui est vocatus Abel; unde Abelianos vel
 Abeloitas eos nos possumus dicere. Non miscebantur uxoribus,
 et eis tamen sine uxoribus vivere sectae ipsius dogmate non
 10 licebat. Mas ergo et femina sub continentiae professione simul
 habitantes puerum et puellam sibi adoptabant in eiusdem con-
 iunctionis pacto successores suos futuros. Morte praeven-
 tiusque singulis alii subrogabantur, dum tamen duo duobus
 disparis sexus in illius domus societate succederent. Utrolibet
 15 quippe parente defuncto, uno remanenti, usque ad eius quoque
 obitum filii serviebant. Post cuius mortem etiam ipsi puerum
 et puellam similiter adoptabant. Nec unquam eis defuit unde
 adoptarent, generantibus circumquaque vicinis, et filios suos
 inopes ad spem hereditatis alienae libenter dantibus.

can or must be considered larger or smaller, as is true of all bodies, properly so called. However, he did have some opinion of this kind concerning the soul. But, as I have said, it could have been possible to imagine that he called God a body, because He is not "nothingness," is not "emptiness," He is not a quality of body or soul, but is everywhere a complete whole, having no spatial divisions, but remaining immutable in His own nature and substance. Therefore, the reason Tertullian became a heretic was not for this, but because in joining the Cataphrygians, whom he had earlier demolished, he also began to condemn, contrary to Apostolic teaching, second marriage as debauchery. Later, having separated from them too, he established congregations of his own. It is true that he also stated that the evildest of human souls are transformed into demons after death.

Chap. 87. There is, or rather was, a certain heresy among the peasants in our own district, that of Hippo. For though it had been gradually dying out, it lasted on in one tiny village, in which, it is true, there were very few people, but all of them belonged to this sect. All were recently reformed and have become Catholics, and there is not one of this heresy left. Their name, which was derived from the Punic language, was the Abelites. Some say that they had gotten their name from the son of Adam who was called Abel; hence, we can call them "Abelians" or "Abeloites." They did not have relations with their wives, and yet, in accordance with the teaching of this sect, they were not allowed to live in the unmarried state. Therefore, a man and a woman, living together under a vow of chastity would, in the marriage contract itself, adopt a boy and a girl who were to be their heirs. If either of these were overtaken by death, others would be substituted for them, as long as two persons of different sex succeeded the former two in the sharing of that household. Indeed, if either parent died and the other lived, the children would serve him until his death also. After his death, they too would likewise adopt a boy and a girl. They were never without a source of adoptions, for their neighbors all around them were producing children, and willingly surrendered their impoverished offspring in the hope that they would be the heirs to an inheritance from others.

Cap. 88. PELAGIANORUM est haeresis hoc tempore omnium recentissima a Pelagio monacho exorta. Quem magistrum Caelestius sic secutus est, ut sectatores eorum Caelestiani etiam nuncupentur.

- 5 Hi Dei gratiae, qua praedestinati sumus *in adoptionem filiorum per Iesum Christum in ipsum*¹ et qua eruimur *de potestate tenebrarum*² ut in eum credamus atque in regnum ipsius transferamur, propter quod ait: *Nemo venit ad me, nisi fuerit ei datum a Patre meo*,³ et qua diffunditur caritas in
 10 cordibus nostris, ut fides per dilectionem operetur, in tantum inimici sunt, ut sine hac posse hominem credant facere omnia divina mandata. Cum si hoc verum esset, frustra Dominus dixisse videretur: *Sine me nihil potestis facere*.⁴ Denique Pelagius a fratribus increpatus, quod nihil tribueret adiutorio
 15 gratiae Dei ad eius mandata facienda, correctioni eorum hactenus cessit, ut non eam libero arbitrio praeponeret, sed infideli calliditate supponeret dicens ad hoc eam dari hominibus ut quae facere per liberum iubentur arbitrium, facilius possint implere per gratiam. Dicendo utique, 'ut facilius possint,' voluit credi,
 20 etiamsi difficilius, tamen posse homines sine gratia divina facere iussa divina. Illam vero gratiam Dei sine qua nihil boni possumus facere non esse dicunt nisi in libero arbitrio. Quod nullis suis praecedentibus meritis ab illo accepit nostra natura ad hoc tantum, in ipso adiuvante per suam legem atque doctrinam, ut
 25 discamus quae facere et quae sperare debeamus, non autem ad hoc per donum Spiritus sui, ut quae didicerimus esse facienda faciamus.

- Ac per hoc divinitus nobis dari scientiam confitentur qua ignorantia pellitur; caritatem autem dari negant qua pie vivitur
 30 ut scilicet, cum sit Dei donum scientia quae sine caritate inflat, non sit Dei donum ipsa caritas quae ut scientia non inflat aedificat.

Destruunt etiam orationes quas facit ecclesia, sive pro in-

¹ Eph. 1. 5.

² Col. 1.13.

³ John 6. 66.

⁴ John 15. 5.

Chap. 88. At the present time, the newest of all heresies is that of the Pelagians, founded by the monk Pelagius. Caelestius followed this master to such a degree that their adherents are also called the Celestines.

These heretics are so opposed to the grace of God by which we are predestined to adoption as His sons through Jesus Christ, and by which we are rescued from the power of darkness that we may believe in Him and be transferred into His kingdom; wherefore He says, "No one can come to me, unless he is enabled to do so by my Father," and by which charity is poured forth into our hearts, that faith may work through charity; they are so opposed to this grace, I say, that they believe that man can fulfill all the commandments of God without it. But, if this were true, in vain would it seem that the Lord said, "Without me, you can do nothing." Accordingly, when Pelagius had been upbraided by the brethren for granting nothing to the help of God's grace in the fulfillment of His commandments, he accepted correction only up to a point. He would not put grace before free will, but with lying subtlety, he suggested that grace was given to men that they might more easily with the aid of grace fulfill what they are commanded to do through the exercise of free will. Certainly, in saying "that they might more easily" he intended it to be understood that men could still fulfill the divine commands without grace, though with greater difficulty. But they say that that grace of God without which we can do no good is nothing else but free will itself. Our nature has received this free will from God without any preceding merits of its own, and it was given to us only, that we, with the help of God through the instrumentality of His law and teaching, might learn what we ought to do and what we ought to hope for, but not that through the gifts of His Holy Spirit we should do what we have learned we ought to do.

Therefore, they admit that knowledge by which ignorance is dispelled has been granted to us by God, but they deny that charity, whereby we live in a holy way, is so granted; hence they teach that, though knowledge, which without charity puffs up, is the gift of God, charity itself, which edifies so that knowledge may not puff up, is not the gift of God.

They deny the efficacy of the prayers which the Church offers up,

fidelibus et doctrinae Dei resistentibus ut convertantur ad Deum,
 35 sive pro fidelibus ut augeatur in eis fides, et perseverent in ea.
 Haec quippe non ab ipso accipere, sed a seipsis homines habere
 contendunt, gratiam Dei qua liberamur ab impietate dicentes
 secundum merita nostra dari. Quod quidem Pelagius in epis-
 copali iudicio Palaestino damnari metuens damnare compulsus
 40 est, sed in posterioribus suis scriptis hoc invenitur docere.

In id etiam progrediuntur, ut dicant vitam iustorum in hoc
 saeculo nullum omnino habere peccatum, et ex his ecclesiam
 Christi in hac mortalitate perfici ut sit omnino sine macula et
 ruga, quasi non sit Christi ecclesia, quae toto terrarum orbe
 45 clamat ad Deum: *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*.¹

Parvulos etiam negant secundum Adam carnaliter natos con-
 tagium mortis antiquae prima nativitate contrahere. Sic enim
 eos sine ullo peccati originalis vinculo asserunt nasci, ut prorsus
 non sit quod eis oporteat secunda nativitate dimitti; sed eos
 50 propterea baptizari, ut regeneratione adoptati admittantur ad
 regnum Dei, de bono in melius translati, non ista renovatione
 ab aliquo malo obligationis veteris adsoluti. Nam etiamsi non
 baptizentur, promittunt eis extra regnum quidem Dei, sed tamen
 aeternam et beatam quandam vitam suam.

55 Ipsum quoque Adam dicunt, etiamsi non peccasset, fuisse
 corpore moriturum, neque ita mortuum merito culpae, sed con-
 ditione naturae. Obiiciuntur eis et alia nonnulla, sed ista sunt
 maxime ex quibus intelliguntur etiam illa vel cuncta, vel paene
 cuncta pendere.

<EPILOGUS>

Ecce quam multas commemoravimus haereses, nec tamen
 modum tuae postulationis implevimus. "Ex quo enim Chris-
 tiana religio," ut verbis tuis utar, "hereditatis promissae nomen
 accepit, quae haereses ortae sint" quo modo commemorare

¹ Matt. 6. 12.

either for infidels and those who resist the teaching of God that they might be converted to God, or for the faithful that faith might be increased in them and that they might persevere in it. Indeed, they contend that men do not receive these graces from God, but possess them of themselves, claiming that the grace of God whereby we are freed from impiety is granted to us according to our own merits. Now Pelagius in fear of being condemned himself was compelled to condemn this doctrine in the episcopal court in Palestine, but he is found to be still teaching this in his later writings.

They even go to such lengths as to say that the life of the just in this world is absolutely without sin, and that through them the Church of Christ is brought to perfection in this mortality so that she is absolutely without spot or wrinkle, as though she were not the Church of Christ, which cries to the Lord throughout the whole world, "Forgive us our debts." Moreover, they deny that infants born in Adam according to the flesh contract the stain of the old death at their first birth. For they maintain that they were born without the bond of original sin, and so there is absolutely no need for them to be forgiven anything in a second birth. But they are baptized for this reason, that by being adopted in a rebirth, they may be admitted to the kingdom of God, passing from the good state to a better state, not being freed by this renovation from any sin of ancient inheritance. For although they are not baptized, the Pelagians promise them a certain life of their own outside of the kingdom of God, it is true, but an eternal and happy one.

They also say that Adam himself would have suffered bodily death even if he had not sinned, and that he had died, not in punishment for his sin, but because of the condition of nature. Some other errors are also charged against them, but the ones mentioned are especially those upon which all the others also are understood to depend, or almost all of them.

EPILOGUE

Consider how many heresies we have treated, and yet, we have not reached the goal set by your request! For "beginning with the time when the Christian religion," to use your own words, "received its title to the promised inheritance, what heresies have existed," how could I, who was incapable of knowing all of them,

- 5 omnes potui, qui omnes nosse non potui? Quod ideo existimo quia nullus eorum quorum de hac re scripta legi omnes posuit. Quando quidem inveni apud alium quas apud alium non inveni, et rursus apud istum quas ille non posuit. Ego autem propterea plures quam ipsi posui quia collegi ex omnibus quas omnes
- 10 apud singulos non inveni, additis etiam quas ipse recolens apud ullum illorum invenire non potui. Unde merito credo nec me posuisse omnes quia nec omnes qui de hac re scripserunt legere potui, neque hoc quemquam eorum video fecisse quos legi. Postremo etiamsi omnes forsitan posui, quod non puto, utrum
- 15 omnes sint utique nescio. Et ideo quod vis me loquente finire, non saltem potest me cognoscente comprehendere.

- Audivi scripsisse de haeresibus sanctum Hieronymum, sed ipsum eius opusculum nec in nostra bibliotheca invenire potuimus, nec unde possit accipi scimus. Quod si tu scieris, perveni
- 20 ad illud, et forte habebis melius aliquid quam hoc nostrum, quamvis nec ipsum, licet hominem doctissimum, omnes haereses arbitrer indagare potuisse. Et certe Abelaitas nostrae regionis haereticos, quantum existimo, ille nescivit, sic forte et alibi alios in obscurissimis locis reconditos eius notitiam ipsa
- 25 locorum suorum obscuritate fugientes.

- Iam vero illud quod habent tuae litterae, "ut omnia omnino dicamus quibus haeretici a veritate dissentiunt," etiamsi omnia scirem, facere non possem, quanto minus possum, qui omnia scire non possum? Sunt enim haeretici, quod fatendum est,
- 30 qui singulis, vel non multo amplius, dogmatibus oppugnant regulam veritatis, sicut Macedoniani vel Photiniani, atque alii quicumque ita se habent. Illi autem, ut ita dixerim, fabulones, id est, qui fabulas vanas easdemque longas perplexasque contextunt, tam multis falsis dogmatibus pleni sunt ut ipsi quoque
- 35 illa numerare non possint, aut difficillime possint. Nec ulli alieno ulla haeresis facile sic innotescit ut suis; unde nec earum

have treated all of them? And I think that this is the reason why none of those whose works on heresies I read gave all of them. For I found in the works of one heresies which another did not treat, and again in those of another heresies which the former did not mention. But I was able to treat of more of them because I gathered from all these writers the heresies which in their totality I did not find in any single writer; I have also added those which I was unable to find in the works of any of them. Hence, I must be right in believing that I myself have not treated all of them either, for I was not able to read all the authors who had written on this subject, nor do I find that anyone of those that I did read had done so. Finally, although I have, perhaps, listed all the heresies, and I do not think I have, I do not know positively whether this is all of them or not. Therefore what you want to be accomplished by my word cannot even be grasped by my understanding.

I have heard that St. Jerome has written on heresies, but I was not able to find that work of his in our library, nor do I know where it can be obtained. But if you know where the work can be had, consult it, and perhaps you will have something better than this work of mine, although I do not think that even he, although the most learned of men, could have investigated all the heresies. Certainly, insofar as I can judge, he did not know the Abelites, heretics of our district. And so, perhaps, there are other heretics elsewhere, hidden away in very obscure places, which escape his attention because of the very obscurity of their locations.

But now, to come to the part of your letter in which you request me "to tell absolutely all points in which the heretics dissent from the truth," even if I knew all these points, I would not be able to tell them. How much less can I do so since I am unable to know all these points? For there are heretics, we must admit, who oppose the canon of truth on one point each, or not much more, such as the Macedonians, or the Photinians, or any others like them. But those, if I may call them so, spinners of fantastic fables, that is, men who weave empty, long, and confused stories, are full of so many false teachings that they themselves cannot even enumerate them, or can only do so with the greatest difficulty. No heresy is as well understood by a stranger as by its own believers. Therefore

quas commemoravi omnia dogmata me dixisse vel didicisse pro-
 fiteor. Quis enim non videat quantam res ista operam, et quam
 multas litteras flagitet? Nec ideo tamen parum prodest errores
 40 istos quos huic operi intexui lectos cognitosque vitare. Quid
 enim contra ista sentiat Catholica ecclesia, quod a me dicendum
 putasti, superfluo quaeritur, cum propter hoc scire sufficiat eam
 contra ista sentire, nec aliquid horum in fidem quemquam debere
 recipere. Quomodo autem quae contra haec veritas habet asse-
 45 renda ac defendenda sint modulum operis huius excedit. Sed
 multum adiuvat cor fidele nosse quid credendum non sit, etiamsi
 disputandi facultate id refutare non possit. Omnis itaque Chris-
 tianus Catholicus ista non debet credere. Sed non omnis qui
 ista non credit consequenter debet se Christianum Catholicum
 45 iam putare vel dicere. Possunt enim et haereses aliae quae in
 hoc opere nostro commemoratae non sunt vel esse vel fieri,
 quarum aliquam quisquis tenuerit Christianus Catholicus non
 erit. Quid ergo faciat haereticum deinceps requirendum est ut,
 cum hoc Domino adiuvante vitamus, non solum ea quae scimus,
 50 verum etiam quae nescimus, sive quae iam orta sunt, sive quae
 adhuc oriri poterunt, haeretica venena vitemus. Huius autem
 sit iam voluminis finis, quod propterea vobis antequam totum
 hoc opus perficerem credidi esse mittendum ut illud quicumque
 legeritis ad id quod restat implendum, quod tam magnum esse
 55 cernitis, me orationibus adiuvetis.

I do not profess that I have mentioned or learned all the dogmas even of the heresies I have treated. Who is there who cannot realize how much effort and how much writing a matter like this demands? Therefore, it is, nevertheless, of great value to be able to avoid those errors which I have included in this work, once they have been read and understood. It is a superfluous task to seek the teachings of the Catholic Church which are opposed to these errors, as you thought I ought to do, since it suffices for this purpose to know that she is opposed to them, and that no one is to put his faith in any of their teachings. Moreover, the manner in which the position of the truth against these errors is to be asserted and defended is beyond the scope of this work. But it is of great advantage to the faithful soul to know what he must not believe, even though he cannot refute this by skill in argumentation. Therefore, every Catholic Christian is bound to give no credence to these doctrines. But not everyone who does not believe them is thereby to suppose or claim that he is a Catholic Christian. For other heresies can exist or can come into existence too, which are not mentioned in this work of ours; and whoever adheres to any of them, will not be a Catholic Christian. Therefore, we must next consider what makes a heretic, so that, while with the help of God we are avoiding this, we may shun not only the heretical poisons which we know, but also those which we do not, whether they have already appeared or can yet appear. But now let us close this volume here. I thought that I ought to send it to you before I finished the whole work so that whoever of you may read it might aid me with your prayers to finish the reminder, when you realize how great a task it is.

COMMENTARY

PREFACE

1. **sancte**: This term is applied to all ranks of ecclesiastics and even to the laity in the letters of Augustine's time. Cf. Sister Mary Bridget O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 A. D.* (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 21; Washington, D. C. 1930) 117.

fili: The word *filius* is quite commonly used as a title of address. No convention seems to have ruled its application. It is addressed occasionally to fellow bishops, to all ranks of the lower clergy, and also to the laity. Both *filius* and *filia* are distinct titles of affection. Cf. O'Brien 83.

Quodvultdeus: Cf. the Introduction, E. Identity of Quodvultdeus.

4. **me . . . facere cogitasse**: Augustine's earlier interest in a manual or book on heresies can be seen from *Ep.* 40.6.9 (CSEL 34².79-81) where he requests Jerome to write a book explaining errors against the Faith.

27. **tuae Caritati**: The *TLL* explains the use of *caritas* as a title of address as an example of metonymy for beloved persons. O'Brien states (p. 52) that ancient Christian epistolary literature attests the continuous use of *caritas* as a form of address to persons of all ranks, ecclesiastical and civil, and also remarks that it is used as a title of friendship.

32. **Quod tuae indicant litterae**: Cf. *Ep.* 221. 2 f.

52. **Beatitudo**: A title widely used in addressing ecclesiastical superiors. Its use was not restricted to inferiors in addressing their superiors, for it is found in letters between bishops, and from bishops to the lower clergy. Cf. O'Brien 3-5.

67. **Veneratione tua**: This is a title commonly reserved for bishops. In a few cases it is found in reference to the lower clergy and even the laity. It is, therefore, better to consider it an ecclesi-

astical title, for Augustine used it only in addressing the pope and bishops. Cf. O'Brien 38-39.

73. **quidam Celsus:** The identification of this person is a difficult matter. M. Schanz ("Ueber die Schriften des Cornelius Celsus," *Rheinisches Museum* 36 [1881] 362-379) maintained that the text of Augustine designates a catalogue posterior to the time of Christ, and that it is thus impossible to identify it with the philosophical part of the *Encyclopaedia* of Cornelius Celsus. On the other hand, L. Schwabe ("Die *Opiniones philosophorum* des Celsus," *Hermes* 19 [1884] 385-392) and A. Dyroff ("Der philosophische Teil der Encyclopädie des Cornelius Celsus," *Rheinisches Museum* 88 [1939] 7-18) believe that this is a reference to the *Latin Encyclopaedia* of Cornelius Celsus. In Schanz-Hosius II 724 both views are presented but no attempt is made to reach a decision.

According to Courcelle (*Les lettres grecques en Occident* 180 f.) this *quidam Celsus* is the Celsinus mentioned by St. Augustine in the *Contra Acad.* 2.2.5 (CSEL 63. 26). Courcelle's argument is that this citation from the *Contra Acad.* agrees perfectly with the catalogue of sects which Suidas cites s. v. *Κελσίως*. In the *De haeresibus* passage which we are discussing here, what makes Augustine say that Celsus brought his work right up to his own times is the fact that the catalogue embraced even the Neo-Platonists. Celsinus could also have been one of Augustine's sources for the school of Plotinus and other information on the history of philosophy which he gives in the *Contra Acad.* 3.17.37, 18.41 (CSEL 63.75 f, 78 f.). Moreover, in the eighth book of the *City of God* (CSEL 40¹.353-407), Augustine reviews the different philosophical sects up to and embracing Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus. Here he has again probably followed the manual of Celsinus, for he could not otherwise have known Iamblichus except through a manual, since he never makes use of him directly and has not read any of his works. He reveals that he is following a manual entitled *Opiniones omnium philosophorum*. This treatment has its parallel in Claudian and Sidonius Apollinaris. All of them, then, had a common source, which most probably would be the Latin translation of the manual of Celsinus.

But who could this Greek Celsinus, posterior to the time of

Iamblichus, be? Of all the ancients who bore this name, the only one who seems to fit the situation is the son-in-law of Julian the Apostate, mentioned in many letters of Libanius, who was active as a writer at Beyrouth. The Celsus of Augustine is the result of a lapse of memory. Celsinus is the name he intended.

81. **Epiphanius:** Born *ca.* 315 A. D. in Palestine of Christian parents. His pious education led him to the early practice of asceticism and eventually into the monastic life in which he spent some thirty years in prayer and study. He was elected bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis in Cyprus. He was a man of remarkable learning for the age in which he lived. He had read a great deal, and in his writings inserted a number of valuable citations from earlier authors. But he lacked critical acumen and his information must be examined with special care. His works: *Anchoratus*, an exposition of Christian belief; the *Panarion*, survey of all heresies with a refutation of each; and two works on Biblical archaeology, *On the Weights and Measures of the Jews*, and *On the Twelve Precious Stones*. The *Anacephaleosis*, or *Recapitulation*, of the *Panarion*, which follows in our printed editions, is not his work. This work is discussed in the Introduction, F. The Sources of the *De haeresibus*. Cf. Bardenhewer III 293-303; RE 6. 193 f.

GNOSTICISM

Since the majority of the early heresies were forms of Gnosticism or were heavily tinged with Gnostic thought, it would be well to preface this commentary on the heresies with some explanation of Gnosticism. Gnosticism is a generic term applicable to the sects and heretical movements in the early Church which claimed that redemption was to be achieved through knowledge (*γνῶσις*). The various causes which produced Gnosticism antedate Christianity by several centuries, for it was one of the results of the fusion of Eastern and Western ideas following the conquests of Alexander the Great. Elements of Greek philosophy and Oriental religion commingled to satisfy the religious and philosophical demands of the times. As a syncretistic movement, Gnosticism could be shaped to appeal to all classes of men, and the universal longing for salvation and redemption, one of the striking features of the Hellenistic Age, could find satisfaction in this system which offered salvation in magic, asceticism, and even libertinism. The term Gnostic

was employed as a designation by a given group to indicate that it had found the last and deepest insight into the world and into the divinity. These pretensions to knowledge, in addition to the theology and liturgy which it borrowed from other religions, made Gnosticism a formidable enemy of orthodox Christianity.

There were great differences in the various sects, but we can speak of fundamental tenets common to all. In the beginning there was an undefined, infinite Something which was not, however, a personal Being. In the beginning this unknown God was pure spirituality, for matter did not yet exist. This was the source for all being and caused a number of pure spirit forces to emanate from itself. The emanation theory is common to all forms of Gnosticism. These emanations are called Aeons and are beings belonging to the purely ideal, noumenal, intelligible, or supersensible world. They are immaterial, hypostatic ideas. They, with the source from which they emanate, form the *pleroma* (the fulness of Being).

In reference to the creation of the world, the Gnostics fall into two main groups, dualistic and monistic. The former taught that the world was the work of the demiurge, an evil spirit who mixed the divine rays and powers with evil matter, while the latter maintained that the weakening of the divine emanations resulted in non-divine matter and the world. World and matter are often conceived as the domain of the Old Testament God and His angels who opposed the good God of the New Testament. Hence the Old Testament was generally rejected as well as parts of the New.

The Gnostic concept of redemption consisted in the undoing of the sin of material existence and the return to the *pleroma*. The demiurge had to be freed, and the divinity and the divine elements imprisoned in matter had to be saved and returned to the *pleroma*. Hence Gnostic salvation was not the individual redemption of each soul, but a cosmic process. It was redemption not of the world, but in the world. The Gnostic Saviour, then, was essentially different in concept from the Christian Saviour. His role was that of teacher, bringing into the world the knowledge which was to free the Divine Light from matter. He had no human nature, for he was an Aeon, who came in the appearance, only, of man.

The first relations of Gnosticism with Christianity appear in the incident of Simon Magus, and the writings of the New Testament reveal the great disturbances caused in the Church by Gnosis and related doctrines: Col. 2.8, 18; 1 Tim. 1.4; 2 Tim. 2.23; Acts 8.9; Apoc. 2.6, 15; 1 John 4.3. Once Gnosticism became a Christian heresy it showed certain definite forms:

(1) A Gnosticism which sought to identify Christianity and syncretistic Judaism. For this group Christianity was only a renewal of the religion and Gnosis (knowledge) which Adam had already possessed, but which had become dimmed and needed to be revived and renewed. This group is exemplified by the Ebionites, Elkesaites, the doctrine of the pseudo-Clementine homilies, and Cerinthus.

(2) A Gnosticism which had accepted Christianity, but which eventually degenerated into heathen naturalism or idealism. There were two different sections of this group. The first, dualistic, cosmogonic, and anti-Judaistic, was found particularly in Syria and its neighborhood. These Gnostics set matter and spirit, Judaism and Christianity, in strong opposition to each other. To this form of Gnosticism belonged Saturnilus, Basilides, the Ophites, and Justin the Gnostic. The second section of this group, pantheistic and spiritualistic, was confined to the narrower cultural field of Hellenism. It held that the evolution of God and the monistic Spirit explained the existence of the world. Religion, especially Christianity, was a return of the Spirit to itself, a withdrawal of spirit from matter.

(3) Gnostic systems which joined themselves to Christianity closely in essential points. Such were the teachings of Marcion, Hermogenes, Tatian, Bardesanes, and Pistis Sophia Gnosticism. Marcion, in particular, came very close to genuine Christian formulas.

Cf. G. Bareille, "Gnosticisme," DTC 6 (1947) 1434-1467; L. Cerfaux, "Gnose préchrétienne et biblique," *Dict. de la Bible-Supplément* 3 (1938) 659-701; E. Peterson, "Gnosi," *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 6 (1951) 876-882; J. P. Steffes, "Gnostizismus," LThK 4 (1932) 554-557.

CHAPTER 1.

Epiph. *Panar.* 21 (GCS 25.238-245); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.853D-856A)—DTC 14.2130-2140 (E. Amann); LThK 9.572 f. (S. Lösch).

1. **Simoniani:** The teachings of the Simonians are described by St. Irenaeus (*Contra haer.* 1.23 [PG 7.670-673]), Hippolytus (*Philosophumena* 6.9-20; 10.12 [GCS 26.136-148; 272 f.]), and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 21). The doctrine of the Simonians was expressly Gnostic and syncretistic. They took the generic Gnostic idea of a supreme hidden God and distinguished Him from the divinities which emanated from Him. They claimed that Simon was the principal emanation of the Deity and that he was the redeemer.

Helena was the first conception of the Divinity, the mother of all, by whom the Deity had created the angels and the aeons. In morals the Simonians were probably anti-nomian.

Simone Mago: The relation of Simon Magus to the Simonians is one of the complicated questions of church history. Acts 8.9-29 is the only authoritative source we have on Simon. Statements in writers of the second century are largely based on legend, and even in the works of men like Justin and Irenaeus it is difficult to substantiate any historical fact in reference to Simon. In the view of the Early Church Simon Magus was the father and author of all heresy.

7. **asserebat . . . constituerat:** St. Justin Martyr is the first to give us the information that Simon claimed to be a god, that he made Helena his associate, and that he caused statues of himself and Helena to be erected in Rome (*Apol.* 1.26, 56 [PG 6.368 f., 413B]; *Dial. cum Tryph.* 120 [PG 6.756B]).

CHAPTER 2.

Epiph. *Panar.* 22 (GCS 25.246 f.); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.856A)—
DTC 10-547 f. (E. Amann); LThK 7.76 (W. Koch).

1. **Menandro:** Menander was a Syrian Gnostic of the first century. St. Justin (*Apol.* 1.26, 56) tells us that he went to Antioch, gained attention through the practice of magic, and spread his false doctrine.

Though he taught a Gnosticism similar to that of Simon and was his disciple, he differed from him in some points: in his concept of the redemption (immortality was to be achieved by his special baptism), and in his rejection of libertinism.

CHAPTER 3.

Epiph. *Panar.* 23 (GCS 25.247-256); *Anaceph.* (PG 42. 856B)
—DTC 14.1210 f. (G. Bardy); LThK 9.193 (J. P. Steffes).

1. **Saturnino:** The name Saturninus, referring to the founder of this sect, is also found in the forms Satornilus and Saturnilus. He lived in the first half of the second century at Antioch and was a disciple of Menander.

St. Irenaeus in *Contra haer.* 1.24 (PG 42. 856B) is the principal, if not the sole, primary source of information on the teachings of this sect which appears as the twenty-third heresy in Epiphanius. The doctrines of this Gnostic sect are by no means clear as found in our sources. But on the basis of the usual Gnostic teachings, the Saturnians apparently had fashioned a dualistic system of redemption. Man, created by seven angels, was given the spark of life by God. Evil people were without this spark. Jesus came as the Redeemer to overthrow the Jewish God and to free the spark of life imprisoned in men. But though the dualistic elements and the theory of redemption presupposed some form of asceticism, they could not overcome the naturalistic elements in the system.

CHAPTER 4.

- Epiph. *Panar.* 24 (GCS 25.258-267); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.856B)
 —DTC 2.465-475 (G. Bareille); LThK 2.20 (J. P. Steffes);
 DHGE 6.1169-1175 (G. Bardy).

1. **Basilide:** Basilides was one of the most important Gnostics of the early second century. He was a disciple of Menander at Antioch, but later settled in Alexandria, where he taught his doctrines until the time of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. He was the founder of a complicated Gnostic sect. He and his son, Isidore, claimed that they based their teachings on the principles received from a certain Glaucias, disciple of St. Peter, and from the Apostle Matthias.

This system has been handed down in manifold form. Irenaeus presents it as a dualistic cosmogony in *Contra haer.* 1.24 (PG 7.675-680). From a good and unknown God there emanated a great variety of intermediate beings, the last of which created the world of matter. Christ (the *voûs* of the Father) came upon earth, but only in the appearance of a body, to free man from exile, that is to free the world-power, the elements of the divinity imprisoned in matter. But only the soul was to be set free. This was to be accomplished through Gnosis, united with magic and libertinism.

CHAPTER 5.

Epiph. *Panar.* 25 (GCS 25.267-275); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.856C)
—DTC 11.499-506 (É. Amann); LThK 7.572 (W. Koch).

1. **Nicolaitæ:** This sect is not very well known, for the information which we have is very contradictory. Augustine follows Epiphanius, but in speaking of the deacon Nicholas, he attempts to soften the charges alleged against him. The Nicolaites are mentioned in St. John's Apocalypse 2.6, 14-16.

Nicolao: Cf. Acts 6.

3. **Iste . . . uteretur:** Whether Irenaeus (*Contra haer.* 1.26 [PG 7.687]) and other writers on heresy are right when they speak of the sensual excesses of Nicholas, or whether the Nicolaites, misunderstanding the ascetism of Nicholas, have falsely attributed this character to him, is not clear. At any rate, the Nicolaites had disappeared or been absorbed into other sects by the end of the second century.

CHAPTER 6.

Epiph. *Panar.* 26 (GCS 25.275-300); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.856C-857A)—DTC 6.1434-1467 (G. Bareille); LThK 4.554-557 (J. P. Steffes).

Anti-Gnostic writing declined in intensity after Hippolytus, and when it began to revive at the end of the fourth century it had a more retrospective and historical character. In the *De haeresibus* Augustine has given a mere outline of the Gnostic movement which he drew from second and third hand sources. He made no attempt to analyze the progressive development of Gnosticism, nor to distinguish the original teachings from their elaborations. This can be seen very clearly from the short and simple exposition of Gnosticism in the present section.

1. **Gnostici . . . gloriantur:** The meaning of the term Gnostic seems to have been quite well understood by St. Augustine, and his statement that the Gnostics are hardly deserving of the name is borne out by the facts. They did give credence to the most fantastic and illogical explanations of the universe. Gnosticism had such little contemporaneous importance that Augustine did not feel it necessary to give the details of its teachings.

5. **Borboritas:** The Borborites (Borboriani, Borboritae < Βόρβορος-mire) were anti-nomian, Ophitic Gnostics of the second to the fifth centuries. Augustine is not correct in ascribing the name and characteristics of this particular group to all Gnostics.

7. **a Nicolaitis exortos . . . a Carpocrate exortos:** The libertinism practised by these various Gnostic sects would naturally lead to the belief that they were related. But here again, Augustine is applying to the whole of Gnosticism practices which were peculiar to certain anti-nomian groups.

17. **bonum deum et malum deum:** This is true only of certain Gnostics and then only with the understanding that the evil god is inferior to the Supreme Being.

CHAPTER 7.

Epiph. *Panar.* 27 (GCS 25. 300-313); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.857A-B)—DTC 2.1800-1804 (G. Bareille); LThK 5.849 f. (W. Koch); DHGE 11.1118 f. (G. Bardy).

1. **Carpocrate:** Carpocrates was a Platonic philosopher who taught at Alexandria in the early part of the second century, and who, incorporating Christian elements into his system, presented a Gnosticism in which the Hellenic element is most marked. His teachings were emanistic and anti-nomian, containing a migration of souls like that in Plato's *Phaedrus*. Whether libertinism was directly taught by Carpocrates or not, his followers became proverbial for deliberate licentiousness of life. Quite possibly the shameful practices charged against the Christians by the pagans of the time had their basis in the practices of such Gnostic sects. This sect lasted into the fourth century.

9. **quaedam Marcellina:** A female teacher of the school of Carpocrates, who went to Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus 155-166 and there made many disciples, who wished to be known by the name Gnostics. This is one of the earliest instances in which it is proved that a sect claimed this title. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 3.2.5 (GCS 15.197 f.); Iren. *Contra haer.* 1.25 (PG 7.685).

CHAPTER 8.

Epiph. *Panar.* 28 (GCS 25.313-321); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.857B)
 —DTC 2.2151-2155 (G. Bareille); LThK 2.813 (J. P. Steffes);
 DHGE 12.170 (G. Bardy).

1. **Cerintho:** A Gnostic syncretistic Jewish Christian who taught at the end of the Apostolic Age. He was in some way connected with the Ebionites, but the influence of his Alexandrian education is most apparent.

2. **Merintho:** This name is mentioned only by Epiphanius and those who have copied him (*Haer.* 28.8). Epiphanius joins the names Cerinthus and Merinthus, but frankly admits his ignorance about the latter name. It may have been a controversial nickname used by the opponents of Cerinthus to mock him (*μήρυθος*—cord, line, snare).

mundum ab angelis factum: The world was not created by the highest, hidden God, but exists from formless matter created by demiurges or angels so far beneath the highest God that they do not even know Him.

3. **atque alia . . . praecepta servari:** He insisted on a partial observance of the Law. Thus he can be considered a link between Judaism and Gnosticism. In his conception of creation, Christology and eschatology, he may with greater justification be considered the predecessor of Judaeo-Christian Gnosticism, rather than Simon Magus.

7. **Chiliastae:** Chiliasm, the belief in Christ's return to earth to reign during the millennium, was a common tenet of many of the Gnostic sects. Cf. Aug. *De civ. Dei* 20.7.

CHAPTER 9.

Epiph. *Panar.* 29 (GCS 321-333); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.357B)—
 Cf. "Judéo-Chrétien," DTC 8.1681-1709 (L. Marchal); LThK
 7.460 f. (J. Schmid). "Judéo-Chrétiens," *Dict. de la Bible*
Supplément 4.1298-1315.

1. **Nasaraei:** This was the name for the Jewish-Christian communities which escaped before the destruction of Jerusalem and

scattered throughout Coelo-Syria, Decapolis, Pella, Transjordan, and as far east as Mesopotamia. Though holding the Mosaic Law, they believed in Christ, and contrary to the Elkesaites and Ebionites who dwelt in the same regions, they seemed to have been essentially orthodox. Cf. Aug. *Contra Cresconium* 1.31.

CHAPTER 10.

Epiph. *Panar.* 30 (GCS 25.333-382), *Anaceph.* (PG 42.857C)

—DTC 4.1987-1995 (G. Bareille); LThK 3.516-518 (J. Lippl).

1. **Ebionaei:** A Jewish-Christian sect. The name comes from a Jewish word meaning "the poor." After the destruction of Jerusalem, Jewish Christians, who following the prophecies of Christ had managed to escape in time, gathered together in various groups. Jewish Christians, with predilections for freedom from the Old Law, had more opportunity to exercise their preference; others, in attempting to be both Jewish and Christian, ended in being neither; still others receded farther and farther from Christianity and approximated pure Judaism more and more. The Ebionites are to be ranked among the last named group. There were two principal types of Ebionism, an earlier, designated Pharisaic Ebionism, and later, called Essene or Gnostic Ebionism.

Christum . . . tantummodo hominem: The earlier Ebionites claimed that Christ was justified by fulfilling the Law. Had anyone else fulfilled the commandments of the Law as perfectly as He, that person would have been the Christ. Hence Christ was only human, nothing more than a Solomon or Jonas, son of Joseph and Mary. But at His baptism a great change took place. From that time on He was endowed with the power and role of Messiah. But He was still simply a man. They were Chiliasts, awaiting a future coming of the Messiah at the millennium.

The later Essene or Gnostic Ebionites were affected by external influences. Mystical and Oriental doctrines along with the ascetical practices of the Essenes were incorporated into their system. The nature of Christ was variously understood by these later Ebionites under Gnostic influence.

4. **Sampsaeos et Elcesaeos:** A book bearing the name of El-

kesai, which supposedly contained angelic revelations, was held in high repute among certain Ebionites at the end of the second century. It announced a new method of forgiving sin, even the greatest, by a new baptism with a certain formula. The Sampsaens were identical with this sect, Sampsaei being another name for them.

8. **Eusebius:** 6.38.

9. **fidem . . . negandam:** During the papacy of Callistus (217-222) there was a great controversy concerning forgiveness of sin after baptism. The book of Elkesai taught that it was lawful to deny the Faith in time of persecution, thus annihilating at once the class of sins whose forgiveness was most controversial at the time.

CHAPTER 11.

Epiph. *Panar.* 31 (GCS 25.382-438); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.857D-860A)—DTC 15.2497-2519 (G. Bardy); LThK 10.476 f. (J. P. Steffes).

1. **Valentino:** Hellenizing Gnostic, who according to Epiphanius, was born in Egypt. He lived in Rome from 136-165 and then departed for Cyprus. It seems certain that his break with the Church occurred in Rome. His system is difficult to describe, for the Fathers paid more attention to his disciples, who modified it in many ways. Irenaeus calls him the father of the Gnostic heresy (*Contra haer.* 1.11.1 [PG 7.560]).

4. **Patrem appellat:** A strong monistic trend runs through the whole of his system in which Ophitic elements are spiritualized. Deep speculation bound up with mysticism and ecstasy, as well as a practical interest in salvation dominate Valentinian Gnosticism.

11. **Christum:** According to Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* 11 [CSEL 47.189 f.]) the Valentinians were divided into two groups, an eastern (Egypt and Syria) and a western (Italy and Southern Gaul). The description of Christ's nature in this passage with its emphasis on passing through Mary's body as through a conduit belongs clearly to the Italian school.

15. **Negat . . . resurrectionem carnis:** This conclusion flows naturally from the strong monism of the system.

CHAPTER 12.

Epiph. *Panar.* 32 (GCS 25.438-447); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.860A)
—Smith and Wace 4.596 (G. Salmon).

1. **Secundiani:** Secundus was one of the earliest and most important of Valentinus' successors. It is practically impossible to distinguish his teachings from those of his master.

CHAPTER 13.

Epiph. *Panar.* 33 (GCS 25.448-464); *Anaceph.* (PG 42. 860A-862A)—Cf. "Valentin," DTC 15.2513-2515; LThK 8.559 f. (J. Zellinger).

1. **Ptolemaeus:** Gnostic of the Italian branch of Valentinus' Gnosticism. There is little known of his life and work. He died *ca.* 180. His letter, preserved in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 33.3-7) and addressed to an unknown Flora, plays a part in the history of Pentateuch criticism (here we find the expression Πεντάτευχος used for the first time), and is counted as the most valuable fragment of Gnostic literature. To free himself from the Law without destroying it, he distinguished three parts in the Pentateuch, one part derived from demiurges, another from Moses himself, a third from the eldest God.

CHAPTER 14.

Epiph. *Panar.* 34 (GCS 31.5-39); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.859B)—
DTC 9.1960-1962 (É. Amann); LThK 6.959 (J. P. Junglas).

1. **Marcus:** A Gnostic of the school of Valentinus, who taught in the middle of the second century. What may be considered Marcus' own teachings were perhaps the most worthless of all that passed under the name of "knowledge" in the second century, magical formulae and puerile speculations about mysteries in numbers and names.

CHAPTER 15.

Epiph. *Panar.* 35 (GCS 31.39-44); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.859B-C)—
DTC 3.378-380 (G. Bareille); LThK 3.1 (A. Bigelmair).

1. **Colorbasus** (Colarbasus): A disciple of Valentinus who lived in the second century. He was probably born in Egypt. According to Hippolytus (*Philos.* 4.13; 6.55 [GCS 26.45; 189]), Ps.-Tert. (*Adv. omn. haer.* 5 [CSEL 47.222]), and Filastrius (*Haer.* 43 [CSEL 38.23]), the school used measures and numbers in its system and thus revealed its dependence on Pythagoras and Ptolemaeus. Heumann (*Hamberg. Vermischte Bibliothek* 1 [1743] 145), Volkmar (*Zschr. Hist. Theol.* [1855] 605-616) and others are not correct in explaining "Colorbasi" in Irenaeus' *Contra haer.* 1.12-16 (PG 7.569-636) as a misreading of the Hebrew Cholarba or Col-arba, "All—four," or the "Voice of Four," the Valentinian Tetras, thereby denying the historical personality of Colorbasus. Irenaeus could not have presupposed a knowledge of Hebrew on the part of his readers. Moreover, all the writers who depend on him accepted Colorbasus as an historical person and the name does appear in inscriptions. Cf. Bigelmair.

CHAPTER 16.

Epiph. *Panar.* 36 (GCS 31.44-50); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.860C)—
DTC 6.2198-2205 (G. Bareille); LThK 4.965 f. (W. Koch).

1. **Heracleone**: Heracleon was a Valentinian Gnostic who lived ca. 145-180. He and Ptolemaeus were the chief representatives of the Italian branch of Valentinian Gnosticism. His works exist only in fragments, but what does remain reveals a strong allegorizing bent in his commentaries on the Scriptures.

3. **Feruntur . . . capita eorum**: This account of the teachings of Heracleon is nothing more than the ascription to this teacher of notices ultimately to be traced to Irenaeus referring to unknown, unnamed Valentinians. The chief interest attached to Heracleon is that he is one of the earliest commentators on the New Testament of whom we have knowledge. It is reasonable to suppose that he was not the author of any formal exposition of Valentinian doctrine, but only of exegetical works in which the principles of

Valentinus were assumed, for it is only of such works that we have any express knowledge.

CHAPTER 17.

Epiph. *Panar.* 37 (GCS 31.50-62); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.860C)—
DTC 11.1063-1075 (E. Amann); LThK 7.731 f. (J. P. Steffes).

1. **colubro:** Gnostic speculation busied itself with the origin of evil, and the favorite solution was that evil was inherent in matter. Hence it was easy for them to conclude that the God of the Old Testament, the Creator of the world, could not be identical with the Supreme Good God. Following this line of thought, the serpent of the Old Testament, who offered to teach our first parents knowledge, was the friend of the human race, while the Creator, who had cursed them, was its enemy.

Ophitae . . . sanctificare: In the narrower sense this term applies to Gnostic groups which gave the serpent a central place in their worship. In a wider sense, the term also applied to many individual groups among whom the cult of the serpent had been more or less suppressed, but who retained certain fundamental doctrines in which the serpent figured. There had been a mixing of the heavenly good powers with material evil powers. This admixture had to be loosed through redemption. The myths concerning the "Anthropos," the "Barbelo," the "Prunikos" or "Sophia," the planetary-astral matter, with here and there the signification and the cult of the serpent, have particular prominence in these sects. In reference to salvation it was the role of the serpent to take the part of true knowledge (Gnosis) against the will of the Old Testament God. The principles of this sect were fundamentally pagan. Its points of contact with Christianity were very few and dealt only with externals.

CHAPTER 18.

Epiph. *Panar.* 38 (GCS 31.62-71); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.680D)—
DTC 2.1307-1309 (G. Bareille); LThK 5.746 (W. Koch);
DHGE 11.226-328 (G. Bardy).

1. **Caiani:** A Gnostic sect of the second century, a branch of the Ophites. Developing the idea of the evil god of the Old Testament

further, they honored all the evildoers of the Old Testament, especially Cain and the serpent. They inverted the moral system of the Old Testament. According to Irenaeus (*Contra haer.* 1.31.1 [PG 7.704]) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 38.1.4) they had a Gospel written by Judas, whom they also honored.

6. **Illos etiam . . . terra dehiscente:** Cf. Numbers 16.31.

CHAPTER 19.

Epiph. *Panar.* 39 (GCS 31.71-80); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.860D)—
Cf. "Ophites," DTC 11.1063-1075; LThK 9.502 (J. P. Steffes).

1. **Sethiani:** Gnostics of the third and fourth centuries who formed one of the branches of the Ophites. They saw in Seth, who reappeared in Christ, the father of the true Gnostics (the Pneumatici, the Spiritual Ones). According to them, the other sons of Adam, Cain and Abel, were the fathers of the "Hylici" and the "Psychici" (the Earthly Ones and the Animal Ones). They thus made use of the Platonic trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit.

CHAPTER 20.

Epiph. *Panar.* 40 (GCS 31.80-90); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.860D-861A)—DTC 1.1769 f. (G. Bareille); LThK 1.621 (K. Algermissen); DHGE 3.1577 f. (P. de Labriolle).

1. **Archontici:** A Gnostic sect of the third and fourth centuries, so called from their doctrine of "Archons," whom they, in common with several other Gnostic bodies, supposed to rule over the seven heavens. They rejected the sacraments and the resurrection of the body. They were most probably Sethians and the last link in the chain of Gnosticism.

CHAPTER 21.

Epiph. *Panar.* 41 (GCS 31.90-93); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.861A)—
DTC 2.2138 f. (G. Bareille); LThK 2.812 f. (J. P. Steffes);
DHGE 12.162 f. (G. Bardy).

1. **Cerdone:** Cerdo was a Syrian Gnostic who lived at Rome ca. 140, where he foreswore his errors, but afterwards secretly professed them. In his teachings the God who created the world, the

God of the Law and the prophets, was extremely different from the Father of Jesus. The former was the known and Just, the latter the unknown and Good. It seems to have been an inaccuracy of Epiphanius that he gives a heading to a sect of Cerdonians, for preceding writers speak only of Cerdo, but not of Cerdonians. It is probable that his followers were early merged in the school of Marcion, who is said to have joined himself to Cerdo soon after he came to Rome.

duo principia . . . alter autem malus: We can easily see in this passage that Augustine has gathered information from various sources. Pseudo-Tertullian (*Haer.* 6 [CSEL 38.222-224]), who was used by Epiphanius and Filastrius, reported that Cerdo introduced two first principles and two gods, the one good, the other evil. In Irenaeus (1.27 [PG 7.687 f.]), however, to the good god is opposed a just one.

CHAPTER 22.

Epiph. *Panar.* 42 (GCS 31.93-188); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.861B)—
DTC 9.2009-2032 (É. Amann); LThK 6.875 f. (J. P. Junglas).

1. **Marcion:** He was the most dangerous heretic of the second century. He was born at Sinope in Pontus and was excommunicated by his own father, a bishop, for seducing a virgin. There is a striking difference between Marcion's teaching and that of others who were commonly classed with him under the name Gnostics. While the systems of the latter contain so many elements derived from paganism, or drawn from fanciful speculation, Marcion's plainly starts with Christianity. Marcion conceived an absolute opposition between the Old and New Testament, Judaism and Christianity, Law and Grace. The God of the Old Testament, a Jewish national God, was a passionate tyrant full of pride and ambition, neither omniscient nor omnipotent. He created the world and man out of uncreated matter. The soul was also His creation. In this last Marcion was definitely anti-Gnostic. The God of the New Testament is the Father of Mercies and the God of all Consolation, who revealed Himself in Jesus. He is all good, demands only faith and damns no one. By His death on the Cross he purchased the creatures of the demiurge. There was to be no resurrection of the flesh, for it will be destroyed as the seat of sin.

The flesh must be mortified here on earth by celibacy. There must be fast and abstinence from meat. Only single persons, or those who have separated from their spouses, can be baptized.

Marcion was no Gnostic, but a positivistic Biblical theologian. The Gnostic belief in Aeons and Oriental syncretism are entirely lacking in the teachings of Marcion. He did not establish a secret society with its own mysterious forms, but an anti-church with a hierarchy and sacraments. It was only after his death that Gnostic elements were introduced into his sect. The sect of the Marcionites surpassed all others of the time in number and importance.

4. Eusebius: 5.13.

CHAPTER 23.

Epiph. *Panar.* 44 (GCS 31.189-199); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.861C)—
DTC 1.1455-1457 (G. Bareille); LThK 1.529 (A. Anwander);
DHGE 3.928 f. (P. de Labriolle).

1. **Apellitae:** Sect founded by a disciple of Marcion, Apelles, who lived for a long time at Rome. He was in close association with a female visionary, Philumene, whose revelations he recorded. In opposition to Marcion he held that there was only one principle and that Christ lived and died in a real body formed of cosmic matter. In his *Συλλογισμοί* he opposed the Old Testament even more strongly than Marcion had. He maintained that all that was necessary for salvation was hope in the Crucified.

CHAPTER 24.

Epiph. *Panar.* 45 (GCS 31.199-202); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.861C)—
cf. "Encratites," DTC 5.7 f. (G. Bareille).

1. **Severiani:** An Encratite sect. The placing of the Severians before the Tatians and Encratites is anachronous. Severus became an Encratite shortly after Tatian. It is possible that the Severians had some Ebionite connections, for elements of Ebionitism are evident in this system. The Encratites are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 25.

Epiph. *Panar.* 46 (GCS 31.202-210), 47 (GCS 31.215-219);
Anaceph. (PG 42.861D, 863A)—DTC 5.4-14 (G. Bareille);
 LThK 3.694 f. (J. P. Steffes).

1. **Tatiani . . . qui et Encratitae:** These were heretics who practiced abstinence, not with a view toward more intense devotion, but in a belief in the essential impurity of the things renounced. Such persons called themselves "continent" (*ἐγκρατῆς*), hence the origin of the name Encratites to denote those whose asceticism was regarded as of an heretical character. They went as far as insisting on the use of water instead of wine in the Holy Eucharist. In time they fell into heresy on dogmatic points, especially by accepting Ebionite, Docetistic, and Gnostic thought. Julius Cassian, Tatian, Severus, Dositheus were founders or leaders of various Encratite sects.

Tatiano: An Assyrian who went to Rome in the first quarter of the second century. There he was the disciple of St. Justin and became a Christian. He gradually fell into Gnostic thought and around 172 returned to the East, where he established his form of Encratism.

CHAPTER 26.

Epiph. *Panar.* 48 (GCS 31.219-241); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864A)—
 DTC 10.2355-2370 (G. Bardy); LThK 7.295-297 (J. P. Junglas).

1. **Cataphryges:** Also known by the name Montanists after their founder.

2. **Montanus:** A native of Phrygia, who in the latter half of the second century originated a fanatical schism, which first started as an ascetic, eschatological revival. But it soon became a dangerous heresy. The Montanists did not replace or change the Creed, yet wanted to substitute their own, more perfect revelation for that of the Church. After 172, Montanus announced his new revelation while in an ecstatic state, claiming to be the organ of the Paraclete. He came as God the Father Himself and as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Two women, Prisca (Priscilla) and Maximilla, soon felt themselves moved by the Spirit to prophesy. They

even surpassed Montanus in their frenzied revelations. As the fanaticism spread, the neighboring bishops wanted to exorcise the women, and a schism was provoked.

The Phrygian cities, Pepuza and Tymium, were to be the places from which the thousand year reign of Christ was to begin. The heavenly Jerusalem was to descend upon Pepuza. A stricter form of life was necessary to prepare for this coming of Christ, and a higher morality in the Church was demanded. This sect soon gathered numerous followers in the East and in the West. In 202 Tertullian joined the Montanists in Africa.

8. **apostolum Paulum:** 1 Cor. 13.9.

12. **infantis anniculi sanguine:** The story is told by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 16.8 [PG 33.928 f.]) and repeated after him by several writers, that the sacrifice of an infant, and the partaking of his flesh, formed part of the Montanist mysteries. This tale is only worth notice as proof that in the places where it was circulated, the sect must have been practically non-existent.

CHAPTER 27.

Epiph. *Panar.* 49 (GCS 31.241-244); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864B)—
DTC 13.1598 (E. Amann).

2. **dicat Epiphanius:** Following his article on the Montanists (*Haer.* 48), Epiphanius has an article (*Haer.* 49) on a sect to which he gives the alternative names Quintilliani, Pepuziani, or Priscilliani, but he shows no sign that he had any real knowledge of the sect he described. The Quintilla of whom he speaks is mentioned by no other authority. Only two prophetesses of the Montanists are named by other writers, the Maximilla and Prisca (or Priscilla) of Chapter 26 *supra*.

CHAPTER 28.

Epiph. *Panar.* 49 (GCS 31.241-244); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864B)—
DTC 1.2035 f. (G. Bareille); LThK 1.708 (J. Geiselman);
DHGE 4.825-827 (P. de Labriolle).

1. **Artotyritae:** (*ἄpros* = loaf; *τύρος* = cheese) A sect affiliated with Montanism who are said to have employed bread and cheese

in the celebration of their mysteries. St. Augustine's observation seems to be, without doubt, his own personal interpretation. Among its members, as among all the disciples of Montanus, women played an important role.

CHAPTER 29.

Epiph. *Panar.* 50 (GCS 31.244-248); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864C)—DTC 13.1445-1447 (E. Amann); LThK 8.577 f. (A. Bigelmair).

1. **Tessarescaedecatitae:** More commonly known as the Quarto-decimani, formed a group in the early centuries of Christianity in Asia Minor who insisted on celebrating Easter on the Jewish feast of the Pasch, the fourteenth Nisan. The reason for this does not seem to have been any tradition that Christ rose on the day of His death, but rather that the day for the celebration of the Pasch had been established by Exodus 12.6. In all other respects they seem to have been orthodox.

CHAPTER 30.

Epiph. *Panar.* 51 (GCS 31.248-311); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864C)—DTC 1.898-901 (G. Bareille); LThK 1.289 (A. Seider); DHGE 2.664 f. (A. Lehaut).

1. **Alogi:** Deniers of the Logos, or at least of the strongest witness for the Logos, St. John the Evangelist. Epiphanius invented the term (*Haer.* 51.3 [GCS 31.250]) to characterize their rejection of the Divine Word preached by St. John. According to Epiphanius they denied, in ardent opposition to the Gnosticism of Cerinthus, who was a Docetist, and to the Montanists, who maintained the continuance of the spiritual gifts in the Church, the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.

CHAPTER 31.

Epiph. *Panar.* 52 (GCS 31.311-314); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.864C-865A)—DTC 1.391 f. (G. Bareille); LThK 1.90 (F. X. Sepelt); DHGE 1.503 f. (V. Ermoni).

1. **Adamiani:** An obscure sect which sought to restore the innocence of Paradise by going naked. They rejected marriage, but

engaged in sexual excesses. They are first mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 52), but he states expressly that he used only oral accounts, having never read anything of them, nor met them personally. He seems rather sceptical of their existence. The identification of the Adamites with a group of Carpocratians having similar traits mentioned by Clement of Alexandria is questionable.

CHAPTER 32.

Epiph. *Panar.* 53 (GCS 31.314-317); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.865A)—
DTC 4.2233-2239 (G. Bareille); LThK 3.637 (A. Anwander).

1. **Elcesaeos et Sampsaeos:** Jewish-Christian Gnostic sect of the second century. The name was derived from a pseudo-prophet, Elkesai, who began his prophesying in the southern part of the East Jordan region and wrote his book of revelations. Cf. notes on Chapter 10 *supra*. In 220 the sect was introduced to Rome by Alcibiades of Apamea. The reports and fragments concerning this sect in Hippolytus (*Philos.* 9.4, 13-17; 10.29 [GCS 26.240, 251-255; 284]), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 19; 20.3; 30.2-17; 53 [GCS 25.217-224; 226 f.; 334-357]), and Eusebius (*HE* 6.38 [PG 20.597C-600A]) are not too trustworthy a picture of the original ideas and developments. In it there were strong traces of Judaism: praying toward Jerusalem, the observance of circumcision, of the Sabbath and of the Law, and a keen interest in the doctrine of angels etc., while Christianity was poorly or slightly represented and in perverted form. They had a doctrine of Christ and a female Holy Ghost, as Aeons of gigantic dimensions, and of a repeated appearance of the Adam-Christ on earth. In this system there is much of astrology and superstition and a strange baptism, repeated as often as necessary for the forgiveness of sins, no matter how grave. This last fact should be noted in relation to the great controversy over the forgiveness of sins which agitated the Church during the papacy of Callistus (217-222).

CHAPTER 33.

Epiph. *Panar.* 54 (GCS 31.317-323); *Anacep.* (PG 42.865B)—
LThK 10.59 (W. Koch); Smith and Wace 4.979 (G. Salmon).

1. **Theodotiani:** Theodotus the Elder was excommunicated by Pope Victor I. Among the few adherents of this sect, Theodotus the Younger was the most prominent. They employed a formalistic and prosaic exegesis, which they used in support of their Christology. In respect to the Deity, and the work of creation, the doctrine of Theodotus seems to have been orthodox, but in respect to our Lord's person, he agreed with Gnostic speculation.

CHAPTER 34.

Epiph. *Panar.* 55 (GCS 31.324-337); *Anaceph.* (PG 42, 865B)—
DTC 10.513-516 (G. Bardy); LThK 7.62 f. (J. Schaumberger).

1. **Melchisedeciani:** Theodotus the Younger, disciple of the above-named Theodotus, held that Christ was mere man, but he added the doctrine that Melchisedech was a heavenly power still higher than Christ, insisting on the inferiority implied in the declaration that Christ was a high priest after the order of Melchisedech. Melchisedech had been doing the work of intercession and advocacy for angels and heavenly powers which Christ was to do for men. Many of the ancient heretics held that Melchisedech was the Logos, or Holy Spirit, or even a power of the Holy Spirit descending on Christ.

CHAPTER 35.

Epiph. *Panar.* 56 (GCS 31.338-343); *Anaoeph.* (PG 42.865B)—
DTC 2.391-401 (F. Nau); LThK 1.965 f. (F. Haase); DHGE
6.765-769 (G. Bardy).

1. **Bardesane:** Syrian Gnostic of the second century. Until his twenty-fifth year he was educated by the pagan priest, Anududuzbar in Mabbug. He was baptized in Edessa. After being a strong defender of the Christian faith, and writing against the Gnosticism of his time, he himself fell into the errors of Valentinus and Marcion. Eusebius (*HE* 4.30 [PG 20.401-404]) and Moses of Chorene (2.66) report that before his death Bardesanes returned to the Church and traveled through Armenia as a missionary.

CHAPTER 36.

Epiph. *Panar.* 57 (GCS 31.343-357); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.865C);
 Fil. Div. her. 53 (CSEL 38.28)—Cf. "Monarchianisme," DTC
 10.2195 f. (G. Bardy); "Patripassianer," LThK 7.1035 f. (I.
 Backes).

1. **Noëto:** A native of Smyrna according to Hippolytus, but of Ephesus according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 57).

Noëtiani: Patripassianism is the common term for sects holding doctrines such as these. They were modalistic monarchians, who out of fear of ditheism stressed the oneness of God so strongly that the distinction between the Father and the Son disappeared. The Passion was assigned to the Father in so far as He was the Son. Epigonus, disciple of Noëtus, brought the doctrine to Rome.

2. **et Spiritum Sanctum:** Sabellius (cf. Chapter 41 *infra*) seemed to have introduced the Holy Ghost into this system: Noëtus had been concerned only with the Father and the Son. Noëtus had already been condemned in the East toward the end of the second century.

CHAPTER 37.

Epiph. *Panar.* 58 (GCS 31.358-363); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.865C)—
 Cf. "Eunuques ou Valésiens," DTC 5.1516-1621 (G. Bareille);
 "Eunuchen," Wetzzer and Welte 4.989 f. (R. Scherer).

1. **Valesii:** A sect reported to have existed in Achaea in the third century. Their historical existence has never been proved. Epiphanius is our only primary source; later writers copied from him.

CHAPTER 38.

Epiph. *Panar.* 59 (GCS 31.363-379); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868A)—
 DTC 2.1987-1999 (F. Vernet); LThK 5.889 f. (J. P. Junglas);
 Cf. "Novatian," DTC 11.816-849 (E. Amann).

1. **Cathari** (καθαροί): The question of penance, which under Pope Callistus (217-222) had already caused dissensions in the Church, was made the pretext for a schism which lasted several centuries. At the end of the Decian persecution, Cornelius was elected to the see of Rome, a position which Novatian had hoped

to obtain himself. Cornelius was disposed to grant absolution to those who had lapsed in time of persecution, the "lapsi." Novatian refused to do so, pushing his severity so far as to demand the forgiveness of sin be refused even to the dying when it could be shown that they were "lapsi." Later on, the same rigorous measures were extended to all grievous sinners. It was the boast of the Novatians that their church was composed only of the pure and holy.

3. **Novatum:** J. P. Junglas ("Novatianer," LThK 7.637) states that the name Novatus, used by Epiphanius and the later Latin writers, is a misrendering of Novatianus. There was, however, a Novatus, a member of this sect in North Africa who was opposed by St. Cyprian. It is not difficult to see how the name Novatus could have replaced Novatianus.

CHAPTER 39.

Epiph. *Panar.* 60 (GCS 31.379 f.); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868A)—
Wetzer and Welte 1.843 f. (Fechtrup); DHGE 3.58 (A. Lehaut).

1. **Angelici:** This is the name of a sect mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 60) who did not know much about them. Augustine is the only one to attempt the explanation for their name, that they worshipped angels. Various other conjectures have been given for the name: that the adherents of the sect lived angelic lives, or that their headquarters were in a place called Angelina to the east of Mesopotamia. It is possible that they got their name from Gnostic teachings, which ascribed the creation to the angels. Augustine's explanation is reasonable, for there were here and there some Christians who carried the cult to excess.

CHAPTER 40.

Epiph. *Panar.* 61 (GCS 31.380-389); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868A)—
DTC 1.1631 f. (G. Bareille); DHGE 3.1037 (M. Bodet).

1. **Apostolici:** This was a sect which was widely spread in Asia Minor and the East in the fourth century. Its members practiced extreme asceticism; one of their chief principles seems to have been

a rejection of private property. They also refused to admit offenders to communion, and condemned marriage. What little is known of this sect we owe to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 61), and he apparently knew them only through oral report. They seemed to have had much in common with the Tatians, Encratites, and Novatians.

7. **Apotacticae**: This name, meaning the "Renunciants," they applied to themselves.

CHAPTER 41.

Epiph. *Panar.* 62 (GCS 31.389-398); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868A); *Fil. Div. her.* 54 (CSEL 38.28)—Cf. "Monarchianisme." DTC 10.2201-2208 (G. Bardy); LThK 9.52 f. (A. Stohr); Cf. "Hermogène," DTC 6.2306-2311 (G. Bareille).

1. **Noëto**: Cf. Chapter 36 *supra*.

3. **Sabellium**: Sabellius embraced the doctrine taught by Noëtus and Praxeas in Rome, and soon became the leader of the Monarchians. He was active in the heresy before the death of Pope Zephyrinus (199-217), was excommunicated by Pope Callistus (217-222), and was apparently still in Rome when Hippolytus wrote the *Philosophumena* (230-235). Of his earlier and later history nothing is known. He was, perhaps, also taught by Beryllus of Bostra.

14. **Noëtianos et Sabellianos**: Augustine's confusion here is easily understood, for Monarchianism unfolded gradually in the discussions at Rome which it had provoked during the papacy of popes Zephyrinus and Callistus. Sabellianism was a modified Monarchianism which was expressly related to the Holy Ghost. It was a form of Modalism according to which the Trinity is not a real but a modal relation of the One Personal God to the world. There were three forms of appearance and activity assumed by the One Personal God in the role of Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier.

CHAPTER 42.

Epiph. *Panar.* 63 (GCS 31.398-402); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868B)—
Cf. "Origenistische Streitigkeiten," LThK 7.780 (A. Antweiler).

1. **Origeniani a quodam Origene dicti sunt:** There is no authority independent of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 63) for the existence of this sect. He himself appears to know them only from hearsay, and had only the vaguest information on them. It is quite probable that these Origeniani of whom Epiphanius heard were doctrinal disciples of Origen, and that to discredit them, their opponents brought charges of immorality against them.

CHAPTER 43.

Epiph. *Panar.* 64 (GCS 31.403-523); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868B)—
DTC 11.1565-1588 (G. Fritz).

1. **Origeniani . . . plura legerunt:** Augustine shows his fine spirit of justice and moderation in this discussion of Origenism. It is certainly true that the teachings of Origen were used by orthodox and un-orthodox theologians and interpreted variously.

9. **Sed sunt alia . . . quae catholica ecclesia omnino non recipit:** Origen's speculative errors are to be found principally in his exegesis, cosmology, and eschatology. His views on the Trinity were neither better nor worse than those of his contemporaries. The majority of his errors arose from a sincere attempt to oppose Gnosticism and to adopt Platonic thought to Christianity. In his commentaries on the Scriptures, he pushed allegorism to the extreme by his mystical and moral interpretations.

11. **maxime de purgatione et liberatione:** This is the theory of the restoration of all things: all things will return to God, their ultimate principle (Origen, *De principiis* 3.6; 1.6.3 [GCS 22.297-291, 82-84]).

24. **De civitate Dei:** Cf. 21.17 (CSEL 40^a.548 f.).

CHAPTER 44.

Epiph. *Panar.* 65 (GCS 37.2-13); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868C)—
DTC 12.46-51 (G. Bardy); LThK 8.16 f. (J. P. Junglas).

1. **Paulo Samosatenos:** Bishop of Antioch *ca.* 260 was a celebrated Monarchian heresiarch, who took the dynamic or Ebionite Monarchianism of Artemon and expounded it in new terminology.

4. **Artemonis:** Taught at Rome at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. He declared that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was an innovation and a relapse into polytheism. He asserted that Christ was a mere man, but born of a virgin, and superior in virtue to the prophets. Cf. Eusebius (*HE* 5.28 [PG 20.512B]; Epiph. (*Haer.* 65). Paul explained this doctrine by maintaining that Christ's preexistence was simply in the Divine foreknowledge. Starting with the unity of God, he denied the existence of a Logos distinct from the Father. The indwelling of the Logos in Christ differed from the indwelling of the same in other men only in degree. He called Christ God, but only insofar as His human nature, by instrumentality of the indwelling Logos, advanced toward God. The Deity of Christ grew by gradual progress out of the humanity.

5. **Photino:** Cf. Chapter 55 *infra*.

8. **Nicaeno concilio:** Cf. 19th canon of Nice (Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* 1.615-618) where their baptisms and ordinations were all rejected and ordered to be repeated. Athanasius (*Or. II c. Ar.* 43 [PG 26.231]) mentions them as using the formula of baptism in a deceitful sense.

CHAPTER 45.

Fil. *Div. her.* 65 (CSEL 38.33); Epiph. *Panar.* 71 (GCS 37. 249-256); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.869C)—DTC 12.1532-1536 (G. Bardy); LThK 8.254 (A. Stohr).

1. **Photinus:** Bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia died in 376. He was originally a disciple and deacon of Marcellus of Ancyra, but turned the latter's Sabellian doctrine on the Logos into the dynamic Ebionite Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata.

CHAPTER 46.

Epiph. *Panar.* 66 (GCS 37.13-132); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868D); Augustine: *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* (PL 32.1309-1378); *De libero arbitrio* (PL 32.1221-1310); *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (PL 34.173-220); *De vera religione* (PL 34.121-172); *De utilitate credendi* (CSEL 25¹.3-48); *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos* (CSEL 25¹.51-80); *Contra Fortunatum Manichaeum* (CSEL 25¹.83-112); *Contra Adimantum* (CSEL 25¹.115-190); *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant "Fundamenti"* (CSEL 25¹.193-248); *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (CSEL 25¹.251-797); *Contra Felicem Manichaeum* (CSEL 25².801-852); *De natura boni* (CSEL 25².855-889); *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum* (CSEL 25².905-947)—DTC 9.1841-1895 (G. Bardy); LThK 6.850 f. (W. Koch); F. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees* Cambridge 1925; A. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* New York 1932; J. Maher, *Saint Augustine's Defense of the Hexameron against the Manichaeans* St. Meinrad, Ind. 1946; H. Polotsky, "Manichäismus," RE, Supplementband 6.240-271; H. Puech, *Le Manichéisme* Paris 1949. (Brother Anthony Moon, F. S. C., *The De Natura Boni of Saint Augustine* [The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 88; Washington, D. C. 1955] has presented a detailed study of St. Augustine and Manichaeism.)

De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum, begun in 388 in Rome after Augustine's baptism, explains the Catholic practices of continence and of abstinence as opposed to the false practices of the Manichaeans. St. Augustine, recognizing as a key idea of the Manichaean heresy its teaching on the origin of evil, devoted to this problem his *De libero arbitrio* and the *Contra Fortunatum Manichaeum*. In the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* he justifies the first three chapters of Genesis against the objections of the Manichaeans. *De vera religione* establishes proof of the existence of one God, contrary to the Manichaean dualism. *Contra Adimantum* deals with the Old and the New Testaments. The letter which the Manichaeans called "Fundamenti" and which was an important work in the Manichaean sect is known to us only in fragments quoted by St. Augustine. In refutation of this letter appeared Augustine's *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant "Fundamenti."* Against Faustus, "blaspheming the Law and the Prophets, their God and the Incarnation of Christ, and saying the writings of the New Testament are false" (*Retract.* 2.7) Augustine wrote *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*. The *Contra Felicem Manichaeum* is the record of a public discussion with a certain Felix, a Manichaean. Around 400 appeared the *De natura boni* wherein Augustine shows that "God is unchangeable and the highest good" (*Re-*

tract. 2.9), and Augustine returns again to the question of the origin of evil. His final written work against the Manichaeans was an answer to a letter of a certain Secundinus, namely the *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum*. Cf. Bardy's edition of *Retractationes* pp. 556-579.

MANICHAISM

It is not surprising to find St. Augustine devoting the largest section, more than one-tenth, of the *De haeresibus* to the Manichaeans, for theirs was a heresy which played an important part in his own life, and one which was a formidable enemy of the Catholic Faith in the third and fourth centuries. With its specious intellectualism and avowed syncretism, it presented a philosophy of life which in importance and extent had become a world religion. The religion of the Manichees had as its object the redemption of being from evil, an aim which was to be reached by the proper understanding of this world, of the evil in it, and the nature of man. In this system redemption was to be accomplished by knowledge, united with a corresponding form of life. Hence, Manichaeism may be considered a form of Gnosticism. (Cf. Puech, 68-72.)

Manichaeism divided the world into two absolutely different parts, the Divine World of Light (Good) and the Wicked World of Darkness (Evil). Though the term God is not applied to the Dark, the system is basically dualistic. (Cf. Polotsky 250.48-68.) These two sources or principles were conceived of as eternally coexistent, once separate, but in the present regrettably intermingled. From this mixture of Light and Dark, Good and Evil, the visible and tangible world came into existence. The aim and object of the children of Light is, then, not the improvement of this world—for that is impossible—but its gradual extinction by the separation of the Light particles from the Dark substance with which they have been mixed. (Cf. Burkitt 4.)

Mani (*ca.* 215-277), the founder of this religion, taught that there had been a succession of prophets who labored for the separation of Light and Dark: Buddha, Zoroaster, Hermes Trismegistus, Plato, Jesus. Mani himself was of course the last and final herald of the Light. All those who had labored before him had presented an incomplete, an imperfect revelation. Mani had come to complete and harmonize their teachings. (Cf. Puech 61-63). In Mani's teachings, however, Jesus held a peculiar place. The historical Christ, who appeared in Palestine, was a heavenly Aeon without a real body. Before this, Jesus, a divine emanation, had appeared to Adam to awaken in the first man the true knowledge of his nature and destiny. Jesus was revealed and visible

Light, the ennobling doctrine of the true destiny of the divine part of man, man's life and salvation through divine suffering. (Cf. Burkitt 38-43.) But Christ had not taught the full truth either, for Mani was the only one who found the correct means to do so; and this consisted in knowledge of the dualism and obedience to the corresponding ethics.

Manichaean morals were epitomized in the observance of the three Seals, that of the breast, that of the mouth, and that of the hands—in other words, abstention from marriage, agriculture, flesh-meat. Realizing that complete observance of these seals was possible only for a few, the perfect, Mani prescribed for those of good will, the imperfect, only the keeping of the decalogue and promised them a gradual purification after death through reincarnation. According to Mani, worship consisted essentially in prayer and fasting, not in the sacraments. The Holy Scriptures of the Jews and Christians were subjected to Mani's own interpretations. The Old Testament was rejected as the work of the Dark demon, while the New Testament was accepted with modifications to suit the dogmas of Manichaeism. Cf. Bardy DTC 9.2 (1927) 1889 f.

The sources of our knowledge of Manichaeism are excellently presented and described by Polotsky ("Manichäismus" 241-243) and Bardy ("Manichéisme," DTC 9.1841-1857). (Bardy [1856-1857] gives a list of the various works of Augustine on Manichaeism. In his special works dealing with Manichaeism, Augustine handles in detail the main problems which are treated summarily in this section of the *De haeresibus*. Cf. *supra*, this chapter.) This information is admirably supplemented by Puech, *Le Manichéisme*. Until the discoveries of materials of Manichaean origin in Chinese Turkestan at the beginning of this century and the later discoveries in 1931 near Lycopolis of writings in Coptic containing much Manichaean source material, the anti-Manichaean writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers and the works of certain Zoroastrian and Mohammedan scribes had been the basis for our knowledge of this religion. The new discoveries have solidly substantiated what we already had and in particular, as far as the present work is concerned, to vindicate St. Augustine's knowledge and the veracity of his reports on Manichaeism. His testimony should have been recognized as of exceptional worth, for he had been a member of the sect from his nineteenth to twenty-eighth year, and even after that continued to read its books and study its doctrine. However, both Beausobre (*Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* [2 vols., Amsterdam 1734 and 1739], I 426, II 399) and Alfarié (*L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin* I 92 f.) questioned the validity of his testimony. But in the light of these new discoveries, their objections

must fall. Both Bardy (1856.6) and Polotsky (242.36-43) claim that Augustine is among the most important of our sources for a knowledge of Manichaeism. J. Maher, O. S. A., in his critical study, when concluding a comparison of Augustine's accounts of the Manichaean cosmogony and that of the Egyptian manuscripts, declares (p. 79) that the new finds "not only fail to detract in any way from the authority and reliability of Augustine's testimony on the teachings of Manes, but on the contrary, are an eloquent confirmation of the value of that authority."

1. **a quodam Persa . . . qui vocabatur Manes:** Mani was born April 14, 216 A. D., of royal Persian stock at Mardinu, or at Afrunya, in Babylonia (Puech 32-34). His father had joined the religion of the Mughtasila, the Baptizers, and in this religion Mani spent his early years, a point well worth noting, for this sect seems to have been an early form of Mandaism, a Babylonian syncretism, which may well have been the basis upon which Mani later built (Puech 39-42). Mani is said to have received his first revelations in his twelfth or thirteenth year and his second in his twenty-fourth year. He then inaugurated his apostolate by a voyage to India, the occasion, possibly, for the introduction of Buddhist elements into his system. During the coronation ceremonies of King Shapur I, Mani met the new king personally, was received with favor and given some sort of official recognition for his teachings. Recent calculations give April 9, 243 as the date of this meeting (Puech 42-46). From this time on Mani traveled extensively through the regions of Asia Minor, spreading his new religion by extraordinary amounts of writing and preaching. Shapur I died (probably in April, 273) and was succeeded by his son, Hormizdas, who continued the royal favor. In April, 274, Bahram I came to the throne and Mani lost favor. The leaders of Mazdaism, the official cult, charged him with attempting to overthrow the state religion and succeeded in having him imprisoned on January 31, 277. Then began for Mani a period of atrocious sufferings at the hands of his tormentors, a period called by the Manichaeans his Passion or Crucifixion. This lasted for twenty-six days, when, finally, exhausted by the treatment he received, Mani died, February 26, 277. Cf. Puech 49-54.

3. **Manichaeum . . . appellare maluerunt . . . geminata . . . Mannicheum vocant:** The name Mani does not seem to be Iranian

but Aramaean and is found among Mandaeans, Babylonian Jews, and others. The Greeks and Latins rendered it by Manes, Manikhaïos, Manichaeus. This latter form, found among the Manichaean texts themselves, is probably derived from the Syriac *Mani hayya*, "Mani the Living" (Puech 33). For the derisive treatment of the name Mani by the enemies of the sect, cf. Puech 113 n. 102, and for the fantastic etymologies given to it by both friend and enemy, cf. Aug. *Contra Faust.* 19-22.

7. **Iste duo principia . . . opinatus est:** Father Maher (*op. cit.*) has forcibly demonstrated that Augustine knew Manichaean cosmogony competently and transmitted it faithfully to posterity. His fifth chapter, "Manichean Cosmogony," and Appendix I, "Table of comparative study of the Manichean cosmogony according to the *Kephalaia* and according to the anti-Manichean works of Augustine," are particularly valuable.

The absolute dualism which Augustine attributes to Manichaeism has been borne out by modern research (cf. Puech 74-75). It seems strange that Silvia Jannaccone (*La dottrina eresiologicalica di S. Agostino* 65) should deny the basic dualism of Manichaeism: (. . . non è più possibile accettare le affermazioni finora correnti, e che ci derivano da Agostino, che nel Manicheismo esistevano a partire dal cominciamento due principi . . .) Her argument is not convincing, nor does she present any reasons for accepting the "transformation of evil into good" of which she speaks on pp. 64-65.

10. **pugnam et comixtionem et malo purgationem:** The Manichaeans spoke of the two Principles or Roots and their existence in the Three Moments. By the Three Moments were meant, the Past, the Present, and the Future. (Cf. Puech 157 n. 284.) The two Principles, being absolutely different eternal existences, were separate in the beginning as they should be. But in the Past the Dark made an incursion on the Light and some of the Light became intermingled with the Dark as it still is in the Present. Nevertheless a means of refining this Light from the Dark was called into being and of protecting the whole realm of Light from any further invasion, so that in the Future the Light and the Dark would be happily separated. Cf. Burkitt 17.

The most usual presentation of the primordial condition of Light

and Dark is that of two contiguous realms or states, existing side by side from all eternity without any commixture. The disturbance of this eternal order was not clearly explained. It seems that the Dark somehow perceived that there was something pleasant beyond his realm and thus came out of his realm to invade the dominion of Light. Cf. Puech 76; Burkitt 20-22.

15. **Ex his autem suis fabulis . . . quando inter se utraque natura pugnavit:** The Manichaean Myth may be summarized as follows: The Father of Light, realizing that his existing manifestations were unable to oppose the enemy, for they had been created for peace, decided to bring a new kind of being into existence. He therefore evoked the Mother of Life, and the Mother of Life evoked the Primal Man, who was not Adam, but Adam's divine prototype, a being wholly divine and consubstantial with the Father of Light. Primal Man was then clothed with the five bright elements, his sons, Light, Wind, Fire, Water, Air, and descended to the frontier to do battle. The result was disastrous. Primal Man was left unconscious on the field of battle, and the five bright elements were swallowed up by the Darkness. From this resulted the mixture of good and evil which is to be found in the world, a real fusion which modified the natures of the Elements of Good and Bad. Body and soul, matter and spirit were thus united.

A second evocation of Light powers came into being, the Friend of Light, who evoked the Great Architect Ban, who evoked the Living Spirit. The Primal Man then had his divine energy restored. He was the protomartyr, and the first to be saved, the archetype of man's abasement and salvation. After the restoration of Primal Man the Living Spirit descended to the lowest abyss and cut the roots of the five Dark Elements so that they could never increase. Returning to the field of battle, he next took the Powers of Darkness prisoner and stayed the invasion of the Light by the Dark. Yet the Five Bright Elements absorbed by the Dark Archons had still to be recovered. The region of Darkness was turned into a prison by encircling it with an impenetrable wall, and the work of extracting the absorbed Light began. A great deal of the Light substance was immediately disgorged, and of this the sun and the moon were made. But a great amount still remained in the frames of the Archons. So the Living Spirit flayed them and of their

skins made this sky, of their excrement compacted the earth, and of their bones molded and raised the mountains. In this manner the damage caused by the invasion of the realms of Light was localized.

To free the particles of Light which still remained in matter, a third creation or evocation, the Messenger, the *Legatus Tertius*, was sent. The Messenger saves the world by setting up a vast machine to purify and refine the still imprisoned Light particles. And, in less mechanical fashion, he strives also for the liberation of the Light by appearing to the captive Archons as a beautiful person of the opposite sex. These Archons, in a passion of desire, begin to give forth the Light elements which they had absorbed. But with the Light came out also the sin which was engrained in their substance. The Light was rescued and taken up into the sun and moon, the sin fell to the earth to become vegetation. The creation of animals followed in similar fashion.

Fearing that all the Light they had absorbed was about to be taken from them, the Archons devised their own means of keeping it imprisoned. By a strange process of generation and cannibalism, the King of the Dark caused his infernal spouse to give birth to a fresh being in which was hidden most of the absorbed Light. This was Adam. The same parents afterward produced Eve, but she had in her frame less Light. Adam, on the other hand, was truly a microcosm, the image of the universe, of God and Matter, of Light and Dark. To Adam submerged in the sleep of death appeared the Saviour, the Friend, the Son of God, Jesus the Splendor. Jesus, the incarnation of salvific intelligence (*νοῦς*) appeared to Adam and brought him the knowledge of his true being and destiny. Thus man came to know the way to free himself. He must consecrate his life to keeping his soul from all defilement. He must devote himself to continence and renunciation in order to set free little by little the Divine substance within himself and disseminated throughout nature. Warned in time, Adam refrained from sexual intercourse with Eve to prevent the continuation of spirit in matter. But at last Adam forgot the warning and Seth was born. (Neither Cain nor Abel was the child of Adam; they were the off-spring of the Archon brood.) In Seth and in his descendants the particles of Light are still imprisoned. Cf. Burkitt 16-33; Puech 74-82; Polotsky 249-262.

22. purgationem ac liberationem non solum . . . virtutes dei facere . . . verum etiam electos suos: The Church and the Elect were means of escape for the Light imprisoned in the material of food. Thus the bodies of the Perfect were considered part of the vast machine set to refine spirit from matter. Cf. Puech 191 n. 389; Burkitt 465 f.

27. eo genere vitae: Cf. *infra* 28.

28. his duabus professionibus: By means of this division we can picture the Manichaean church as composed of two concentric circles. The Auditors formed the larger, external circle; the Elect, the smaller, inner one. The former represented the lay element, profane and peccable, merely associated with the church and admitted to its membership to serve as aides and auxiliaries to the latter. Cf. Puech 91 and n. 391.

The rigorous morality demanded by Manichaeism naturally surpassed the abilities of the masses, hence the division into the Elect, the Perfect, and the Auditors, the Imperfect. Manichaean ethics (cf. *supra*, introduction to this section) were fulfilled in the observance of the three seals: that of the mouth, of the hand, and of the breast. The first demanded that nothing impure be taken in or allowed out of the mouth. Evil words and evil food were thereby forbidden. Only vegetables were allowed to the Perfect. The second seal, that of the hand, forbade all actions detrimental to the imprisoned Light: slaying of animals, plucking of fruit, etc. The third forbade all evil thoughts, whether against the Manichaean religion or against purity. Marriage was repudiated because the propagation of the human race meant the continual reimprisonment of the Light substance in matter. But only the Elect were expected to fulfill these completely. The Auditors, who formed the vast bulk of Mani's adherents, were bound only by Mani's Ten Commandments, which forbade idolatry, lying, greed, killing, adultery, theft, incantations and magic, doubts about religion, slackness and negligence in business, the neglect of certain exercises of piety. Cf. Burkitt 60-61; Puech 88-89; Bardy DTC 9.1879-1882.

31. In ceteris autem hominibus . . . maxime in eis qui generant filios, artius et inquinatius colligari putant: The Light elements

bound in food and drink are still further imprisoned in the bodies of the non-Elect who consume them. Moreover, Matter has in concupiscence its supreme expression, for by means of it, Evil makes men its accomplices and instruments by prolonging in the bodies of their offspring the captivity of the Light elements. Cf. Puech 88 n. 372.

34. **Quidquid . . . luminis . . . propriis sedibus reddi:** The machine fashioned by the Legatus Tertius resembled a vast water wheel with twelve buckets, which were to take up the souls of men and the Light particles in their bodies as they die. These Light particles mount to the moon on the Column of Glory. For the first part of the month, the moon, filling with these particles, waxes. The latter part of the month, the moon wanes as it transfers them to the sun. The sun, in its turn, restores the purified Light to its celestial Fatherland. Cf. Burkitt 43-44; Puech 79-80; Polotsky 255.27-67.

37. **Quas itidem naves de substantia dei pura perhibent fabricatas:** After the victory of Light over Dark, the Living Spirit, the Demiurge, operated the first liberation of Light by separating it into three different masses. That which had not suffered at all from contact with Darkness formed the sun and the moon; that which suffered but partially gave rise to the stars; that which was most contaminated had to undergo a long and complicated purification. Cf. Puech 79.

38. **Lucemque istam non solum in his navibus . . . verum etiam in aliis quibusque lucidis rebus:** Of the best elements left after the creation of the sun and the moon were formed the five other planets which were charged with presiding over the days and weeks. The light breeze joined to thick vapor produced our air; the heavenly fire mixed with flame produced our fire. Light combined with some obscure elements gave us all brilliant and clear objects, e. g., gold, silver. Cf. Bardy DTC 9.1874 f.

42. **Quinque enim elementa . . . vento malo ventum bonum:** The realm of Evil consisted of the five dark elements, Smoke, Fire, Wind, Water and Darkness. To each of these belonged demons proper to it, bipeds to the Smoke, quadrupeds to the Fire, flying creatures to the Wind, swimming creatures to the Water, serpents

to the Darkness. When Primal Man descended to do battle with the Darkness, the good elements which formed his armor—Light, Wind, Fire, Water, Air—were swallowed up by the corresponding Evil elements. When the mechanism of salvation had been set up, Hyle, the King of Darkness, determined to frustrate the divine economy through counter creation. To this end he used the Princes of Smoke to produce man. Cf. Poltosky 249-252; Aug. *De natura boni* 46.18. (CSEL 25².884-886).

52. **lunam . . . bona aqua . . . solem vero ex igne bono:** After the victory of the Second Evocation over Evil and the work of separating Light from Dark had begun, the purest fire was drawn off to form the sun, and the clearest water to form the moon. For further information of the Light ships cf. Jackson *Researches* 41-42.

54. **Esse autem in eis navibus sanctas virtutes:** The Legatus Tertius takes position in the sun, and the Virgin of Light in the moon. With them are divine powers capable of changing their sex, whose proper role is to excite the concupiscence of the opposite powers and thus to disengage the light particles from their being. Cf. Bardy DTC 9.1875 f.; Puech 80.

59. **Angelis lucis:** The Manichaean texts of central Asia also mention these Angels of Light and with even more precision "the five angels, gatherers of souls." For further information and references cf. Alfarié *L'évolution intellectuelle de Saint Augustin* 110 n. 1.

61. **Qua occasione . . . ut substantia divina purgetur:** This is a conclusion which Augustine logically derives from Manichaean doctrine. If the Manichaeans were so concerned lest souls be confined in flesh by coition and if, as they maintained, the soul is freed from the seeds of vegetation by being consumed by the Elect, is it not logical to conclude that this practice extended to the seeds of animal creation? Cf. Aug. *De mor. Manich.* 18.66. (PL 32.1373).

64. **Sed hoc se facere negant:** The defense which the Manichaeans made against this charge was that only dissidents from their sect were guilty of such matters. It is well to remember that Augustine himself, though a former member of the sect, does not make these allegations in his own name. In fact he declares that he

received good moral training from the Manichaeans. Cf. *De util. cred.* 3. (CSEL 25¹.5-6).

66. **Detecti sunt . . . aliqui adducti sunt . . . confessi sunt:** Augustine presents evidence from the public acts of civil and ecclesiastical courts. There is no reason for rejecting these testimonia. But we must, in all justice, remember that they are cases involving individual sections of the Manichaeans. Augustine is trying to demonstrate that the tenets of Manichaeism led to such practices and cites these instances to prove his point. For similar charges and the rejection of them cf. Alfarc 164 n. 2, 165 n. 1. On Quodvultdeus, as deacon in Carthage, cf. Possidius *Vita* 16.

87. **illi libri . . . sunt omnibus . . . communes Ac per hoc sequitur:** In the macrocosm the Divine Virtues work for the freeing of the imprisoned Light and convey it to the Paradise of Light. On this earth the Manichaean Elect serve a similar purpose. Hence consistency in their belief demands that the Elect imitate the vile operations of the Virtues. Augustine is emphasizing and underlining the ridiculous consequences of Manichaean dogma.

103. **Nec vescuntur . . . carnibus Nec ova . . . sumunt . . . nec alimonia lactis utuntur . . . vinum non bibunt:** These prohibitions formed part of the seal of the mouth (cf. *supra*, introduction to this section). The perfect Manichaean was to abstain from all meat and all meat products, for flesh was the creation of demons. True, there was some of the divine Light imprisoned in animals, but its elements were continually being given off by respiration, digestion, etc. Moreover, death caused the divine principle to disappear from the body and thus rendered meat an unclean mass. The vital element left eggs when broken and milk when drawn from the body. Wine was regarded with horror as the bitterness of the Prince of Darkness. Cf. Bardy, DTC 9.1879; Puech 90, esp. n. 385; Alfarc 126-143.

114. **Animas auditorum suorum in electos revolvi arbitrantur . . . ut . . . in nulla corpora revertantur:** The souls of the Elect were considered so pure that they gained release from the body immediately after death. The Auditors were to be purged from the Darkness upon their return to life in the bodies of the Elect or in the fruits and vegetables, which find their nourishment in the

sunlight and open air and which were destined to be purged by the digestive action of the Elect. Cf. Puech, notes 389, 390, 391; Alfarc 153-154.

116. **Ceteras autem animas et in pecora redire putant et in omnia quae . . . in terra:** Non-Manichaeans were doomed to re-incarnation in animals or plants. Cf. A. Jackson, "The Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Manichaeism," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45 (1925) 246-268.

118. **Herbas enim atque arbores sic putant vivere ut:** As part of the seal of the hand, it was forbidden to reap, prune trees, harvest fruits, etc., for plants were likewise considered to possess some of the Divine elements, which would suffer pain as the result of such treatment. Cf. Bardy DTC 9.1880; Puech 90 n. 385.

124. **suisque auditoribus . . . haec ignosci:** By contributing to the universal deliverance of Light, the Auditors had their sins forgiven, or even more, had them transferred into pious works through the agency of the Elect. Cf. Puech n. 391; Alfarc 152.

133. **omnem carnem . . . originem ducere:** Cf. *supra* 15.

135. **conceptum tamen generationemque devitent:** Since the Auditors were not capable of making the complete renouncement ordered by the observance of the three seals, they were advised to obey it insofar as they were able. Hence, in reference to the seal of the breast, they were directed to limit the effects of their concupiscence as much as possible. Cf. Alfarc 151.

137. **in omnem carnem . . . per escas et potus venire animas credunt:** Animal creation was the most vicious means of detaining the Light substance, for by the life processes of animals new Light particles were absorbed and further enchained. Cf. Alfarc 127 f.

142. **Adam et Evam . . . colligasset:** The appearance of the Legatus Tertius caused Matter to fear that the captive Light would completely escape. To obviate this, Matter determined to concentrate the major part of it in a personal creation. Two demons one male, Ashaqloun (the Sacras of St. Augustine) and one female, Namrael, were charged with the execution of this plan. When the Legatus Tertius had begun his work, the disturbances he created caused the female demons to abort. In accordance with the new

plan, Ashaqloun devoured all these abortions to get into himself as much of the Light as he could. He then coupled with his wife to beget the two first humans, Adam and Eve. Cf. Puech 80; Alfarcic 116 f.

147. **Christum autem:** Christ, in the Manichaean system, the Splendor, came down from the Kingdom of Light to awaken Adam from the Sleep of Death, to inform him of his divine origin and of the consubstantiality of his soul with the Light which suffered throughout the world because of its fusion with Darkness. The redemptive mission of Jesus to Adam is fulfilled for future men by the Nous, as an emanation of Jesus. Cf. *supra*, introduction to this section. The Nous is the founder of religion, the Father of the Apostles. It is through the teaching of the Apostles, the various delegates from on high, that Nous enters into the souls of men, or more exactly, reenters, for it had been removed from the Light elements by Primal man to return at the proper moment. Cf. Puech 81-83; Polotsky 256-259; Alfarcic 121 f.

150. **animas non ad corpora liberanda:** Salvation was only for the soul, the element of Light. Cf. Puech 84.

151. **nec fuisse in carne vera:** The historical Christ of Galilee was a reappearance of the Divine Aeon. In the teachings of Mani He could, therefore, not come in real flesh. Mani's concept of Jesus of Galilee was completely Docetistic. Cf. Polotsky 268.59-270.9.

153. **Deum qui legem per Moysen dedit:** This was a notion, common to most forms of Gnosticism, based upon the premise that matter was evil. Hence the Creator of the world of matter, the God of the Old Testament, had to be conceived as a demon. The objection to the Old Testament was also characteristic of the teachings of Basilides, Valentinus, Marcion. (See *supra* Chapters 4, 11, 22.) Cf. Burkitt 82; Bardy 1889 f.; Alfarcic 75 f.

156. **testamenti novi:** The New Testament fared better at the hands of Mani, but it also was submitted to severe criticism. For fuller discussion cf. Bardy DTC 9.1890.

160. **de Paraclito:** Cf. John 16.7. As the Nous Jesus, the incarnation of salvific intelligence, had manifested Himself in earlier

apostles; the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, deigned to come in Mani. Cf. Alfarc 212-213, 294-295; Burkitt 94; Polotsky 266.48-267.45; Puech 62-63, esp. notes 250-251.

164. **duodecim discipulos . . . ceteri electi vocantur:** Among others, Agapius, Photius, and Peter of Sicily tell us that Mani had twelve apostles like Christ. Following his example, the Manichaeian religion had twelve masters, subject to a supreme head. These were the chiefs of seventy-two bishops. This hierarchy, in which we have echoes of the Gospels, is evidently based on the Catholic hierarchy and constitutes one of the closest links of Manichaeism with Christianity. Cf. Bardy DTC 9.1885; Polotsky 262.34-57.

171. **Sed mittuntur etiam:** Every member of the Manichaeian Elect was a sort of itinerant preacher who, at the direction of Mani, was to wander continuously about the world preaching the doctrine and leading men to truth. As a result the spread of Manichaeism was prodigious. Cf. Puech 63 f.

174. **Baptismum in aqua nihil . . . salutis afferre:** The faithful Manichaeian would not even bathe, to avoid hurting the divine elements contained in water. However, the Manichaeians admitted a baptism of Christ, which they carefully distinguished from that of John the Baptist. But it is difficult to determine whether it was with water or not. It could have been simply an imposition of hands. Cf. Alfarc 136 f., 145; Polotsky, 264, 55-62, who denies a baptism of water.

176. **Orationes faciunt:** The sun and the moon, being sources of pure Light and engaged so intimately in the process of redemption, would naturally hold a great place in Manichaeian worship. For further details cf. Bardy DTC 9.1886 f.

180. **Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, sed substantiae tribuunt gentis adversae:** This deterministic doctrine is attributed to the Manichaeians not only by Augustine but also by Titus of Bostra (2.1), by the Greek formula of abjuration to be found among dubious works of Clement of Rome (PG. 1.1465) and by Photius *Contra Manich.* Sermo II 2.3 (PG 102. 86 f.); cf. Alfarc 118.

182. **Omnem carnem . . . malae mentis . . . esse opificum:** The

body proceeds from the Demon as we have seen above. Cf. note *supra*. For further references cf. Alfarc 117.

184. **Carnalem concupiscentiam**: Cf. Gal. 5.17. This expression of the Evil, the Matter, in man is one of the marks of the dualism in his nature. Cf. Puech 80-81.

189. **duas animas**: Man was destined to concentrate and perpetuate the mixture of Light and Darkness. In his person he represented the universe; he was a microcosm. His body and all evil inclinations came from the world of Darkness, while his soul and its good endowments came from the Kingdom of Light. More precisely, man possessed two souls, one good, and the other, evil. Cf. Alfarc 117 f.

194. **finito isto saeculo . . . in globo . . . Cui globo**: Salvation, for man as well as for the universe, was to consist in the final and complete separation of the Light and Dark elements. Some Manichaean schools held that all the Divine Light would be saved and restored; but others held a more pessimistic view, that certain souls, by reason of their sins, were so closely bound to Darkness that they could not be freed and would have to share the eternal imprisonment of Matter after judgment. Cf. Puech 84 f.

CHAPTER 47.

Epiph. *Panar.* 67 (GCS 37.132-140); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.868D-869A)—DTC. 6.2359-2361 (G. Bareille); LThK 5.9 (A. Schulz).

1. **Hieraca**: Hieracas or Hierax, a man well trained in Greek and Egyptian literature and science, and remarkably conversant with the Scriptures, was born at Leontopolis in Egypt in the second half of the third century. Though he was the author of many works, none of them has come down to us.

Hieracitae . . . negant: Hieracus was a man of great austerity and remarkable oratorical ability, characteristics which gained for him many followers among the Egyptian ascetics. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 67) is the principal source of our information on the teachings of Hieracas and from him we learn that the heresiarch interpreted the Scriptures, especially Genesis, in allegorical fashion and denied the reality of the terrestrial paradise. For Hieracas

there was no resurrection of the body; the body was nothing more than a prison from which the soul would be liberated at death; the resurrection of the body would have been a new imprisonment of the soul. Epiphanius mentions the possibility that he got his notions on the resurrection from Origen. But C. Bareille (DTC 6.2.2359-61) is inclined to believe that his errors on the resurrection as well as his other heretical theories can be traced to the Gnostic conception of the essential evil of matter. This would explain his allegorical interpretation of paradise and would correspond fully with his system of asceticism and his denial of the resurrection of the body.

2. Monachos . . . et monachas et coniugia non habentes . . . recipiunt: This rejection of marriage is evidently based on the Gnostic conception of matter. But to justify his position, Hieracas had recourse to St. Paul (Heb. 12.14): *that holiness without which no man will see God*. The doctrine of the fear of God, the condemnation of envy, covetousness, injustice, etc., had been sufficiently taught in the Old Testament. The one new thing that Christ had come to teach was the inculcation of absolute chastity. This was "holiness without which no one will see God." The Old Testament had allowed marriage, but it was a state of imperfection, suppressed for the future by the New Testament.

3. Ad regnum caelorum non pertinere parvulos: This is based on his interpretation of St. Paul. 2 Tim. 2.5. If he who strives cannot be crowned unless he strives lawfully, how can he be crowned who has never striven at all?

CHAPTER 48.

Epiph. *Panar.* 68 (GCS 37.140-152); *Anaceph.* (PG 869A)—
DTC 10.531-536 (E. Amann); LThK 7.67 f. (A. Stohr).

1. Meletio: Meletius was bishop of Lycopolis in Upper Egypt, and author of a schism which assumed some importance during the fourth century. Meletius had been consecrated bishop not long before the beginning of the Arian controversy. The see of Lycopolis was next in rank to that of Alexandria, of which Peter, afterwards martyr, was then bishop (300-311). When Peter had fled from his diocese in persecution, Meletius stepped in, assumed

the character of primate of Egypt, ordained priests and, in general, intruded himself into the affairs of other dioceses. Thereupon Peter took action against Meletius, forbidding his flock to communicate with the bishop of Lycopolis.

nolentes orare cum conversis: This information is to be found in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 68) and though the account of Epiphanius is regarded as too favorable to Meletius and contradictory to other accounts, this evidence of divergence of views on the treatment of "lapsi" seems true, for we know from others that at Easter in 306 Peter had published an encyclical letter in which he regulated in detail different questions relative to the "lapsi." Cf. DTC 10.1.532.

3. **Nunc autem dicuntur Arianis esse coniuncti:** The Meletian schism came under consideration at the Council of Nicaea (325), the second, fourth, and sixth canons of which have reference to this schism. Meletius did not resist its decrees and remained quiet temporarily. However, the appointment of Athanasius to the see of Alexandria (326) was the signal for the union of every faction opposed to him, and in the events which followed Meletius took part. Thereafter the Meletians adopted the errors of Arianism and were known as the Egyptian Arians.

CHAPTER 49.

Epiph. *Panar.* 69 (GCS 37.152-299); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.869B)—DTC 1.1779-1863 (X. Le Bachelet); LThK 1.635-641 (A. Stohr); DHGE 4.103-113 (F. Cavallera); G. Bardy, "Les origines de l'Arianisme et le concile de Nicée," *Fliche-Martin Histoire de l'église* 3 (1936) 69-95; "Le réaction Eusébienne et le schisme de Sardique," *ibid.* 97-130; "Les variations de l'Arianisme," *ibid.* 131-176.

ARIANISM.

The controversy with the Arians held little place in the work of St. Augustine. The treatise on the Trinity is not written directly against them. Even when one reads here and there allusions to their doctrines, the impression is not given that they were constituting a great danger for the Church in Africa. Augustine from time to time had received letters from some members of their sect. In 427 or 428 Augustine met

an adversary worthy of him in the person of the bishop Maximus, a Goth in origin, and without doubt the same one who wrote the *Dissertatio contra Ambrosium*; the two bishops discussed the faith. The Arians really became a problem for the Church of Africa only after the death of Augustine. Cf. Bardy *Les révisions* 589 f.

1. **Ario:** Arius was born in the second half of the third century in Libya and received his education in Antioch. In 306 Arius took the part of Meletius (cf. *supra* Chapter 48) against Peter, bishop of Alexandria. But abandoning the Meletians, Arius was reconciled with Peter, who ordained him deacon about 308. However, further disputes with Peter led to his excommunication. When Achillas succeeded to the see of Alexandria on the death of Peter, Arius, who had made Achillas his friend, was raised to the priesthood in 313 and given charge of the district called Baucalis. This position entitled him to expound the Scriptures officially and enabled him to exercise great influence. In 318 the controversy between Arius and Alexander, who had obtained the see of Alexandria after the death of Achillas, broke out concerning the fundamental truth of Our Lord's divine Sonship and substance. After vainly attempting to correct Arius of his errors, Alexander and a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops excommunicated him, and the heresiarch then fled to Palestine. Political and party strife added to the bitterness and spread of the new heresy. Arius had almost been elected patriarch of Alexandria and his party was still strong. Moreover, many bishops of Asia Minor and Syria trained in the school of Antioch took up the defense of their fellow schoolman. In June of 325 the Council of Nicaea met and condemned Arius. But by 331 he had gained imperial favor and his fortunes began to wax. Athanasius, the new patriarch of Alexandria, was ordered to receive Arius back into communion with the Church, and, when he refused, great disturbances developed in Asia Minor and Egypt. By 335 the Arians had grown so powerful that the Synod of Tyre was able to depose Athanasius on a series of false charges. Catholics were then exposed to persecution and Arius succeeded in having an interview with the emperor, submitting a creed which Constantine accepted as orthodox. By imperial decree Arius' reinstatement in the Church was demanded and the heresiarch was already openly triumphing over his enemies when he was overcome by sudden death in 336.

errore quo Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum nolunt esse unius eiusdemque naturae atque substantiae: Various elements were at work to produce the heresy of Arius, among which we must mention Alexandrian theological speculation, particularly the work of Origen, and the influence of the school of Antioch. The Alexandrian scholars had not been able to achieve perfect clarity in their speculations on the Divinity, for the necessity of maintaining the unity of God and the Trinity of Divine Persons posed many problems which they were unable to solve. Origen's teachings on the indivisibility of the Godhead and the three hypotases laid the foundation for future controversy and his Trinitarian subordinationism opened the way to error. Through Alexandrian scholarship and Origen the influence of Plato and Philo came to bear upon the new heresy, particularly the concept of the Logos Demiurgos and the Arche Anarchos. To this should be added the strong tendency towards rationalism found in the school of Antioch, which was under the influence of Aristotelian logic. This tendency towards rationalism was manifested in the teachings of Paul of Samosata (cf. *supra* Chapter 44), the true ancestor of those who deny the divinity of Christ. For Paul, Jesus, the man, was distinct from the Logos. By merit he was made the Son of God; he was not the Son by nature, for the Supreme Being is one in Person and in Essence. Lucian of Samosata (or of Antioch) had been the associate of Paul in his Christological speculations, and it was from Lucian that Arius received the basis for his own theories. Lucian had given the system a double trend: The Logos Demiurgos was essentially different from the inner divine Logos; The Logos Demiurgos united himself with the man, Christ, in such a way to take the place of his soul. Therefore, when Arianism appeared upon the scene, it was a philosophical-theological syncretism of all Trinitarian and Christological heresy.

The fundamental teachings of Arianism may be listed as follows:

1. The Father alone is the uncreated cause of all. The Son is begotten and therefore not equally eternal with the Father. There was a time when the Son did not exist.
2. Since the Son began to exist in time He is not of the essence of the Father, but was created by the will of the Father out of nothing. Therefore, he is only a creature, not God by nature.

3. The Son was brought into existence for the Creation of the world (the Demiurgos), since it was impossible for the Father to create without an intermediary. It was for this reason that Christ, the Logos, had to be created.

4. At the time of creation, the Logos received the glory of the Father and the power of creation. He appears as unchangeable as God, but only insofar as he has received the grace of being accepted by the Father as the Son.

Arius taught that in His essence the Son is mutable and completely different from the Father, but God foresaw the voluntary perseverance of Jesus in perfect justice, and, therefore, granted to Him who was by nature mutable, immutability and divine dignity.

Following the same line of thought, he conceived of the Holy Ghost as the inferior of the Son. The Trinity consisted of three persons not only distinct and separate, but different in their nature. In a word the three of them are completely different, whether it be in substance or in glory. The Son was created immediately by the Father and everything else was created by the Son. The conclusion must be that the Holy Ghost is the creature of the Son. (St. Athanasius *Ep. ad Serap.* 1.2 [PG 26.532 f.]). The Holy Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father, the first and the greatest of His works.

6. **In eo autem . . . minus noti sunt:** In this way the Arians sought to safeguard the unity of person in Christ, a unity which the simultaneous presence of two finite souls, the Logos and the human soul, would have compromised. This particular doctrine cannot be found in the fragments of the works of Arius that are still extant. But we learn from other sources (Athanasius *Contra Apollin.* 2.3 [PG 26.1136 f.]; Theodoret *Haeret. fabul.* 5.11 [PG 83. 448-453], that he also taught this. Cf. Tixeront II 27.

8. **Nec adversus eos . . . fuisse certatum:** Evidently Augustine was not familiar with Athanasius *Contra Apollin.* 1.15; 2.3. (PG 26.1120 f., 1136 f.); Theodoret, *Haeret. fabul.* 4.1 (PG 83.414). His source was, as he tells us, Epiphanius *Haer.* 69.19, 49 (GCS 37.168 f., 195 f.).

11. **Rebaptizari . . . catholicos:** Augustine is evidently speaking here of the later Arians, for at the time of the Council of Nicaea

they were not accused of tampering with Baptism. It is quite possible, however, that later Arians, basing themselves on their faulty notion of the Trinity, demanded a rebaptism with a form more in conformity with their conception of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER 50.

Epiph. *Panar.* 70 (GCS 37.232-249); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.869C)—
DTC 1.2265-2287 (G. Bareille); LThK 1.786 (W. Koch);
DHGE 5.299 f. (A. Régnier).

1. **Vadianos:** The Vadiani (also called Audiani) were members of a sect in Mesopotamia and Syria founded by a layman Audius, or Audaeus, *ca.* 325. The sect was strictly ascetic and in spite of persecution maintained itself into the fifth century.

2. **Anthropomorphitas:** Starting from a literal interpretation of Gen. 1.26, Audius reasoned from the nature of man to the nature of God, whose image he was. His theory was a literal anthropomorphism, which ascribed all the attributes of man to God.

5. **parcens eis ne dicantur haeretici:** This indulgence on the part of Epiphanius can be explained by his opposition to the exegetical methods of Origen. Cf. E. Peterson "Audi," *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 2.389.

Eos . . . separasse . . . culpandos episcopos divites et pascha cum Iudaeis celebrando: Audius was an outspoken critic of the luxury and vices of the clergy. This and his Quartodecimanism was given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 70) as the reason for the schism.

7. **eos in Aegypto ecclesiae catholicae communicare:** During the Origenistic controversies toward the end of the fourth century, Anthropomorphism was held independently by many Egyptian monks in the Scetic desert, who, with Pachomius at their head, were the most violent opponents of the spiritualistic theology of Origen. The ascetic life of the Vadiani and their Anthropomorphism evidently led many to identify the monks of Egypt with the followers of Audius.

CHAPTER 51.

Epiph. *Panar.* 73 (GCS 37.267-313); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.871A)—DTC 14.1790-1796 (É. Amann); cf. "Arianismus," LThK 1.635-641; G. Bardy, "Les Variations de l'Arianisme," *Fliche-Martin* 3.131-169.

1. **Semiarianos:** After the Council of Nicaea (325), as we have seen above, the enemies of Athanasius, the anti-Nicaean opposition, grew in power and eventually seemed to be victorious. But this same anti-Nicaean opposition was essentially lacking in harmony. They had united for the attack, but as soon as victory seemed to be theirs, they split into three groups. The first was that of the genuine Arians, led by Aëtius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius of Constantinople (cf. *infra* Chapter 54). At the other extreme, with Basil of Ancyra for its leader, were those who came to be called Semi-Arians. They expressed the relations between the Father and the Son by the term *ὁμοιούσιος* ("of similar substance"). For them it stated the distinction between the two persons more clearly than the *ὁμοούσιος* ("consubstantial") of the Council of Nicaea. Moreover, they felt better able in this way to understand the subordination of the Son. Some members of this group were really orthodox, but they placed no trust in the formulas of Athanasius. About 360, others denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost and thus the name Semi-Arians came into use to designate those who held correct, or almost correct, views on the person of the Son, but departed from the doctrine of the Church regarding the person of the Holy Ghost (cf. *infra* Chapter 52). Between these two parties there arose a third whose leader was Acacius of Caesarea. This was a mere political party determined to keep up the combination of the anti-Nicaean forces by avoiding as much as possible all precise formulas. It settled upon the term *ὁμοιος* ("like, similar"). Hence they were known as the Homoeans or Acacians. Cf. J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas* (translated from the fifth French Edition by H. L. B.) II (2nd ed. 1923) 48-51.

CHAPTER 52.

Epiph. *Panar.* 74 (GCS 37.313-332); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.871B)—
cf. bibliography at beginning of Chapter 49; DTC 9.1476-78.

1. **Macedonio:** Macedonius was a Semi-Arian bishop of Constantinople. Upon the death of Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, in 336, the orthodox followers of Alexander had Paul consecrated bishop, while the Arians rallied around Macedonius. But the emperor Constantius convened a synod of Arian bishops, banished Paul, and translated Eusebius of Nicomedia to the see (338). At his death the hostilities between the followers of Paul and Macedonius were renewed. Paul returned, but the Arian bishops consecrated Macedonius bishop. Constantius again had Paul expelled and, though he censured Macedonius, he permitted him to continue officiating. After Paul's death (342), he was sole bishop. He persecuted orthodox believers, was deposed (360) by the Synod of Constantinople, and retired into seclusion and died (364).

2. **de Spiritu Sancto litigent:** Arius and Eunomius looked upon the Holy Ghost as a creature of the Son. But this point of their doctrine had remained in the background. About 359-360 this doctrine came to the fore in several places. Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, wrote to Athanasius to tell him that some of the pastors and the faithful, though detesting the wicked teachings of Arius concerning the Son, did entertain erroneous views, regarding the Holy Ghost as a creature, one of the ministering spirits, differing from the angels in degree only. Cf. Tixeront II 58. At the same time, or perhaps shortly before, some bishops who belonged to the homoiousian or Semi-Arian party, also declared against the divinity of the Holy Ghost, representing Him as a minister similar to the angels. This teaching spread rapidly at Constantinople, in Thrace, Bithynia, and the Hellespont. Cf. Tixeront II 59.

5. **Hos potius quidam Seminarianos vocant:** At first this doctrine was not adopted by the Semi-Arians, but it became so popular among them that between the years 360-380 the name Semi-Arians was used as synonymous with Pneumatomachi.

9. **nullam . . . substantiam:** The specific teachings of the Pneumatomachi on the Holy Spirit are not easy to discover. They

consisted more in negation than any definite affirmation. The words of Eustathius of Sebasteia given in Socrates, *HE* 2.45 (PL 67.360A-B), state the sum of the matter: "For myself I would not dare to call the Holy Ghost either God or creature." (Cf. "Macedonius," DTC 9.1476-1478.) Macedonius' authorship of this heresy is disputed, for the heresy on the Holy Ghost began after he was deposed for his Semi-Arianism. The Council of Constantinople (381) did not call them the Macedonians but identified them with the Semi-Arians, for the error seemed to have begun in that party and adapted Arian principles to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost (can. 1). Didymus the Blind, writing shortly before 400, was the first to consider Macedonius the founder of this group (*De Trin.* 2.10).

CHAPTER 53.

Epiph. *Panar.* 75 (GCS 37.333-340); *Anaceph.* (PG 42. 872 B-C)—DTC 1.515 f. (H. Hemmer); LThK 1.113 (A. Bibel-mair); DHGE 1.663 (V. Ermoni).

1. **Aëriani:** The only original account of this sect is to be found in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 75). At the time of Augustine and Filastrius, it was devoted to rugged asceticism and criticized the higher clergy unmercifully.

Aërio . . . qui, cum esset presbyter, doluisse fertur quod episcopus non potuit ordinari: Aërius of Pontus had been the friend of Eustathius of Sebasteia, who had been taught by Arius in Alexandria and who had been consecrated bishop (356) under Arian influences. For a long time Aërius had been a member of the circle of ascetics gathered about Eustathius. When Eustathius became bishop of Sebasteia, he raised Aërius to the priesthood and put him in charge of the hospital in Sebasteia. But it seems that Aërius, who had also been a candidate for the bishopric, was led by jealousy and ambition to criticize his former friend for his various proceedings; envy deepened into dislike, and dislike into open hostility.

3. **Arianorum haeresim lapsus:** Epiphanius states that Aërius was a complete Arian and because of his cleverness of speech much more dangerous than Arius. It is probable, however, that he belonged to the homousian group of Eustathius.

dogmata addidisse nonnulla: He asserted (1) the equality of bishops and priests, maintaining that there was no difference in power or honor between the two orders; (2) the celebration of Easter was a Jewish celebration and should be done away with as a relic of Jewish superstition, now that "Christ Our Passover has been sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5.7); (3) prayers and alms for the dead were useless; (4) the law of fasting was a relic of the Old Law and opposed to the Gospel. Many of these views had already been held in the circle of Eustathius' ascetics, as can be seen from the acts of the Synod of Gangra (343) and Sozomen *HE.* 3.14 (PG 67. 1068-1082).

8. **Sicut Encratitas . . . Filaster vero:** We can not determine whom Augustine meant by "quidam" unless it be Filastrius. Edmund Venables in Smith and Wace s. v. Aërius, has this to say: Philaster [Filastrius], whose authority when unconfirmed by other testimony is very small, confounds the Aërians with the Encratites, and asserts that they practised abstinence from food and rejected marriage" (Fil. *Haer.* 72 [CSEL 38.38]). But Bigelmair (LThK) accepts the testimony of Filastrius saying, that, at the time of Filastrius and Augustine, the ascetical movement prevailed in the sect.

CHAPTER 54.

Epiph. *Panar.* 76 (GCS 37.351-414); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.873 A-B)—DTC 1.516 f. (X. Le Bachelet); LThK 1.113 f. (A. Stohr); DHGE 1.667 f. (V. Ermoni).

1. **Aëtio:** Aëtius, a native of Coelo-Syria, had a checkered career. Born in the humblest of circumstances, he succeeded in gaining an education, had an active part in the theological disputations of the times and died as an Arian bishop, but without a see, around 370 in Constantinople. He gained his training in theology at Arian Antioch and spent some time in Alexandria where he became acquainted with Aristotelian dialectics. About 350 as a deacon in Antioch he started the sect of the extreme Arians, known as the Aëtians.

2. **Eunomio:** Eunomius of Cappadocia, pupil and secretary of Aëtius, became bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia and died in 395.

He completed and formulated his master's heretical system with a preciseness and logical consistency which stamped the name of the Eunomians on the Anomoean heretics instead of the name of Aëtius, their real founder.

4. **hanc haeresim:** This heresy was Arianism brought to its logical conclusions, after the declarations of the Council of Nicaea. The Catholic faith on the nature of the Son had been formulated and crystallized in the term *ὁμοούσιος* "consubstantial." Aëtius maintained that the Son is in no way like the Father, using the term *ἀνόμοιος*, while the more moderate Arians, the Semi-Arians, sought to liken the Son to the Father in all things. They employed the term *ὁμοιοούσιος*. Hence the Aëtians were also known as the Anomoeans.

5. **Fertur . . . si particeps esset:** Aëtius was an Epicurean of sorts and preached a "faith without good works." According to his system, the most sinful acts were nothing more than the innocent expression of natural necessity. Cf. Le Bachelet, DTC 1.516 f.

CHAPTER 55.

Epiph. *Panar.* 77 (GCS 37.416-451); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.873C)—
DTC 1.1505-1507 (P. Godet); LThK 1.544-546 (A. Seider);
DHGE 3.962-982 (R. Aigrain).

1. **Apollinaris:** Apollinaris, the Younger, was born at Laodicea around 310. Here he taught and later became bishop. He was a man of extraordinary learning and impeccable morals, esteemed by pagans and Christians alike. He performed valuable service in fighting Arianism, but was not entirely free of the error himself. He did indeed oppose the Trinitarian Theology of Arius, but not its Christological errors.

2. **sicut Ariani . . . Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse:** Apollinaris defended the divinity of the Logos, but like Arius maintained that the Logos took the place of the human soul in Christ. When this theory was proved contrary to the Scriptures, he consented to teach that there existed in Christ an inferior or animal soul.

3. **In qua quaestione victi:** Adopting the psychological tri-

chotomy of Plato (σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα) he attributed to Christ a human body (σῶμα) and a human soul (the ψυχή ἄλογος, the *anima animans* which man has in common with animals) but not a rational spirit (νοῦς, πνεῦμα, ψυχή λογική, *anima rationalis*) and put in the place of the later the divine Logos. This lessening of Christ's human nature he considered necessary both for His sinlessness and oneness. Apollinaris feared that by admitting the νοῦς and therefore, of necessity, the free independent will, the oneness of Person and the sinlessness of the Redeemer would be impaired. Two perfectly independent beings cannot become one. If perfect divinity were united with perfect humanity in Christ, there would be two sons of God, a natural Son and an adopted one, and we would be redeemed not by God, but by man. There would have been no genuine redemption at all (false concept of personality). Furthermore, if to the νοῦς there were added an alterable free will in the Redeemer, there would be the possibility and actuality of sin, and thereby our redemption would also be excluded (false concept of freedom of choice).

7. *carnem illam et verbum unius eiusdemque substantiae*: Apollinaris established so close a connection of the Logos with human flesh, that all the divine attributes were transformed to the human nature and vice-versa, and the two merged in one nature in Christ.

9. *verbi aliquid in carnem conversum . . . non autem carnem de Mariae carne . . . susceptam*: Tixeront observes (II. 100 f.) "These errors brought on secondary errors, but they also gave to the opponents of Apollinaris the opportunity to represent him as the author of still other errors which he does not seem to have held. . . . It is untrue that the Bishop of Laodicea . . . deemed that body [of Jesus] of divine origin, that he looked upon the Virgin merely as a channel through which that body had passed Apollinaris expressly affirms that the Son of God is ἐκ γυναικὸς κατὰ σάρκα." It does not seem to Tixeront just to ascribe these errors in question to the followers of Apollinaris either. Cf. 105-108.

CHAPTER 56.

Epiph. *Panar.* 78 (GCS 37.452-475); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.873D)—
 DTC 1.1378-1382 (H. Quillet); LThK 1.484 (J. P. Junglas);
 DHGE 3.543 f. (A. Lehaut).

1. **Antidicomaritae:** General term for Adversaries of Mary: The Ebionites, for example, maintained that she lost her virginity before the birth of Jesus through natural processes of generation. That she had lost her virginity after the birth of Jesus through the scandalous assertion that she bore other children to Joseph, was the opinion of Helvidius, Bonosus of Sardica, Jovinian. This reference of Augustine seems to come from Epiphanius (*Haer.* 78) and to refer to a sect in Arabia at the end of the fourth century who were first to be called Antidicomaritae. They maintained the novel supposition advanced at that time by Bonosus and by Helvidius that "Our Lord's brethren" were children born by the Blessed Virgin to Joseph after Our Lord's birth.

CHAPTER 57.

Epiph. *Panar.* 80 (GCS 37.484-496); *Anaceph.* (PG 42.873D)—
 DTC 10.792-795 E. Amann); LThK 7.114 (W. Koch).

1. **Massalianorum:** Massalians, also called Messalians after a Syriac name meaning the "praying people." About 350 there appeared in Syria, Armenia, Asia Minor, and Thrace, this group of fanatics, whose manner of life was said to have originated in Mesopotamia. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 80) they had no settled system and no recognized leader and were not guilty of any error of doctrine. Their manner of life was the only thing he saw fit to criticize, though it seems that they denied the necessity of the sacraments, convinced that only the practice of asceticism was needed.

9. **nonnulli eos dicant de purgatione . . . intrare:** Possibly language intended by them metaphorically was misunderstood, for they described the soul of him who had not Christ in him as the abode of serpents and venomous beasts.

13. **Euphemitas:** Epiphanius (*Haer.* 80) connects the Euchites

with these Euphemites, heathen devotees, who it seems had also been known as Massalians. It is very credible that before the Christian Euchites there had been ascetics going about in this region, unconnected with Christianity, who under pretense of devotion lived an idle life.

Martyrianos: Epiphanius tells us that some of the magistrates put several of these people (Euphemites) to death for their errors; these Euphemites then buried the bodies of those who had been thus executed, held meetings for their divine service on the spot and called themselves and their buried dead Martyriani.

14. **Satanianos:** Epiphanius charges a section of the Euphemites with calling themselves Sataniani, and with worshipping Satan under the idea that with such service they might disarm his hostility. It does not appear that Epiphanius means to assert that the Christian Euchites were historically derived from the heathen Euphemites, but merely that there was a general resemblance of practice between the two.

15. **Euchitae opinari monachis non licere . . . operari:** In this they differed from the Christian monks of the time who supported themselves by the labor of their hands. Cf. Augustine. *De opere monachorum* (CSEL 41); Smith and Wace svv. Euchites and Euphemitae; Eric Peterson, "Massalians" *Enciclopedia Cattolica*.

THE END OF PART I.

1. **usque ad istos:** As Augustine himself explains in this passage immediately following Chapter 57, he has taken the first fifty-seven heresies from Epiphanius. It has been indicated in the Introduction, Outline of the *De haeresibus*, that the eighty-eight heresies may be divided into three parts, according to the sources employed. Section 57 closes Part I in which Augustine used Epiphanius' work on heresies.

2. **episcopus Cyprius:** Cf. *supra*, p. 59.

3. **Cuius . . . ratio postulabat:** Cf. Introduction p. 8.

12. **libris quinque . . . omnes sex libros totius . . . operis:** This statement of Augustine presents a difficulty. The *Panarion*

is composed of three books, divided into seven "tomes," three "tomes" in the first book and two "tomes" in each of the remaining two books. The same information concerning those books and seven "tomes" is given in the preface to the *Anacephaleosis*. Augustine may have had a copy of the *Anacephaleosis* which was improperly marked. The twenty heresies which he speaks of as in the first book were in reality in the first "tome" of the first book. The heresies after Christ begin in the second "tome" of book one and continue into the third "tome." In the text Augustine used, evidently "tomes" two and three were reckoned as one. This would give us the count Augustine makes, one book containing the heresies which existed before Christ, five containing those which arose in the Christian era, six books in all.

17. **duas in unum referens:** Cf. Chapter 25 in which Augustine combines Epiphanius's heresies 46-47.

19. **ex duabus unam facere voluit:** Augustine's chapters 27-28 are Epiphanius's 49.

21. **Philaster:** Filastrius, bishop of Brescia, wrote his *Diversarum Hereseon Liber* between 383-391. Cf. Introduction pp. 25 f.

CHAPTER 58.

Fil. *Div. her.* 51 (CSEL 38.27)—Smith and Wace 3.908 f.
(G. Salmon).

1. **Metangismonitae:** During the Arian controversy the text, "the Father is in me and I in the Father" (John 10.38), came under discussion and the question was asked, "How can the greater be contained in the less?" In answer to this Athanasius replied (*Or. 3 cont. Ar.* 1 f. [PG 26.321-325]) that such a question betrayed a material conception of the Deity, as if they who had asked it thought of the Persons of the Godhead as empty vessels, the one filled by the other. There is no evidence that any of the Arians actually used this illustration, or that those who used it constituted a distinct sect. Filastrius, who made every effort to lengthen his list, counts as his fifty-first heresy those who taught this doctrine.

CHAPTER 59.

Fil. *Div. her.* 55 (CSEL 38.28 f.)—Cf. "Hermias," DTC 6. 2306 (G. Bareille); LThK 9.445 f. (J. P. Steffes).

1. **Seleuciani vel Hermiani:** According to the report of Filastrius (*Haer.* 55), which is quite vague, they formed a Gnostic sect in Galatia in the second and third centuries. Seleucus was the master and Hermias and Proclinus (cf. *infra* Chapter 60) were his disciples. The doctrine of the group is closely related to that of Hermogenes of Carthage (cf. Chapter 41). The chief error ascribed to Hermogenes (a heretic towards the close of the second century) was the doctrine that God had formed the world, not out of nothing, but out of previously existing uncreated matter. (The chief source of information is Tertullian's *Adversus Hermogenem*.) J. Steffes believes it is difficult to identify Hermias and Hermogenes. George Salmon in Smith and Wace s. v. "Hermogenes" believes that Filastrius' Hermias is Hermogenes. (This is also the opinion of Bardenhewer I. 326 f.) Salmon's reasons are logical enough. In Heresy 54, Filastrius passes off the Hermogenians as a school of Sabellians, but in the next section he speaks of the Galatian heretics Seleucus and Hermias, attributing to them the doctrines which belong to Hermogenes: that matter was coeternal with God; that man's soul was from matter; and that Our Lord deposited His body in the sun. It is most improbable that such a combination of doctrines was taught independently by two heretics and it is not very likely that Hermogenes had disciples in Galatia. But Salmon remarks that Filastrius attributes to his heretics other doctrines which we have no reason to think were held by Hermogenes: that evil proceeds sometimes from matter, sometimes from God; that there was no visible Paradise; that baptism of water was not to be used, because souls had been formed from wind and from fire, and the Baptist had said that Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire; that angels, not Christ, had created men's souls, that this world was only the *infernum*, and that the only resurrection is that resurrection of the human race which daily takes place in the procreation of children. Filastrius may have read tracts of Tertullian which made mention of Hermogenes. But we are safe in rejecting his account as untrustworthy, even though it be not now possible to trace the origin of his confusion.

CHAPTER 60.

Fil. Div. her. 56 (CSEL 38.29 f.)—Cf. "Seleucianer," Wetzzer and Welte 11.84 f. (Gaisser); Smith and Wace 4.483 (G. Salmon).

1. **Proclianitae:** Heretics mentioned by Filastrius (*Haer.* 56), but concerning whom, if they existed at all, we have no independent information.

CHAPTER 61.

Fil. Div. her. 62 (CSEL 38.32 f.)—Smith and Wace 4.200 (G. Salmon).

1. **Patriciani:** Patricius had taught at Rome. This and the information presented by Augustine, as well as all other notices to be found in heresiological works, seem to have had Filastrius as their only source. The Patricians were apparently a Gnostic sect.

CHAPTER 62.

Fil. Div. her. 75 (CSEL 38.38 f.)—Smith and Wace 1.175 f. (F. Hort).

1. **Ascitae:** (Ascodrugitae) Under the name Ascodrugitae, which Augustine abbreviates to Ascitae, Filastrius (*Haer.* 75) describes a sect in Galatia, who danced round an inflated wine-skin "like pagans dancing to Father Liber." Filastrius is responsible for the ascription of this practice (a false application) to Matt. 9.17 or Luke 5.37. F. Hort (Smith and Wace 1.175 s.v. Ascodrugitae) makes an interesting observation: The apparent absurdity of the account given by Filastrius looks at first sight like the fictitious embodiment of a conjectural derivation (*ἄσκος*, a wine-skin). Yet the rite he describes may with better reason be thought a curious relic of the earlier worship of central Asia Minor, that of Marsyas, defeated and slain by Apollo. This Phrygian worship extended over the region which was later known as Galatia.

CHAPTER 63.

Fil. *Div. her.* 75 (CSEL 38.39 f.)—Smith and Wace 4.197 (G. Salmon); Cf. "Taskodrugiten," Wetzzer and Welte 11. 1228 f. (Fessler).

1. **Passalorynchitae:** Epiphanius in his article on the Montanists (*Haer.* 48.14) treats of the Tascodrugitae, whom he counts as a kindred sect, and explains the name as meaning the same as Passalorhynchitae. This latter name he derives from *πάσσαλος*—peg, *ῥύγχος*—nose. We hear of them, independently it seems, from Filastrius (*Haer.* 76), who ascribes their practice to a desire to imitate David (Ps. 141.3) and the prophets, but having in reality for their model the vain silence of the Pythagoreans. Some number them among the Gnostics, particularly the school of Marcus (cf. Theodoret, *Haer. fab.* 1.8 f. [PG 83.357-360]). Some claimed that they denied the Incarnation, Sacraments, even Baptism, and claimed redemption by Gnosis.

5. **Cur autem:** St. Augustine has reason to observe that the term to describe men who put their finger to their nose, *Dactylorhynchitae*, would have been a more suitable name.

CHAPTER 64.

Fil. *Div. her.* 77 (CSEL 38.40)—DTC 1.1724 f. (G. Bareille); LThK 1.580 (W. Koch); DHGE 3.1102 (A. Lehaut).

1. **Aquarii:** This was the name given to Christians of their time who used water instead of wine in the Holy Eucharist by Filastrius (*Haer.* 77) and Chrysostom (*Hom. in Matth.* 82.2 [PG 58. 739 f.]). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.19 [GCS 15.58-62]) knew of this custom, but not the name, a custom which was observed by the Ebionites, Tatianites, Marcionites and Manichaeans. They were known also by the name *Hydroparastatae*. This practice of substituting water for wine in the Eucharist was also found without any heretical intent. Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* 63 (CSEL 3².702). At his time some were accustomed to celebrate the Eucharist in the morning without wine, and again in the evening with wine. It would seem that this custom arose in the time of persecution, for Chris-

tians then were daily communicants and could be detected by the smell of wine, for pagans would not have used it early in the morning. Cf. A. Lehaut, DHGE 3.1102.

CHAPTER 65.

Fil. *Div. her.* 79 (CSEL 38.40 f.)—LThK 6.80 (W. Koch);
Smith and Wace 1.596 (G. Salmon).

1. **Coluthiani:** This was a sect which formed in Alexandria during the Arian disturbances. Coluthus was one of the first to agree with Bishop Alexander in condemning Arius (320-321). But when Athanasius had become bishop (328) Coluthus separated himself from Athanasius' jurisdiction and formed his own party, going so far as to ordain to the priesthood, though he was not even a priest himself. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 69.2 [GCS 37.153 f.]) mentions only that he taught false and perverted doctrines. Filastrius (*Haer.* 79) gives us the information we have in Augustine. It seems that these heretics favored dualism, ascribing to an evil principle the many evils and trials to which men are subject.

2. **Deus creans mala:** Cf. Is. 45.7.

CHAPTER 66.

Fil. *Div. her.* 79 (CSEL 38.40 f.)—DTC 6.52 f. (G. Bareille);
LThK 4.45 (A. Manser).

1. **Florino:** Florinus was a priest at Rome in the latter half of the second century who became an adherent of Valentinian Gnosticism. He is known to us by two notices in Eusebius (*H. E.* 5.15, 20 [PG 20.464, 484 f.]), who drew his information from works written by Irenaeus in opposition to Florinus. One was a letter written to Florinus entitled *On Monarchy, or that God is not the author of evil*, and Eusebius remarks that Florinus seems to have maintained the opposite opinion concerning God. Irenaeus warned Pope Victor against the writings of Florinus who, probably under Pope Victor, was deposed from the exercise of his priesthood. Though Augustine speaks of a sect called the Florinians, it is quite improbable that Florinus ever had a sect gathered about him, for he is not named by Epiphanius, Filastrius or by Pseudo-Tertullian,

who has so many notices of Roman heretics, nor was he named in the works of Hippolytus or Tertullian. Augustine may have combined the notice in Eusebius with Filastrius' mention in Chapter 79 of an unnamed heretic who in opposition to Coluthus maintained that God is the author of evil.

2. **fecit Deus . . . bona:** Cf. Gen. 1.31.

CHAPTER 67.

Fil. *Div. her.* 80 (CSEL 38.42 f.)—Cf. "Eternels," DTC 5. 911 f. (G. Bareille); Smith and Wace 4.586 f. (G. Salmon).

1. **Haeresim quandam:** Filastrius (Haer. 80) is the original source for this heresy. No information other than that which he gives is available. The *Dictionnaire des hérésies* (Migne, Paris, 1847, t. 1, col. 677) uses the term "Eternels" to designate certain Christians of the early ages of the Church who believed that after the (general) Resurrection the world would remain for ever as it now is. Cf. DTC 5.911 f. The author of *Praedestinatus* (though Dom Morin ascribes this work to Arnobius the Younger [*Études, Textes, Découvertes* 1913, p. 315-324], *Clavis* [n. 243] lists it as dubious) who based his work on Augustine's *De haeresibus*, found in heresy 57 of Augustine the name Sataniani without any explanation of the tenets of the sect, and in *De haer.* 67 the tenets of a sect without a name, so he combines, in his heresy 67 (PL 53.610), the information, calls the latter sect Satanniani, and, since their tenets throw no light on the name, he invents an imaginary Satanianus as the founder of the sect.

CHAPTER 68.

Fil. *Div. her.* 81 (CSEL 38.43)—LThK 1.967 (K. Algermissen); Smith and Wace 2.431 (G. Salmon).

1. **nudis pedibus:** These were superstitious people classed by Filastrius as heretics (Haer. 81) and called by him Excalceati. They were said to have derived their custom from a misinterpretation of Exodus 3.5; Josue 5.16; Is. 20.2, maintaining that the wearing of shoes was sinful. We have no other information about them.

CHAPTER 69.

Fil. Div. her. 83, 85 (CSEL 38.45, 46); Optatus, *Libri VII* or *De schismate Donatistarum adversus Parmenianum* (CSEL 26); Augustine: *Psalmus contra partem Donati* (CSEL 51. 3-15); *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* (CSEL 51.19-141); *De baptismo* (CSEL 51.145-375); *Contra litteras Petilianus* (CSEL 52.4-227); *Epistula ad catholicos de secta Donatistarum* (CSEL 52.232-322); *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam* (CSEL 52.326-582); *De unico baptismo contra Petilianum* (CSEL 53.3-34); *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* (CSEL 53.39-92); *Contra partem Donati post gesta* (CSEL 53.98-162); *Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem* (CSEL 53.168-178); *Gesta cum Emerito Donatistarum episcopo* (CSEL 53.181-196); *Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum episcopum* (CSEL 53.262-274)—DTC 4.1701-1728 (G. Bareille); LThK 3.408 f. (J. Ranft); W. Frend, *The Donatist Church* Oxford 1952; P. Monceaux, "Saint Augustin et le Donatisme," *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe*. vol. 7, Paris 1923; J. R. Palanque "L'affaire Donatiste," Fliche-Martin *Histoire de l'église* 3 (1936) 41-52; "Les métropoles ecclésiastiques à la fin du IV^e siècle," *ibid.* 437-487; Tixeront 2.220-229; H. Pope, O. P., *Saint Augustine of Hippo* Westminster Md. 1949, 254-361. For the various letters of Augustine dealing with Donatism, cf. DTC 4.1727 f.

Shortly after he was ordained priest in 391, St. Augustine began his struggles, by word and pen, with the Donatists. He wrote the *Psalmus contra partem Donati* to make known the arguments of Optatus and to show that the sect—which had charged that the orthodox party numbered many *traditores* in its ranks—had itself been founded by *traditores*. (*Traditores* was a technical expression used to designate those who, during the time of persecution, had given over the Sacred Books, the sacred vessels, and even their own brethren.) After 395 the Bishop of Hippo met with some of the Donatist leaders. In 400 he wrote *Contra epistulam Parmeniani*, refuting from Scripture the calumnies and arguments of Parmenian. In the *De baptismo* he shows that the effect of the sacrament is independent of the holiness of the minister. *Contra litteras Petilianus* answers two letters against the Church and one attacking Augustine, both written by Petilianus, the principal Donatist controversialist of the day. In many of his letters, Augustine strove to combat the Donatist error by setting forth truth. He pursued his campaign with *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam*. To inform the public about the Conference of Carthage (411), he composed *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*. His *Liber ad Donatistas post collationem* exhorted the laity to union.

Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem and *Gesta cum Emerito Donatistarum episcopo*, both in 418, concern Augustine's meeting with Emeritus. The *Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum episcopum* ca. 420 refutes the objections of Gaudentius who had been one of the seven Donatist leaders taking part in the Conference of 411. In the fourth century, Donatism had no more indefatigable adversary than the Bishop of Hippo. He founded its adherents on the terrain of history by the collection and production of authentic documents; he refuted their principles by Holy Scripture; finally, in a celebrated conference, he conquered their error publicly. When he comes, then, to this chapter in the *De haeresibus* where he is discussing the Donatist heresy, it is mainly from his own rich experience that he draws his information.

1. **Donatistae:** The Donatist schism may be said to have had at its roots the Novatian concept of the Church of the Pure, St. Cyprian's concept of the validity of Baptism depending on the worthiness of the minister, and the disturbances that arose as a result of Diocletian's persecution. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage during this persecution (303), advised a moderate attitude towards the imperial edicts which demanded the surrender of Christian writings. He himself had hidden the Sacred Scriptures and passed off heretical works in their place. Mensurius, moreover, felt it his duty to check the inordinate enthusiasm for martyrdom. There were too many would-be martyrs whose character would not bear investigation; the jails were full of unworthy persons fed and honored by injudicious devotees. Mensurius and his archdeacon Caecilian did their best to discountenance the reverence with which the good but mistaken Christians regarded these underserving men. Naturally, much opposition grew up against this attitude of Mensurius, but no positive break came until his death and the election of Caecilian to succeed him (311). Those who were opposed to the election of Caecilian obtained the help of the Numidian bishops, and at the Council of Carthage (312) deposed him and consecrated in his stead the lector Majorinus; the irrevocable step, transforming opposition into schism, had been taken. One of the charges lodged against Caecilian was that he had allowed himself to be ordained by Felix of Aptunga, who had surrendered the Holy Scriptures to the pagans. Under this charge, later proved untrue, lay concealed an entire theory of the validity of the sacraments.

5. **post causam . . . falsitati rei deprehensi:** In 312 the Edict of Toleration was published. In Africa it was to apply to the church

in communion with Caecilian, and in defence of their property the Donatists appealed to the Emperor. Their case was heard at Rome in 313 and Caecilian was acquitted of *traditio* (i. e., of delivering the Sacred Books to be burnt). Caecilian was again found innocent at Milan in 316. Anulinus, the proconsul, held an inquiry in Africa concerning the charges against Felix (15 Feb. 314), and Felix was found innocent when it was discovered that the charges against him rested on false evidence of letters forged by a Roman official. Cf. Aug. *Ep.* 88 (CSEL 34².407-418).

7. **in haeresim schisma verterunt:** Cf. Introduction pp. 45-50.

ecclesia Christi . . . exstincta. Audent etiam rebaptizare catholicos: The whole Donatist error is contained in these two principles: (1) public and notorious sinners, and especially prevaricating bishops and priests, do not belong to the Church; (2) outside the true Church the sacraments cannot be administered validly. For the first principle cf. *Gesta collationis carthaginensis*, PL 11.1408D, 1410D, 1413A; Aug. *Contra litt. Petil.* 2.9.21 (CSEL 52.33); *Contra epist. Parm.* 2.13.30 (CSEL 51.81). For the second principle the Donatists claimed the authority of St. Cyprian, who, in truth, had had a mistaken concept on the valid administration of baptism. Augustine had to answer them on this point in his *De baptismo* 2-5. (CSEL 51.174-297).

15. **Huius haeresis principem . . . Donatum . . . Donatus alius in eadem divisione successit:** For a long time it had been usual to distinguish these two, Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casae Nigrae. But in recent years doubt has been cast upon this distinction. We never hear of any Donatus residing at Casae Nigrae, but at Carthage. The Donatus who was called the Donatus of Casae Nigrae (which may have been his town of origin and not the seat of his bishopric) disappears from history after the Lateran Synod and the party in Africa is led thereafter by Donatus the Great at Carthage. The distinction between Donatus of Carthage and Donatus of Casae Nigrae is not found in the sources before the Council of Carthage in 411. St. Augustine accepted the distinction with some hesitancy (*Retract.* 1.213 [CSEL 36.99-100]). But since his time the distinction became traditional. However, the fact that one Donatus disappeared as the other came upon the scene has

led many moderns to doubt and to reject the distinction. Cf. J. Chapman, "Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casae Nigrae," *Revue bénédictine*, 26 (1909) 13-23; P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne* 5 (Paris 1920) 100-105. Frend states (p. 21) that when Majorinus died "Donatus of Casae Nigrae was immediately chosen in his place. He was destined to preside over the fortunes of his Church for over 40 years, and it was from him that the Donatists took their name."

21. **Exstant scripta eius:** This report of his unorthodoxy is verified by Jerome *Vir. ill.* 93 (PL 23.696). In *Ep.* 185.1.1 (CSEL 57.1 f.), Augustine stated that the Donatists had not held the Trinitarian heresy. But Donatus himself evidently had written in favor of this heresy to establish an alliance with the Arians in North Africa. Cf. A. Pincherle *Encic. Catt.* s. v. "Donato," and Monceaux, *op. cit.* 131-134.

28. **Montenses:** Donatus established a bishop, Victor of Garba, at Rome for the handful of Donatists there (*ca.* 320). At Rome they were given the name Montenses from the place where they met, a cave outside the city. The Donatists maintained a bishop there until the conference of 411. But this was the only place, outside of Africa, where they did so. Cf. Monceaux, *op. cit.* 151-152.

32. **Circumcelliones:** G. Willis, *Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* 9, states that these lawless rebels, who lived on their depredations in the country districts of Africa, got their name from wandering around the farmhouses (*circum cellas*). Cf. Aug. *Contra Gaudentium* 1.28.32. However, Frend (p. 173) states that the *cellae*, until recently thought to be farmhouses, on the basis of recent discoveries in Algeria could be considered shrines, and the Circumcellions as visiting these shrines and being fed there. They were mostly men of peasant origin, African in nationality, who usually spoke only Punic. They readily allied themselves to the Donatist cause, claimed the title of saints, and were frequently called Agonistici (Champions) by the Donatists. Their leaders were frequently Donatist bishops. Any of their men who died in battle were considered martyrs and to them were given all the honors of martyrdom. Their passion for pseudo-martyrdom by suicide is attested to by Optatus, 3.4 (CSEL 26.81-85); Filastrius (*Haer.* 85 [CSEL

38.46]); Theodoret (Haer. fab. 4.6 [PL 83.424]). Cf. Frend 174 f. For discussion of various opinions and studies, cf. "Circoncillions d'Afrique," DHGE 12.837-839 (J. Ferron).

39. **nec . . . se contaminari putant:** The Donatists did at times try to disassociate themselves from any responsibility for the Circumcellions, but in vain. The Circumcellions were known to have been under the direction of Donatist bishops, and the Donatists honored these fanatics after death. Cf. G. Bareille, DTC s. v. "Circoncillions."

42. **Multa et inter ipsos facta sunt schismata:** Towards the end of the fourth century, Donatism began to split up into factions. One of the first to cause internal trouble was Tychonius, who published two works between 370-375, the *De bello intestino* and the *Expositiones diversarum causarum*, in which he presented a vivid criticism of Donatism and many Donatist theses. He refused to rejoin the Catholics and founded no schism of his own. Rogatus, bishop of Cartennae in Mauritania, broke with his colleagues around 370 for their sufferance of violence. By 380 various petty Donatist schisms of small import had arisen: in Numidia, the Urbaneses; in Tripolitania, the Arzuges; at Carthage, the Claudanists, followers of Claudianus, chief of the Donatist community in Rome, who, banished from Italy, intrigued against the authority of Parmenian in Carthage, a skilled leader of the sect in that city. But the Maximianist schism gave the greatest blow to Donatism. In 392 Parmenian died and was succeeded by Primian. Arbitrarily excommunicating four deacons, he aroused general opposition. Neighboring Donatist bishops were asked to try the case and pronounce on Primian's conduct. But Primian refused to accept any interference. In 393 these bishops met again at Cabarussis to the number of over 100, excommunicated him, and had Maximian consecrated at Carthage. There were now two Donatist parties in Carthage, the Primianists and the Maximianists. Primian and his party were the stronger, but the Maximianists refused to submit, a situation which resulted in the internal struggle and persecution. Cf. Palanque 458-460.

48. **compulit eos nosse . . . nec . . . communionem suam contaminare timuerunt:** This action was certainly inconsistent with

the oft-repeated principle of the Donatists that schism and other sins invalidated the sacraments conferred by a minister guilty of them. The Catholics did not hesitate to make great capital out of this. Aug. *Contra Crescon.* 4.1.1; 47.57 (CSEL 52.497 f.; 554 f.) *Epp.* 141.6; 43.9.26; 53.3.6; 108.4.13 (CSEL 44.239 f.; 34².108, 156 f., 624-626).

CHAPTER 70.

Fil. *Div. her.* 84 (CSEL 38.45 f.); Augustine: *Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas* (PL 42.669-678); *Ad Consentium contra mendacium* (CSEL 41.469-528)—D'Alès, "Priscillien," *Rescherches de sciences religieuses* 23 (1933) 5-44, 129-175—DTC 13.391-400 (G. Bardy); LThK 8.479 f. (J. P. Junglas); Tixeront II. 229-241.

PRISCILLIANISM.

Priscillian began to propagate his ideas around 370-375 in the environs of Mérida and Córdoba in Spain. He gathered a number of adherents, mainly women, and some bishops. In 380 the errors attributed to him were condemned at the Council of Saragossa. Though the name of Priscillian did not figure in the canons of Saragossa, measures had been taken against the sect. However, Priscillian, made bishop of Avila, found himself the equal of his adversaries. A decree of banishment against the Manichaeans offered opportunity for its being applied likewise to the Priscillianists. In 381, Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvianus, were exiled. On their way to Italy they spread their errors in Aquitania. Though Pope Damasus refused to receive them, and St. Ambrose rebuffed them, they succeeded by intrigue in having Gratian's edict revoked. From the usurper Maximus, Ithacius obtained instructions for the heretics to appear at the Council of Bordeaux (385). Priscillian appealed to Maximus. The Priscillianists were brought to Treves. Maximus listened to those who counseled severity. Priscillian under torture had acknowledged himself guilty of immorality and of the study of abominable subjects. On the charge of witchcraft he was condemned to death. Two clerics, one deacon, several laymen and a woman were executed with him. Instantius and other Priscillianists were transported or punished with exile. The punishment inflicted on the leaders seemed to give new life to the sect's fanaticism.

In 415, Augustine wrote *Ep.* 237 and *Contra mendacium* against the errors of the Priscillianists. The struggle between orthodox and heretics continued until the end of the heresy in 563, when seventeen anathemas

were pronounced against the various Priscillianist tenets by the Council of Braga.

1. **Priscillianus:** In 385 Priscillian was executed at Treves by the usurper Maximus on charges of magic and immorality. He owes his prominence almost exclusively to the fact that he was (erroneously) considered to be the first heretic put to death for his religious convictions.

2. **dogmata permixta secantur:** Before 1889, when G. Schepss found and published a part of the writings of Priscillian (*Priscilliani quae supersunt* CSEL 18), Priscillian was regarded as among the worst of heretics. The Council of Braga (Mansi, *Coll. conc.* 9.774 f; Hefele-Leclercq 3¹.176-182) pronounced seventeen anathemas against the various Priscillianist tenets in 563. This council gives us the clearest and fullest exposition of what was considered the system, and its statements are corroborated by sources which go back to the beginning of the fifth century. On the basis of these ancient authorities, Priscillianism was understood to be a mixture of Gnosticism and Manichaeism, a composite of dualism, astrology, Pythagorism, Docetism, and immoderate Encratism, combined with Sabellianism, some Origenist tenets and excessive reliance on Old Testament and New Testament Apocrypha.

But with the discovery of Priscillian's writings, opinion has changed considerably. Some critics are even inclined to acquit him entirely. However, some traces of these heretical tenets can be found in his newly discovered works. *Tractatus* III (CSEL 18.44-56) seems to confirm the charge of his reliance on Apocrypha. There is an air of Sabellianism about a few formulas he used: "Tu enim es deus qui . . . unus deus crederis, invisibilis in patre, visibilis in filio et unitus in opus duorum sanctus spiritus inveneris" (*Tractat.* XI [CSEL 18.103.15-20]); "invisibilis cernitur, innascibilis nascitur, incomprehensibilis adtinetur" (*Tractat.* VI [CSEL 18.74.12-14]); "unus deus trina potestate venerabilis, omnia et in omnibus Christus est sicut scriptum est: Abrahae dictae sunt repromissiones et semini eius: non dicit in seminibus tanquam in multis sed quasi in uno et semini tuo quod est Christus" (*Tractat.* II [CSEL 18.37.23-27]); cf. *Tractat.* VI, p. 75). Traces of Apollinarianism can also be found in the *Tractatus* VI (p. 74). There is a decidedly Gnostic character in the fragment of a letter quoted by

Orosius *Commonitorium* (CSEL 18.153). The teaching of the 33rd Can. of Priscillian (CSEL 18.124) upon abstaining from meat and wine; a disapproval of marriage and of the begetting of children in *Tractatus* IV (CSEL 18.59 f)—all these are indications of the heresies ascribed to Priscillian by other authors.

However, these same teachings are contradicted by Priscillian himself in other parts of his writings. Priscillian maintains that God is the creator of the world, of man and the human body (*Tractat.* V [CSEL 18.63, 65]; XI [CSEL 18.104f]). Though admitting that some of his followers are charged with Manicheism, he rejects that error (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.22]; II [CSEL 18.39 f]). He rejects astrology (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.14]; V [CSEL 18.63, 65]; VI [CSEL 18.78]), and Docetism (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.7, 21]; IV [CSEL 18.60]; X [CSEL 18.102]). He condemns the Nicolaitans, Ophites, Arians, Novatians, Basilidians, Homuncionites, Borborites, and Patripassians (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.23]; II [CSEL 18.38]). The difference of sexes comes from God, and all must fight against concupiscence (*Tract.* I [CSEL 18.28]; X [CSEL 18.101 f]). He professes his belief in the resurrection of the body (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.29]; II [CSEL 18.37]) and admits only four Gospels (*Tractat.* I [CSEL 18.31]).

The contradictions between Priscillian's own writings and the statements made in reference to his teachings by ancient authors and councils raise problems which may never be solved. St. Jerome *Vir. ill.* 121 (PL 23.714A) declared that there were differences of opinion as to what Priscillian taught. This may be ascribed to the fact that his teachings lent themselves to contradictory interpretation, or that his writings were not fully in accord with his teachings. In view of all this, it is more reasonable not to give too much credence to Priscillian, of whose works we have only a part, and to whom the principle that lying and dissimulation were justifiable was attributed, and to accept rather the statements of Orosius, and Pastor of Gallecia, who were honest and near to the events (Cf. Tixeront 2.240 f.). There is, therefore, good reason to prefer the statements of the latter over Priscillian's own testimony. But we cannot pass final judgment on his teachings except in regard to those points which are clearly confirmed in his writings.

5. *Propter occultandas . . . prodere noli*: St. Jerome *Ep.* 133.3

(CSEL 56.244-247) and Sulpicius Severus *Chron.* 2.50 (CSEL 1.103) as well as the Council of Braga, Can. 15 (Hefele-Leclercq 3.¹178) speak of the immorality of Priscillian's doctrines. Their advocacy of perjury to protect the secrets of the sect is treated by Augustine in *Ep.* 237.3 (CSEL 57.527 f.); *Contra mendac.* 2.2 (CSEL 41.471 f.).

7. animas dicunt eiusdem naturae atque substantiae cuius est deus: The Council of Braga (Can. 5), Orosius (*Commonitor.* 2 [CSEL 18.153-155]); Augustine (*Contra mendac.* 5.8 [CSEL 41.479-481]); Pastor (*Libell. anath.* 11 [Mansi, *Coll. conc.* 3. 1004]) charged the Priscillianists with believing that angels and human souls are emanations of the divine substance. (Pastor of Gallecia's *Libellus in modum symboli* according to Tixeront II.230, note 31, contains the creed and anathemas wrongly ascribed to the first or second Council of Toledo [Mansi, *Coll. conc.* III, 1002 f].)

8. ad agonem . . . corpora seminari: The sixth canon of the Council of Braga charged them with believing that human souls sinned in heaven where they dwelt, and on this account they had been cast into the bodies of men on earth. Orosius *Commonitor.* 2 (CSEL 18.153-155) and Augustine in the *De haer.* present this more clearly.

12. Astruunt . . . ab astrologis nuncupatur: Canons 9 and 10 of the Council of Braga (Hefele-Leclercq 3.¹177 f.) present this doctrine of the Priscillianists as follows: Human souls and bodies are subject to the influence of the stars. The twelve signs of the zodiac correspond to the various parts of the body and of the soul, and are connected with the names of the twelve Patriarchs. Cf. Oros. (*Commonitor.* 2 [CSEL 18.153-155]), Pastor (*Libell. anath.* 15 [Mansi 3.1004]).

Carnes . . . coniuges . . . disiungens: Canon 14 (Hefele-Leclercq 3.¹178); Fil. (*Haer.* 84 [CSEL 38.45 f.]); Pastor (*Libell. anath.* 17 [Mansi 3.1004]) attests to the fact that the Priscillianists looked upon meat as unclean food. They likewise condemned marriage and the procreation of children as an evil. Cf. Council of Braga (Can. 11 [Hefele-Leclercq 3.¹178]); Filastrius (*Haer.* 84 [CSEL 38. 45 f.]); Pastor (*Libell. anath.* 10 [Mansi 3.1004]).

23. **Opificium . . . carnis . . . malignis angelis tribuunt:** This teaching, that the body is not the work of God, but the creation of bad angels is mentioned by Can. 13 of Braga (Hefele-Leclercq 3¹.178) and Filastrius (*Haer.* 84 [CSEL 38.45 f.]).

25. **scripturarum canonicarum . . . apocryphis:** Can. 17 of Braga (Hefele-Leclercq 3¹.178) confirms this claim that Priscillian perverted the Scriptures and made certain Apocrypha the equal of revealed truth. Cf. Oros. (Commonitor. 2 [CSEL 18.153-155]); Augustine (*Contra mendac.* 3.5 [CSEL 41.476-478]; *Ep.* 273.3 [CSEL 57.527]); Pastor (*Libell. anath.* 12 [Mansi 3.1004]).

29. **Sabellianam sectam:** Cf. Braga, can. 1 (Hefele-Leclercq 3¹.177); Oros. (Commonitor, 2 [CSEL 18.153-155]); Pastor, (*Libell. anath.* 2, 3, 4. [Mansi 3.1003]).

CHAPTER 71.

Fil. Div. her. 86 (CSEL 38.47)—DTC 1.394 (V. Oblet); *LThK* 1.98 f. (A. Bigelmair); DHGE 1.530 f. (V. Ermoni).

1. **qui cum hominibus non sumunt escas:** Though Filastrius and Augustine give this heresy no name, the author of *Praedestinatus* (c. 71 [PL 53.612]) (ca. 450) calls its followers "Adelophagi" (ἀδελως φαγεῖν "to eat without being seen"); Filastrius (c. 86) ascribes this custom to their claim that the prophets acted in this way. Cf. 3 Kings 13.9.

3. **Dicit etiam:** The author of *Praedestinatus*, contrary to Augustine and Filastrius, says that these heretics professed belief in a consubstantial Trinity.

CHAPTER 72.

Fil. Div. her. 91 (CSEL 38.50)—DTC 13.2654 f. (É. Amann).

1. **Rhetorio:** This heretic is mentioned by Filastrius in *Haer.* 91 (CSEL 38.50). The author of *Praedestinatus* (c. 72 [PL 53.612]) calls his followers the Rhetorians. Cotelier considered this doctrine to be related to the teachings of Apelles. ("Apelles apud Eusebium, nullius in Christum sperantis fidem examinari vult, aut mutari. Idemque, ni fallor, fuit error Rhetorii cunctarum haere-

sium approbatoris." Cf. PG, 1. *Constitut. Apost.* VI 10, note 34, col. 933). In the work ascribed to St. Athanasius, *Contra Apollinarium*, 1.6 (PG 26.1101) Rhetorius and his heresy are mentioned. Fabricius (cf. note n to Filastrius, *Haer.* 91 [PL 12. 1202 f.]) suggests that Rhetorius is not a proper name, but refers to the rhetor Themistius, who taught that variety of opinions on religious questions was not offensive to the Deity, but was rather a means of pleasing Him. Fabricius also calls attention to the fact that Prudentius ascribes the same opinion to Symmachus (*Liber II contra Symmachum* 772-776 [CSEL 61.275]). Modern scholars are inclined to see a form of Gnosticism in this heresy.

CHAPTER 73.

Fil. *Div. her.* 92 (CSEL 38.51 f.)—Smith and Wace 4.1010 (G. Salmon).

1. **in Christo divinitatem doluisse:** This error was found among the followers of Apollinaris and is to be seen, at least implicitly, in the teachings of Apollinaris himself. Cf. *supra* chap. 55. The author of *Praedestinatus* c. 75 (PL 53.612) calls these heretics mentioned by Augustine, and Filastrius (92), the Theoponitae; Danaeus in his edition of Augustine's *De haeresibus* calls them the Theopassiani. Cf. Fabricius' note to Filastrius, *Haer.* 92. PL 12. 1203 note b. (This reference as well as subsequent references from Danaeus are quoted from PL 12.)

CHAPTER 74.

Fil. *Div. her.* 93 (CSEL 38.52-54)—Smith and Wace 4.1054 (G. Salmon).

1. **quae triformem sic asserit deum:** Danaeus in his note to this chapter of Augustine calls these heretics the Triformii or Triformiani; the author of *Praedestinatus* c. 74 calls them Triscilidae. Cf. PL 12.1205, note a.

CHAPTER 75.

Fil. *Div. her.* 96 (CSEL 38.55 f.)—Smith and Wace 3.183 (G. Salmon).

1. **aquam . . . coaeternam**: Danaeus gives these heretics the name Aquei; the author of *Praedestinatus* calls them the Hydrotheitae (c. 75). For a full discussion of the various heresies concerned with water, cf. *Kirchenlexicon* I. 1175-1177.

CHAPTER 76.

Fil. *Div. her.* 97 (CSEL 38.56 f.)—Smith and Wace 3.137 (T. Davids).

1. **corpus hominis . . . esse imaginem dei**: The author of *Praedestinatus* c. 76 calls these heretics Homuncionitae, a very poor designation, yet one by which they who claimed that Christ was mere man were known. Danaeus notes in his index to Augustine's *De haeresibus* that these heretics were called the Melitonii. Cf. Galeardi's notes to Filastrius *Haer.* 97 (PL 12.1209 f., note g). These heretics, according to Filastrius, took Gen. 1. 26 f. as the justification for their belief (CSEL 38.56 f.).

CHAPTER 77.

Fil. *Div. her.* 114 (CSEL 38.79)—Smith and Wace 1.99 (F. Hoet).

1. **esse innumerabiles mundos**: The author of *Praedestinatus* calls this the "haeresis Ametritarum" (c. 77 [PL 53.614]). St. Jerome Apol. adv. Ruf. (PL 23.401) tells us that Origen held a theory of innumerable worlds. Cf. Fabricius' note to Filastrius, *Haer.* 115 (PL 12.1239, note b). Fil. *Div. her.* 114 in CSEL is *Haer.* 115 in PL.

CHAPTER 78.

Fil. *Div. her.* 124 (CSEL 38.89 f.).

1. **Alia sceleratorum animas converti in daemones**: Danaeus calls this the heresy of the Tertullii in the index to Augustine's *De haeresibus*. The author of *Praedestinatus* calls it the heresy of the

Psychopneumones (c. 78 [PL 53.614]). Cf. Fabricius' note to Filastrius *Haer.* 124 (PL 12.1249) where Fabricius states, erroneously, that *Praedestinatus* calls them the Peripneumones.

CHAPTER 79.

Fil. Div. her. 125 (CSEL 38.90 f.).

1. **descendente ad inferos Christo:** Danaeus gives the name *Liberati* to these heretics; the author of *Praedestinatus* (c. 79 [PL 53.614]) calls them the *Adecerditae*. Cf. Fabricius' note to Filastrius *Haer.* 125 (PL 12.1250 f. note 1).

CHAPTER 80.

Fil. Div. her. 127 (CSEL 38.92 f.).

1. **Filium . . . semper . . . fuisse . . . semper eum Filium non fuisse:** Even the author of *Praedestinatus* (c. 80 [PL 53.614]) is at a loss for a title for this heresy. Danaeus calls it the heresy of the *Nativitarii* or *Initiarii*. This opinion was held by some of the early Christians, Tertullian for example (*Adversus Hermogenem.* 3). Cf. Fabricius, note on Filastrius, *Haer.* 127 (PL 12.1254, note n).

CHAPTER 81.

DTC 9.1032-1044 f. (É. Amann); LThK 6.677 f. (W. Koch).

1. **Lucifero Caralitano . . . schisma, non haerism . . . condidisse:** Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, was one of the bitterest opponents of Arianism. However, when Athanasius advocated mildness in the treatment of repentant Semi-Arians at the Council of Alexandria in 362, Lucifer, considering this a betrayal of the faith, withdrew from communion with the Catholics and returned to Sardinia. It is difficult to say to what extent he was an actual schismatic. St. Ambrose (*De excessu Satyri* 1.47 [PL 16.1306B]) says that "he had separated himself from our communion," and St. Augustine, "that he fell into the darkness of schism" (*Ep.* 185.47 [CSEL 57.40 f.]). Cf. DTC 9.1032-1044 (É. Amann); LThK 6.677 f. (A. Anwander).

4. **Apud quendam . . . in haereticis Luciferianos positos:** The existence of the sect is attested by St. Jerome's *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* (PL 23.155-182) and by an appeal made to the emperors by Luciferian priests *ca.* 383-384. (For this petition cf. *Ep. 2. Collectio Avellana* [CSEL 35¹.5-44].) This accusation of heresy on the origin of the soul appears word for word in Pseudo-Jerome *Indiculus de haeresibus* 38 (PL 81.642). For a discussion of the problem which this fact occasions cf. Introduction, pp. 26-28.

10. **Utrum ergo:** Augustine does not want to discuss the nature of heresy or the problem of the soul's origin at this point (cf. Introduction pp. 51-52 for clarification).

CHAPTER 82.

DTC 8.1577-1580 (J. Forget); LThK 5.586 f. (W. Koch).

1. **apud istum:** Cf. *supra*, Chapter 81.

2. **iam noveram:** Jovinian had begun to preach his heresy at Rome shortly after 385. Augustine's familiarity with his doctrines can be seen in the *De bono conjugali*, *De sancta virginitate*, *De fide et operibus*.

3. **omnia peccata, sicut Stoici philosophi, paria esse dicebat:** F. Copleston summarizes this teaching of the Stoics, at least of Epictetus, in the following words: "Sins differ from the material standpoint, but from the moral standpoint they are equal in that they all involve a perverted will." (*A History of Philosophy* I 433). Cf. Ueberweg-Praechter *Geschichte der Philosophie* I 424.

4. **nec posse peccare . . . meritis adaequabat:** Though these errors seem rather crude, they were far-reaching in their implications. Jovinian was teaching salvation by faith alone, and the uselessness of good works. His concept of salvation through faith and baptism only affected many minds at the close of the fourth century and occasioned St. Augustine's *De fide et operibus*. Cf. Tixeront II 243-245.

16. **haeresis oppressa et extincta est:** Jovinian's error was brought to the attention of Pope Siricius, who condemned it in a synod at Rome in 390. St. Jerome vigorously refuted it (*Adversus Iovinianum libri duo* [PL 23.211-238]) and after Jovinian's death in 406 very little is heard of his sect.

CHAPTER 83.

Encic. Catt. 1.1749 f. (A. Audino); Smith and Wace 1.151 f. (F. Hort).

1. **Cum Eusebii historiam perscrutatus essem:** Bardy contends that Augustine used the Greek text, but Altaner is unwilling to accept this theory. Cf. Introduction, The Sources of the *De haeresibus* pp. 28-29.

cui Rufinus . . . duos libros addidit: Eusebius had brought his history down to the year 324. The two books which Rufinus added continued the work from 324 to the death of Theodosius in 395. Cf. Bardenhewer III. 552 f., 556.

4. **in sexto libro:** *HE* 6.37. (PG 20.598).

7. **animas cum corporibus mori . . . utrumque resurgere:** This doctrine was a species of materialism, ascribing the body the principal role in human personality, and closely resembled the teachings of Tatian. John of Damascus (*Orat. ad Graec.* 13 [PG 94. 758]) calls these heretics the Thnetopsychitae.

8. **hos disputatione Origenis . . . correctos:** The date of this disputation seems to have been either the reign of Emperor Gordian III, 238-244, or that of Philippus, 244-249. Cf. Smith and Wace s. v. "Arabaci."

CHAPTER 84.

LThK 4.955 (W. Koch); Smith and Wace 2.892 (E. Ffoulkes).

1. **Helvidio:** The only contemporary source of information on Helvidius is St. Jerome, *De perpetua virginitate beatae Mariae adversus Helvidium* (PL 23.183-206), ca. 383, when they were both in Rome.

3. **Sed mirum . . . Antidicomaritas Epiphanius appellavit:** This statement is evidently based on the notice in the *Anacephaleosis*, for if Augustine had seen the fuller account of the *Panarion* (*Haer.* 78 [GCS 37.452-475]), the fact that Epiphanius speaks of the Antidicomarianites as an Arabian sect should have caused him to hesitate in identifying the group of Helvidius, who was active in Rome, with another so far off in Arabia. W. Koch claims

that the two were not identical, and H. Quilliet (DTC s. v. "Antidicomarianites") speaks of them separately. Cf. *supra* Chapter 56 and Commentary.

CHAPTER 85.

DTC 11.2246 f. (É. Amann); Wetzzer and Welte 9.1598 (A. Esser).

1. **Paterniani:** Augustine seems to be the only source except *Praedestinatus* for this heresy. Cf. also Aug. *Contra Julian*. 5.26 (PL 44.800). No doubt the name Venustiani was given them on account of their excesses. Little is known of their origin and spread. *Praedestinatus* (*Haer.* 85 [PL 53.616B]) states that they were condemned by Pope Damasus and that a subsequent civil law leveled capital punishment against them.

CHAPTER 86.

DTC 15.130-171 (G. Bardy); LThK 9.1053-1056 (J. Martin).

1. **Tertullianistae:** The Montanists of Carthage—whom Tertullian joined—were never very numerous even in the time of Tertullian. Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 1.10 [CSEL 20.239 f.]) speaks of his followers as an elite group. St. Cyprian makes no mention of them and St. Optatus of Milevis, *De schisma donatist*. 1.9 (PL 11.898 f.), names them among the heresies which have passed from sight. Cf. DTC. s. v. "Montanisme" 2366 f.

8. **Tertullianus . . . animam . . . corpus esse contendit:** Augustine has pointed out elsewhere (*Ep.* 190.4.14 CSEL 57.148 f.) that Tertullian seems to make God a corporeal being. Cf. Tertull. *Adv. Praxeas* 7 (CSEL 47.235-237); *De carne Christi* 11 (CSEL 70. 218-220). However he does state that God is spiritual (e. g., *Apologet.* 21 [CSEL 69.53-60]). Most probably Tertullian was using *corpus* as synonymous with *substantia*. Cf. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas* I. 309 f.

In regard to the human soul, Tixeront (314 f.) states that there is no doubt that Tertullian admitted the corporeity of the soul, a doctrine which he borrowed from the Stoics, to whom he appeals. Cf. Tertullian *De anima* 5-8 (ed. J. H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1947, pp. 6-10).

20. **est Tertullianus factus haereticus:** Around 206-208 Tertullian's inclinations towards Montanism were beginning to show. The works he wrote at this time showed his tendency toward a more definite asceticism, a firm disapproval of the toleration accepted in the Church, and a more and more marked feeling of the action of the Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church. Cf. P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste* 323, 358, 399 f., 360-361.

21. **quos ante destruxerat:** What does Augustine mean by this? Is it merely a reference in general to the *De praescriptione haereticorum* of Tertullian? (This work of Tertullian, according to J. Quasten, *Patrology* II 270 f., purposed to end the controversy between Catholics and all heretics by setting forth the *praescriptio*, a juridical objection that leads to a complete rejection of the case by the defendant's barring the suit in the form in which the plaintiff enters it. The two *praescriptiones* that deprive all heretical systems of their bases are given by Tertullian in ch. 21: (1) "Christ sent the apostles as the preachers of the gospel and for this reason no others than those whom Christ appointed ought to be received as its preachers." (2) "The apostles founded the churches, declared the gospel to them and empowered them to declare it to others." Or is it a particular reference to the Catalogue of thirty-two heresies attached to the *De praescriptione haereticorum*? Bardenhewer II. 431 f.) and Quasten (II 272) note that this catalogue of heresies is usually regarded as a mere summary of the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus. Cf. G. Bardy, "Tertullien," "Montanisme," DTC.

secundas nuptias . . . damnare: Cf. Tertull. *De monogamia* (PL 2.939-952).

22. **apostolicam doctrinam:** 1 Tim. 4.3.

23. **ab ipsis divisus:** The information given here by Augustine seems to be the only testimony we have of the later history of the African Montanists, Tertullian's separation from them, and the formation of his own sect of Tertullianists. Cf. De Labriolle-Bardy, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne* 106 f.

24. **animas . . . pessimas . . . in daemones verti:** Cf. Tertull. *De anima* 54-58 (ed. J. H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1947 pp. 72-80).

CHAPTER 87.

DTC 1.55 (L. Guilloureaux); DHGE 1.92 f. (V. Ermoni);
Wetzer and Welte 1.33.

1. **quaedam haeresis rusticana**: This sect seems to be known only through St. Augustine. G. W. Walch, *Ketzergeschichte*, t. 1, p. 608, proposes various reasons for rejecting the existence of this sect, but they are certainly not conclusive.

4. **omnes hoc fuerunt**: hoc is here used in reference to what precedes, and with emphasis and contempt. TLL 6.2708.22-60.

CHAPTER 88.

Augustine: *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* (CSEL 60. 3-151); *De spiritu et littera* (CSEL 60.155-229); *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (CSEL 42.3-48); *De gestis Pelagii* (CSEL 42.51-122); *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* (CSEL 42.125-206); *De natura et origine animae* (CSEL 60. 303-419); *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* (CSEL 60.423-570); *Contra Iulianum* (PL 44.641-874); *Contra secundum Iuliani responsionem imperfectum opus* (PL 45.1049-1608)—DTC 12.675-715 (R. Hedde and É. Amann); LThK 8.63-65 (W. Koch); G. de Plinval *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme* Lausanne 1943; Tixeront 2.432-505.

PELAGIANISM.

The basic principle of Pelagianism is the affirmation of the moral strength and self-sufficiency of man's will. There is no original sin, the Pelagians say, and consequently Baptism is not absolutely necessary for salvation. However, it is required for those who would be members of the kingdom of Heaven, which is the Church, and who desire to be in communion with Christ. Sanctifying grace is not the necessary foundation of supernatural activity, but only a remedy for actual sins, or a spiritual ornament of the Christian and a sign of his divine adoption. They likewise held that actual graces can be no more than exterior graces for the purpose of instruction and example, or, at the most, interior graces of illumination. Interior grace acting immediately on the will they did not admit. The Redemption is not a rebirth, a change from death to life, but only an uplifting to a higher life.

In his first anti-Pelagian work, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*,

Augustine combatted the doctrines without naming the heretic. In Book I, Augustine established the fall of Adam, cause of death and of sin, which Baptism remits in infants; Book II combatted Pelagian impeccability; Book III is a letter. Toward the end of 412 appeared *De spiritu et littera*, addressed to Marcellinus. In this work *spiritus* and *littera* correspond to *gratia* and *lex* (cf. DTC 12.687). Herein Augustine combatted the doctrine of Pelagius on the help of Divine Grace. At the end of 415 (cf. Bardy, "Les révisions," *Bibliothèque Augustinienne: Oeuvres de saint Augustin* 12 [Paris 1950] 586) appeared *De natura et gratia*, requested by two of the faithful who had seen the treatise of Pelagius, *De natura*. Augustine, in this work, proclaims the necessity of grace. About the same time he refuted Celestius in the *De perfectione iustitiae*. Probably at the end of 417 (for discussion of date, cf. Bardy, *Les révisions* 588 f.) Augustine gave to the history of Pelagianism a most precious document, the *De gestis Pelagii*, which records the acts of the Council of Diospolis. After the condemnation of Pelagius in Rome, appeared *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, the first book of which refutes Pelagius who calls grace liberty, or the law, or the remission of sins, and the second book of which establishes the existence of original sin even in infants. *De natura et origine animae* is devoted to a problem which occupied St. Augustine very much. *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*, placed after the *Contra Gaudentium* in the *Retractationes*, answers two letters of Julian of Eclanum. *Contra Iulianum* followed, perhaps in 422. The last work of Augustine, left incomplete, was also a refutation of Julian, the *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem imperfectum opus*.

1. *hoc tempore . . . recentissima*: Pelagius was born between 350-354, went to Rome 382-385, began his religious activity at Rome 394, died sometime between 423-429. Cf. De Plinval, *op. cit.* Tableau Chronologique 13-15.

2. *Pelagio*: The particulars of the early life and career of Pelagius are imperfectly known. St. Jerome's words in reference to Pelagius: "Scottorum pultibus praegravatus" and "Habet enim progeniem Scotticae gentis de Brittannorum vicinia" (*Comm. in Ierem. Prol.* 1.4 [CSEL 59.4]; Bk. 3.1 [CSEL 59.151]) are to be taken only in a rhetorical sense, to cast upon Pelagius the opprobrium of barbaric origins. The only certain information we have on his nationality is that he was a Briton (Aug. *Ep.* 186.1 [CSEL 57.45] "Brittonem fuisse cognominatum"; Mercator, *Liber sub-not. Iuliani* [PL 48.111] "Pelagium gente Britannum"; Orosius, *Apol.* 12 [CSEL 5.620] "Britannicus noster."). Other hypotheses on his origins and name (Pelagius as a Grecized form of the Celtic word, Morgan, man of the Sea) are without foundation. Cf. De Plinval, 57-61.

monacho: Pelagius was a monk, seemingly without membership in any definite community, but not a cleric. He deliberately chose to remain a layman, preaching on his own authority to the people. Cf. De Plinval, 102 f.

3. **Caelestius . . . Caelestiani:** In all probability the success of Pelagianism in Africa, Sicily, and Rhodes was the fruit of Celestius' activity. For good reason the contemporaries of St. Augustine called this the Celestian heresy. There certainly is room for an investigation of Celestius' impact on Pelagius, to discover to what extent his ideas may have been imputed to Pelagius. (Aug. *De peccato originali* 6.6; 11.12 [CSEL 42.170; 173 f.]). Cf. De Plinval in Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'église* 4 (1948) 93-94.

5. **Hi Dei gratiae . . . in tantum inimici sunt, ut sine hac posse hominem credant omnia divina mandata:** Cf. Eph. 1.5; Col. 1.13; John 6.66; Rom. 5.5; Gal. 5.6; John 15.5. Augustine presents the fundamental principle of Pelagianism here, evidently the Stoic conception of human nature. Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 133. Pelagius was a representative of a tendency common in the West in his time. Though Paganism was dying as a religious force, its spirit continued on under various forms of which Manichaeism and Pelagianism were the most significant aspects. The former considered man in the power of two irresistible forces to which he is abandoned without any responsibility of his own. The latter regarded man as the complete master of his own destiny through the action of his free and independent will.

Man has been created free and this freedom consists in the power to choose between doing good or avoiding what is wrong. It is an emancipation from God by which man becomes his own master and acts just as he pleases. Cf. Tixeront II 434-435.

At Rome the doctrine of Pelagius had been developing quietly without raising any reaction, though we do know that Pelagius had protested against the words of Augustine, quoted by a bishop in a sermon: "Da quod iubes, et iube quod vis." Pelagius protested against this as destructive of freedom of the will. Cf. *De dono persever.* 20.53 (PL 45.1026).

13. **Denique Pelagius a fratribus increpatus . . . facilius possint implere per gratiam:** Fearing the coming of the barbarians

under Alaric, Pelagius and Celestius left Rome. We find them trying to make converts at Syracuse in Sicily in 409, and at this period were composed the *De natura* of Pelagius and the *Definitiones* of Celestius. Leaving Sicily they attended the conference between the Donatists and the Catholics at Carthage in 411. Then the two separated, Pelagius to go to Palestine, Celestius to remain at Carthage. That same year, Paulinus, priest of Milan and disciple of St. Ambrose, denounced Celestius and his errors, which were then condemned in a council at Carthage. The heresy was now in the open.

Little is heard of the activities of Pelagius in Palestine until Jerome began his polemic against him with his letter to Ctesiphon (*Ep.* 133) in 415. This was soon followed in the same year by the *Dialogus contra Pelagianos*. In answer to Jerome, Pelagius wrote his four books *De libero arbitrio*.

The words of Augustine given here as Pelagius's explanation of grace "ut . . . per gratiam" are found to be a direct quotation from Pelagius's *De libero arbitrio*. Cf. Aug. *De gratia Christi* 29. 30 (CSEL 42.149): "Ut quod per liberum," inquit, "homines facere iubentur arbitrium, facilius possint implere per gratiam." Can we conclude from this that Augustine in the words "a fratribus increpatus" is referring to Jerome's work in attacking Pelagianism?

21. **Illam vero gratiam . . . in libero arbitrio:** Pelagius had been accused of designating as grace free will itself in the synod of Diospolis. Cf. Aug. *De gestis Pelagii* 10.22 (CSEL 42.75). For, as Augustine says here, he had read and verified in a work of Pelagius (*Liber de natura*) this statement: "hanc se dicere dei gratiam, quod possibilitatem non peccandi natura nostra cum conderetur, accepit, quoniam condita est cum libero arbitrio."

24. **per suam legem atque doctrinam ut discamus quae . . . debeamus:** Augustine quotes Pelagius's words on this subject in the *De gratia Christi* 7.8 (CSEL 42.131): "adiuvat enim nos deus" inquit, "per doctrinam et revelationem suam, dum cordis nostri oculos aperit; dum nobis, ne praesentibus occupemur, futura demonstrat; dum diaboli pandit insidias; dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiae caelestis illuminat. . . . Qui haec dicit gratiam tibi videtur negare?"

31. **quae . . . aedificat:** Cf. 1. Cor. 8.1.

33. **Destruunt . . . orationes quas facit ecclesia:** In the *De natura et gratia* 18.20 (CSEL 60.245 f.) Augustine tells us that Pelagius admitted prayers for forgiveness, but nowhere admits prayer for the avoidance of sin, stressing the Pelagian view of the will's independent power. Prayer, for Pelagius, was a means of showing men what to desire and what to love (*De gratia Christi* 30.32 [CSEL 42.149 f.]); cf also *De gratia Christi* 41.45 [CSEL 42.158 f.]. Pelagius attributed so much power to the will as to take away prayer from religious duty (*De natura et gratia* 58.68 [CSEL 60.284 f.]).

37. **gratiam Dei . . . secundum merita nostra dari:** The Pelagians taught that the graces of light and example could be merited through the independent exercise of the will. Cf. Aug. *De gratia Christi et de pecc. orig.* 27.27; 31.34 (CSEL 42.147 f., 151 f.); *Contra duas epistulas Pelag.* 2.8.17 (CSEL 60.478 f.).

38. **Quod quidem . . . episcopali iudicio Palaestino . . . damnare compulsus est:** Cf. *supra* 2. Orosius had been sent to Palestine by Augustine to confer with St. Jerome. While in Palestine Orosius sought to bring the heresy up for condemnation. In July 415 a diocesan synod was called by Bishop John of Jerusalem, but Orosius was hampered by the fact that he did not know Greek, and Pelagius, quite capable of using Greek, was able to uphold his orthodoxy. However, it was decided to refer the matter to Pope Innocent I. Cf. Orosius, *Liber apologet.* 3-8 (CSEL 5.606-614); Aug. *Gest. Pelag.* 14.37 (CSEL 42.93 f.). But that same year the Gallic bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, brought the matter before Bishop Eulogius of Caesarea. Thereupon Pelagius was summoned before a synod of 14 bishops in Diospolis. Before these bishops Pelagius disowned some of the objectionable propositions attributed to him, for they really belonged to Celestius, others he explained in such equivocal fashion that his judges were able to acquit him. Cf. *De gestis Pelagii* of Augustine, particularly 20.44 (CSEL 49.99): "Now, since we have received satisfaction on the points which have come before us touching the monk Pelagius, who has been present; since, too, he gives his consent to pious doctrines, and even anathematizes everything that is contrary to the Church's faith, we confess him to belong to the communion of the Catholic Church."

40. **in posterioribus suis scriptis hoc invenitur docere:** The *Libellus fidei ad Innocentium papam* (PL 45.1716-1718) was written in 417; the following, except for some fragments, are lost: *Epistola ad Augustinum* (cf. *De gestis Pelagii* 32.57 [CSEL 42.111]) and *Epistola ad amicum quemdam presbyterum* (cf. *De Gestis Pelagii* 30.54 [CSEL 42.106-108]) which were sent to Augustine after the synod of Diospolis. The *Epistola ad Innocentium* (cf. *De gratia Christi* 30.32 [CSEL 42.149 f.]) and the *De libero arbitrio* were both written in 417. In all of these writings, except the *Libellus fidei*, in which he ignores the problem of original sin and merely touches on grace, Pelagius has gone back to his errors or seeks to explain them in ambiguous language.

41. **vitam iustorum . . . nullam omnino habere peccatum:** Pelagius had been charged at Diospolis with having said that "the Church here is without spot or wrinkle," a point which the Donatists with their Novatian ideas maintained. Cf. *De gestis Pelagii* 11.26; 12.27 (CSEL 42.79 f.; 80 f.). Augustine reports that the same reference to Scripture (Eph. 5.27) had been used by Celestius. Cf. *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* 9.20. (CSEL 42.18-20). Cf. also *Contra duas litteras Pelagianas* 4.7.17 (CSEL 60.540 f.) and *De dono perseverantiae* 5.8 (PL 45.998 f.).

46. **Parvulos . . . negant . . . contagium . . . contrahere:** Since all sin in the Pelagian system is essentially an act of the free will, the Pelagians refused to admit the existence of original sin. In the *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* 2.14 Augustine tells us that even after the synod in Palestine Pelagius entertained this view of original sin in the first book of his *De libero arbitrio*.

49. **eos . . . baptizari . . . ut . . . admittantur ad regnum dei:** In the *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* 1.23.33 (CSEL 60.32 f.), *De peccato orig.* 17.19-21.24 (CSEL 42.179-183), and *Serm.* 294 (PL 38.1333-1343), Augustine refutes the Pelagian error that infants are baptized not for the remission of sin, but to obtain the kingdom of heaven. The Pelagians argued that, though Christ had said that unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, He meant only that infants are to be baptized to be with Christ in heaven. Should they die without baptism they will have salvation and eternal life, since

they are bound with no fetter of sin. Cf. *De pecc. mer. et remiss.* 1.30.58 (CSEL 60.57 f.).

55. **Adam . . . fuisse moriturum . . . conditione naturae:** The Pelagians refused to admit that Adam was born in a condition superior to our present state, for this would be admitting a defect, a weakening of human nature in something essential. Cf. *De. gest. Pel.* 17.23 (CSEL 42.76 f.).

EPILOGUE.

2. **Ex . . . ortae sint:** Cf. Quodvultdeus' Letter to Augustine, *Ep.* 221.2.

13. **quos legi:** Cf. Introduction pp. 30.

17. **Audiui scripsisse de haeresibus sanctum Hieronymum:** There is no mention of a catalogue of heresies by Jerome in the various patrologies. However, in the *De viris illustribus* Jerome cites heretics, Jews, and even pagans. Pseudo-Jerome obtained some of his information for the various heresies he treated in his *Indiculus de haeresibus* from St. Jerome's *De viris illustribus* (Cf. F. Oehler, *Corpus haereseologicum*, I p. XIII).

22. **Abeloitas:** Cf. Ch. 87 *supra*.

26. **ut . . . dissentiunt:** Cf. Quodvultdeus' Letter to Augustine, *Ep.* 221.2.

31. **Macedoniani:** Cf. Ch. 52 *supra*.

Photiniani: Cf. Ch. 45 *supra*.

45. **modulum . . . excedit:** Cf. Augustine, Introduction to *De haeresibus*.

52. **antequam . . . perficerem.** The second part in which Augustine planned to discuss what constitutes a heretic evidently was never written. Cf. Introduction, pp. 9-10.

INDICES

A. INDEX LOCORUM SANCTAE SCRIPTURAE *

Genesis 1.26:204; 1.31:192.
Exodus 12.6:150; 3.5:192.
Josue 5.16:108,* 192.
3 Regum 13.9:202.
Liber Psalmorum 18.6:104.*
Isaias 20.2:192; 45.7:191.
Matthaeus 5.17:41; 6.12:124; 9.17:189; 16.6-12:41.
Lucas 5.37:189; 18.1:102.*
Ioannes 6.66:122,* 212; 10.38:187; 15.5:122,* 212.
Actus Apostolorum 5.17-18:40; 15.5:40; 24.5:40; 24.14-16:40; 26.5:40;
28.22:40; 8.9-29:135.
Ad Romanos 5.5:212.
1 Ad Corinthios 8.1:213; 11.18-19:41, 48; 11.19:42; 13.9:149.
Ad Galatas 5.6:212; 5.20:42.
Ad Ephesios 1.5:122, 212; 5.27:215.
Ad Colossenses 1.13:122,* 212.
1 Ad Thessalonicenses 5.17:102.*
2 Ad Timotheum 2.5:173; 4.3:209.
Ad Hebraeos 12.14:173.
2 Petri 2.1:42.
Apocalypsis 2.6, 14-16:137.

B. INDEX LOCORUM OPERUM SANCTI AUGUSTINI

Contra Academicos 2.2.5:131; 3.17.37:131; 18.41:131.
De anima et eius origine 1.14.19:33n; 4.24.38:51.
De baptismo 2-5:195; 4.16.23:52.
De civitate Dei 18.51:45f; 21.17:156.
Confessiones 1.14:32n.
Contra Cresconium 1.31:140; 2.3.4:47; 2.7.9:47; 4.1.1:198; 47.57:198.
Epistulae 40.6.9:130; 43.9.26:198; 53.3.6:198; 88:195; 108.4.13:198; 141.6:
198; 185.1.1:196; 185.47:205; 186.1:211; 190.4.14:208; 222.3n, 6n, 7,
31n; 223.4n, 31n; 237.3:201.
Contra epistulam Parmeniani 2.13.30:195.
Contra Faustum Manichaeum 2.6:33; 19-22:162; 32.17:46.
De fide et symbolo 21:45.
De gestis Pelagii 6.16-18:49; 10.22:213; 11.26:215; 12.27:215; 14.37:214;
20.44:214.
De gratia Christi et de peccato originali 2.14:215; 7.8:213; 27.27:214;
29.30:213; 30.32:214; 31.34:214; 41.45:214.
De haeresibus Praefatio: 23; 3:37; 26:26; 28:27; 42:37; 40:50; 43:51;
46:10n; 50:51; 57:51; 57:25n; 57:31n; 68:51; 80:25n; 81:51;
83:28f; 86:52; *Epilogus*: 10n.

* Quotations used in the text of the *De haeresibus* are marked with an asterisk.

- Contra Iulianum* 1.6:31; 2.6:31; 5,2,7:34.
Contra mendaciam 2.2:201; 3.5:202; 5.8:201.
De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum 18.66:167,
De natura boni 46.18:167.
De natura et gratia 18.20:214; 56.68:214.
De opere monachorum 186.
De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum 1.23.33:215.
De peccato originali 6.6:212; 11.12:212; 17.19-21.24:215; 23.26f:49n.
Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum 2.8.17:214; 4.12.34:50.
De dono perseverantiae 20.53:212.
Contra litteras Petiliani 2.9.21:195; 2.38.91:33.
Ennaratio in Psalmum 118 29.9:34.
Quaestiones in Heptateuchum 7.37:33n; 2.116:33, 34.
Retractationes 1.213:195.
Sermones 32.27f:46; 319.3:34.
De trinitate 3 proem. 1:33.
De utilitate credendi 3:168.

C. INDEX LOCORUM CETERORUM AUCTORUM ANTIQUORUM

- Ambrosius, *De excessu Satyri* 1.47:205.
Expositio in psalmum 118, sermo 13.6:43.
Athanasius, *Contra Apollinarium* 1.6:203; 2.3:177; 1.15:177.
Epistula ad Serapium 1.2:177.
Orationes 3 contra Arianos 1f:187.
Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1.22:1.
Chrysostomus, *In Matthaeum* 82.2:190.
Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.19:190.
Collectio Avellana 2.206.
Cyprianus, *Epistulae* 51.1:45; 73.4:45; 74.7:45.
Ad Quirinum (Testimonia) 3.86:44.
Cyrillus Hierosol., *Catecheses* 16.8:149.
Didymus, *De trinitate* 2.10:181.
Eugippius, *Excerpta* 19, 280:1.
Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4.30:152; 5.13:147; 5.15,20:191; 5.28:157;
6.38:141, 151.
Filastrius, *Liber de omnibus heresibus* 43:143.
Gregorius Magnus, *Epistula* 7.15:1.
Hippolytus, *Philosophumena* 4.13:143; 6.9-20:134; 6.55:143; 9.4,13-17:151;
10.12:134; 10.29:151.
Ignatius, *Epistula ad Ephesios* 6.21:43.
Epistula ad Trallenses 6.11:43.
Irenaeus, *Contra haereses* 1. Proem. 1.1:143; 1.11.1:141; 1.12-16:143;
1.23:134; 1.24:136; 1.26:137; 1.27:146; 1.31.1:145; 3.11.9:43; 3.12
11f:43.
Isidorus Hispal., *De viris illustribus* 22:1.
Hieronymus, *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*: 206.
Epistula 133.3:200.
In Hieremiam prophetam Prol. 1.4:211; 3.1:211.
Commentarii in iv epistulas Paulinas (ad Galatas) 3.19-21:43;
(ad Titum) 3.10:44; 3.11:47.

- Apologia adversus libros Rufini*: 204.
De viris illustribus 93:196; 121:200.
 Ioannes Damascen., *Oratio ad Graecos* 13:207.
 Iustinus, *Apologia* 1.26,56:135.
 Dialogus cum Tryphone 80.4:27; 120:135.
 Moses Choren., 2.66:152.
 Optatus Milev., *De schisma Donatistarum* 1.9:208; 3.4:196.
 Origenes, *De principiis* 3.6:156; 1.6.3:156.
 Orosius, *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagianos* 12:211; 3.8: 214.
 Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum
 2:201,202.
 Pastor, *Libellus in modum symboli* 10,11,15:201; 2,3,4,12:202.
 Possidius, *Indiculus* VII 16:1.
 Pseudo-Augustinus, *De accedentibus ad gratiam*: 17,18.
 Pseudo-Hieronymus, *Indiculus de haeresibus* 19:27; 20:27; 25:26; 38:206.
 Quodvultdeus, [Aug.] *Epistulae* 223:4; 223.2:31.
 Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.45:181.
 Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.14:182.
 Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2.50:201.
 Tertullianus, *De anima* 5-8:208; 54-58:209.
 Apologeticum 21:208.
 De carne Christi 11:208.
 Adversus Hermogenem 3:205.
 De praescriptione haereticorum 6.2:43; 42.8:43.
 Adversus Praean 7:208.
 Adversus Valentinianos 11:141.
 Pseudo-Tertullianus, *Adversus omnes haereses* 5:143; 6:146.
 Theodoretus, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 1.8:190; 4.1:177; 4.6:
 197.

D. INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- | | |
|---|---|
| Alfaric, P.: 167, 168, 169, 170, 171,
172. | Chapman, J.: 196. |
| Allo, E.: 41, 42. | Cotelier: 202. |
| Altaner, B.: 6, 23, 29. | Courcelle, P.: 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 131. |
| Amann, E.: 205. | |
| Anwander, A.: 205. | Danaeus, L.: 203, 204, 205. |
| | Dyroff, A.: 131. |
| Bardenhewer, O.: 6, 209. | Ferrou, J.: 197. |
| Bardy, G.: 22-30, 165, 166, 167, 168,
169, 170, 171. | Franses, D.: 12n, 14-17, 18, 20, 22. |
| Bareille, G.: 197. | Frend, W.: 196, 197. |
| Battifol, P.: 52. | |
| Bayard, L.: 44, 45. | Goldbacher, A.: 2n. |
| Bigelmair, A.: 182. | De Guibert, J.: 46, 47, 50n, 51. |
| Burkitt, F.: 162, 163, 164, 165, 166,
170, 171. | Holl, K.: 23, 24. |
| | Hort, F.: 189. |
| Chaine, J.: 42n. | |
| | Jackson, A.: 167, 169. |

- Jannaccone, S.: 5n, 46n, 56, 162.
 Janssen, H.: 43n.
 Junglas, J.: 154.
- Kappelmacher, A.: 17-19, 20.
 Koch, W.: 208.
 Krüger, G.: 28.
- De Labriolle, P.: 25, 27, 28, 209.
 De Labriolle-Bardy: 209.
 Lagrange, M.: 42n.
 Lehaut, A.: 191.
- Maher, J.: 162.
 Mai, 12.
 Marrou, H.: 31, 32, 34, 35, 36.
 Maurists: 11n.
 Mohrmann, C.: 47-48.
 Monceaux, P.: 196.
 Moricca, U.: 6.
 Morin, G.: 12, 13, 18, 20, 27, 192.
- O'Brien, M.: 130.
- Palanque, J.: 197.
 Peterson, E.: 178, 186.
 Pétré, H.: 44, 50.
 Pincherle, A.: 196.
 De Plinval, G.: 211, 212.
- Polotsky, H.: 164, 166, 167, 170, 171.
 Prat, F.: 40, 41n.
 Puech, H.: 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172.
- Quasten, J.: 209.
 Quilliet, H.: 208.
- Salmon, G.: 188.
 Schanz, M.: 6, 131.
 Schepens, P.: 16.
 Schepss, G.: 199.
 Schwabe, L.: 131.
 Simonetti, M.: 19, 20.
 Specht, T.: 52.
 Steffes, J.: 188.
- Tillemont, L.: 11, 12, 13, 21.
 Tixeront, J.: 177, 180, 184, 201, 208, 212.
- Venables, E.: 182.
- Walch, G.: 210.
 Watson, E.: 44.
 Willis, G.: 196.
- Zarb, S.: 6.

E. INDEX NOMINUM ET RERUM

- Abel: 145.
 Abelites: 121, 210.
 abstinence: 148; in Priscillianism: 201.
 Acacians: 179.
 Acacius of Caesarea: 179.
 Achilles: 175.
 Adam, condition of: 216.
 Adam-Christ, the: 151.
 Adamites: 77, 150-151.
 Adecerditae: 205.
 address, titles of in Epistolography: 130.
 Adelophagi: 113, 202.
 ἀδελφως φάγειν: 202.
Adversus quinque haereses: 19.
 aeons: 147, 151; explanation of: 133.
 Aëreans: 101, 181-182.
- Aërius: 181.
 Aëtians: 101, 182-183.
 Aëtius: 179, 182.
 Agonistici: 196.
 αἵρεσις: 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43.
 αἰρεῖσθαι: 38, 39.
 Alcibiades of Apamea: 151.
 Alexander of Alexandria: 175, 191.
 Alexander, bishop of Constantinople: 180.
 Alexandria: 175.
 allegorical interpretation of Scripture: 172.
 allegory: 143, 156.
 Alogi: 77, 150.
 Altaner, B.: 207.
 Alypius: 4, 5, 6.
 Ambrose, St.: 43.
 Ametritarum: 204.

- Anacephaleosis:** 22, 23, 25, 207;
 considered genuine by Augustine:
 23; comparison of *Panarion* with:
 23; not genuine work of Epipha-
 nius: 24; comparison of *De*
haeresibus with: 37; copy used by
 Augustine: 187.
Angelici: 79, 154.
Angelina: 154.
angels, creation as work of: 154;
 cult of: 154.
anima animans: 184.
anima rationalis: 184.
Anomoean heresy: 183.
ἀνόμοιος: 183.
anthropomorphism: 178.
Anthropomorphitae: 178.
Anthropomorphites: 51.
anti-church: 147.
Antidicomarianites: 101-103, 185,
 207.
anti-Nicaean opposition: 179.
anti-nomian: 135, 138.
Antioch: 135, 136.
Anududuzbar: 152.
Anulinus: 195.
Apelles: 147, 202.
Apellitae: 73-75.
Apocrypha: 199; use of: 202.
Apollinaris: 115, 183, 184, 203.
Apollinarists: 101, 183, 184.
Apostles: 42.
Apostolic Age: 43.
Apostolici: 50, 79-81, 154-155.
Apostolic teaching: 52.
Apostolic times: 45.
Apotacticae: 155.
Aquarians: 107, 190-191.
Aquei: 204.
Arabaci: 119, 207, 208.
Arabian sect: 207.
archdeaconate: 21.
archons: 145.
Archontics: 73, 145.
Arian controversy: 187.
Arian disturbances: 191.
Arianism: 181, 183; in North Af-
 rica: 16; Augustine and: 174;
 explanation of: 176-177; oppo-
 nents of: 205.
Arians: 20, 97-99, 173-178, 180, 181,
 182, 183, 196; Egyptian: 174;
 proselytizing: 15.
Aristotelian dialectics: 182.
Arius: 175, 180, 181, 191.
Arnobius the Younger: 192.
Artemon: 157.
ἀρτος: 149.
Artotyrites: 29, 77, 149, 150.
Arzuges: 197.
asceticism: 181-182, 185; heretical:
 148; extreme: 154; Egyptian:
 172; in Tertullianism: 209.
Ascitae: 27, 107, 189.
Ascodrugitae: 27, 107, 189.
ἄσκος: 189.
astrology: 151; in Priscillianism:
 201.
Athanasius: 174, 180, 191, 205;
Oratio II contra Arianos: 157.
Audaeus: 178.
Audiani: 178.
Audius: 178.
Augustine: exchange of letters with
 Quodvultdeus: 2-6, 7-8, 10, 33;
 treatment of heresies: 8; school
 of writers: 20; relations with
 Quodvultdeus: 21; opinion of Fi-
 lastrius: 25-26; knowledge of
 Greek: 28-29, 31-37; commen-
 taries on the Scriptures: 32; use
 of Latin translations of Greek:
 34, 35; use of term *haeresis*: 45;
 interest in a manual of heresies:
 130; confusion on Noëtians and
 Sabellians: 155; familiarity with
 Jovinianism: 206; on Tertullian-
 ism: 208; on African Montanists:
 209; *Sermo* 294: 215.
baptism: 46, 135, 141, 147, 178;
 Marcionite: 44-45; heretical: 151;
 St. Cyprian on: 194; of infants:
 215.
Bardenhewer: 188, 207.
Bardesanes: 134.
Bardesanists: 79, 152.
Bardy, G.: 207.
Basilides: 134, 136.
Basilidians: 65, 136.
Basil of Ancyra: 179.
Beatitudo as term of address: 130

- Bible, Latin: 35.
 body: creation of bad angels: 202;
 principal role in human person-
 ality: 207.
 Bonosus of Sardica: 185.
 Borborites: 138.
 Braga, Council of: 199-202.

 Caecilian: 194, 195.
 Cain, honoring of: 145.
 Cainites: 71-73; 144-145.
 Callistus, Pope: 141, 151, 153-154,
 155.
 Capeolus: 12, 13, 21.
Caritas, as term of address: 130.
 Carpocrates: 138.
 Carpocratians: 67, 138, 151.
 Carthage: 12, 14, 15.
 Cassiodorus: 1.
 Catalogue of Heresies, addition to
 De praescriptione haereticorum:
 209.
 Cataphrygians: 52, 75, 148-149.
 Cathari: 79, 153-154.
 Celestius: 212, 214, 215; heresy of:
 212; influence on Pelagius: 212;
 at Rome: 212-213; at Syracuse:
 213; at Carthage: 213; *Defini-*
 tiones: 213.
 celibacy: 147.
 Celsinus: 131-132.
 Celsus (*quidam*): 131-132.
 Cerinthus: 134, 150.
 Cerdo: 145.
 Cerdonians: 73, 145, 146.
 Cerinthians: 139.
 Cerinthus: 134, 139, 150.
 "the Champions": 196.
 Chiliasm: 139, 140, 149.
 Christ: 147, 151; divinity of at-
 tacked: 157, 175; *vous* of the
 Father: 136; the Christ: 140; na-
 ture of: 141, 184; and Seth: 145;
 soul of: 183, 184; mere man: 204;
 descent into hell: 205; flesh from
 Mary: 184.
 Christianity: 146, 151.
 Christian belief: 51.
 Christian community: 45.
 Christian writers: 38.
 Christology, heretical: 152.

 Church: 45, 48, 50, 52, 148; of
 Christ: 46; constitution of: 47;
 of the pure: 154, 194; purity of:
 215.
 Cirta: 15.
 Claudian: 131.
 Claudianists: 197.
 Clement of Alexandria: 151.
 clergy: of North Africa: 33; criti-
 cism of: 175, 181, 182.
 Circumcellions: 196-197.
 Collyridians: 29.
 Colorbasii: 71, 143.
 Colorbasus: 143.
 Coluthiani: 107, 191.
 Coluthus: 191.
 Constantine the Great: 175.
 Constantius, emperor: 180.
Contra Iudaeos: 19.
 Copelston, F.: 206.
 Cornelius Celsus, *Encyclopedia* of:
 131-132.
 Cornelius, Pope: 153.
corpus: 208.
 cosmogony, dualistic: 136.
 cosmology, Platonic thought on:
 156.
 Council: of Nicaea: 157, 174, 175,
 177, 179, 183; of Alexandria: 205.
 creation: Gnostic: 133, 139; Mani-
 chaeon: 154.
 Creator, enemy of man according to
 Gnostic thought: 144.
 Creed: 46, 148.
 Cresconius: 49.
 Crucifixion, salvation through: 146-
 147.
 Cyprian: 46, 154; letters of: 44-45;
 Epistula 63: 190.

 Dactylorhynchitae: 190.
 Damasus, Pope: 208.
 damned, release of by Christ's de-
 scend into hell: 115, 205.
 David, imitation of: 190.
De accedentibus ad gratiam: 19.
De cantico novo: 19.
De cataclysmo: 19.
De civitate Dei: 35.
De promissionibus et praedictioni-

- bus Dei:** 13, 14, 15, 16, 17n, 18, 19, 20.
De symbolo: 19.
De tempore barbarico I: 12, 13, 17, 19.
De tempore barbarico II: 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19.
De ultima quarta feria: 19.
 deity, material conception of: 187.
 demiurge: 133, 146.
 diaconate: 13, 21.
 Didymus the Blind: 181.
 discipline, ecclesiastical: 21.
 dissensions, ecclesiastical: 38.
 Divine Light: 133.
 divinity, Gnostic concept of: 138; passibility of: 203.
 Docetism: 43, 148.
 doctrinal errors: 42.
 Donatism: 8, 29, 47, 48, 50, 109-111, 193-198; bibliography: 193; Augustinian bibliography on: 193-194; essence of: 195.
 Donatists, schisms among: 197.
 Donatus: 193-198.
 Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casae Nigrae: 195-196.
 Dositheus: 148.
 dualism: 191.
 Easter, celebration of: 150.
 eating unseen: 202.
 Ebionites: 69, 134, 139, 140, 147, 185.
 Ebionitism: 148.
 Edict of Toleration: 194-195.
 Egyptian monks, confusion of with Vadiani: 178.
 Elkesai: 140-141, 151.
 Elcesaites (Elkesaites): 79, 134, 140, 151.
 emanation theory: 133, 138.
 Encratites: 29, 155, 182.
Ennaratio in Psalm. 118: 35.
Ennarationes in Psalmos: 33.
Enneads of Plotinus: 35.
 Ephesians: 43.
 Epictetus: 206.
 Epigonus, disciple of Noëtus: 153.
 Epiphanius: 1, 3, 8, 9, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 36, 51, 132-186 *passim*, 190, 191; Carthaginian translation of: 6; use of by Augustine: 187; in letters of Augustine: 3, 4, 7; life and works: 132, 146.
 Essene: 140.
Eternels: 107, 192.
 etymologies: 27.
 Eucharist, water instead of wine in (Ebionites, Tatianites, Marcionites, Manichaeans): 190.
 Euchites: 185-186.
 Eudoxius of Constantinople: 179.
 Eugippius: 1.
 Eunomius: 179, 180.
 Eunomius of Cappadocia: 182-183.
 Eunomians: 183.
 Euphemites: 185-186.
 Eusebius: 29, 30, 192; Augustine's use of Greek text: 207; *Church History*: 9, 28; *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6. 37: 207.
 Eusebius of Nicomedia: 180.
 Eustathius of Sebasteia: 181, 182.
 Excalceati: 192.
 Excesses, sexual: 208.
 Encratites: 75, 147-148.
 exegesis: 51, 152.
ἐκκρεαίς: 148.
 Fabricius: 203, 204, 205.
 factions: 42.
 faith: 43, 45, 49, 50; denial of: 141.
 false doctrines: 43.
 fast and abstinence: 147.
 Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, distinction of: 179.
 Fathers, of the Church: 42, 43, 46, 50.
 Felix of Aptunga: 194.
 Filastrius: 1, 8, 9, 22, 25, 26, 30, 146, 181-205 *passim*; use of by Augustine: 187; in letters of Augustine: 3, 4, 7; opinion of by Augustine and others: 26.
 Florians: 107, 191-192.
 Florinus: 191.
 forms, three in God: 115, 203.
 Galeardi: 204.
 Gennadius: 12.
 Genseric: 16.

- Glaucias, disciple of St. Peter: 136.
γνώσις: 132.
 Gnosis: 136, 144.
 Gnostic conception of matter as evil: 173.
 Gnostic sect: 136, 189, 190.
 Gnosticism: 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 154, 188, 203; use of term: 132-133, 137, 138; explained: 132-134; origin of evil: 144; Christian forms of: 133; divisions of: 133; reflections of in New Testament: 133; monistic: 133; dualistic: 133; syncretistic: 134; Syrian: 135; opposition to: 156; Valentinian: 191; and Manichaeism, mixture of: 199.
 God: of New Testament: 146; of Old Testament: 146; the known and just: 146; the unknown and good: 146; author of evil: 191-192; a corporeal being: 208.
 gods, two: 146.
 Gospel of Judas: 145.
 Gospels: 43.
 Grace: 213, 214; and free will: 213.
 Greek: 30; current opinions on Augustine's knowledge of: 31; Quodvuldeus' ignorance of: 31; translated by Augustine: 31; commentators: 33; theologians: 34; Biblical: 35; translations: 35; Augustine's knowledge of: 28-29, 31-37; knowledge of in the West: 37; hellenistic: 39.
 Greeks: in Hippo: 35.
De haeresibus: second book planned: 8, 9, 10.
De haeresibus liber: 25.
haeresis: 37, 38, 40, 44, 49.
 heaven, not for children: 173.
 Helena: 135.
 Hellenistic: 40; Greek: 39; Age: 132.
 Helvidians: 119, 207-208.
 Helvidius: 185, 207.
 Heracleonites: 71, 143.
 heresies: 22, 42; anonymous: 26; various confused into one: 185.
 heresy: 41, 43, 49, 52; writers on: 1; difficulty in defining: 7; manual of: 9; detection of: 21; refutation of: 22, 23; anonymous: 25; history of: 25; etymology of: 43; and schism, synonymous use of: 46; fluctuation in Augustine's concept of: 46-47; defined by Cresconius: 47; and schism: 47; concept of: 50; list of: 60-63; father of: 135.
 heretic, first put to death: 199.
 heretics: 43, 44, 49, 51; reason for considering: 50.
 Hermians: 105, 188.
 Hermias: 188.
 Hermogenes: 134, 188.
 Hermogenians: 188.
 Herodotus: 38.
 heterodox: 39, 41.
 Hieracas (*Hierax*): 172-173.
 Hieracites: 97, 172-173.
 Hippo: 31.
 Hippolytus, Saint: 22, 137, 153.
hoc: 210.
 Holy Eucharist, water instead of wine in: 149.
 Holy Ghost: 148, 152, 155; female: 151; divinity of: 179; creature of the Son: 180; heresy on: 181; action in Church according to Tertullian: 209.
 Holy Scripture, surrender of: 194.
 Homoeans: 179.
 human nature, Stoic concept of: 212.
 homoiousian: 180.
 homousian: 181.
 Homuncionitae: 204.
 Hydroparastatae: 190.
 Hydrothetiae: 204.
 Hylici: 145.
 Iamblichus: 131-132.
 Ignatius, Saint: 43.
 Initiarii: 205.
 Irenaeus, Saint: 1, 22, 43, 143, 191.
 image of God, body of man, not soul: 115, 204.
 innocence of Paradise: 150.
 Innocent I, Pope: 214.
Indiculus: 28.

- Isidore, of Seville: 27.
 Isidore, son of Basilides: 136.
- Jannaccone, S.: 5-6, 46n, 56, 162.
- Jewish-Christian: 139, 140.
 Jewish sects: 23.
- Jerome: 33, 43, 44, 130, 214; *Adversus Jovinianum*: 206; *De perpetua virginitate beatae Mariae adversus Helvidium*: 207; against Pelagius: 213; catalogue of heresies: 216; *Dialogus contra Pelagianos*: 213; Epistula 133 (Letter to Ctesiphon): 213; *De viris illustribus*: 216.
- Jerusalem, destruction of: 139-140.
- Jesus: 145; in Gnostic thought: 136; Christ: 140.
- John Chrysostom, Saint, *Homilies to the Neophytes*: 31.
- John, Saint, the Evangelist: 150; his Gospel: 38.
- John, bishop of Jerusalem: 214.
- Joseph, father of children of Mary: 185.
- Josephus: 39, 40; *Antiquities* of: 35.
- Jovinian: 185, 206.
- Jovinianists: 117, 206.
- Judaism: 39, 40, 146, 151; syncretistic, and Gnosticism: 134, 139.
- Judaeo-Hellenistic communities: 39.
- Julian, the Pelagian: 4, 5, 6.
- Julius Cassian: 148.
- Justin, the Gnostic: 134.
- Justin, the Martyr: 1, 148.
- Kathapoi*: 153.
- Latin language: 33, 38, 44.
 "lapsi": 154, 174.
- Law, the, its fulfillment in Christ: 41.
- letters, exchange of between Augustine and Quodvultdeus: 21-22.
- Liberati: 205.
- libertinism: 135.
- letter to Flora, of Ptolemaeus: 142.
- Logos: 152, 157, 177, 183; deniers of: 150; divine: 184.
- Lord's brethren: 185.
- Lucan: 29.
- Lucifer Calaris: 205.
- Luciferians: 26, 115-117, 205-206.
- Macedonians: 99, 180, 181.
- Macedonius: 180.
- Majorinus: 194.
- Mandaism: 161.
- Manes: 162.
- Mani: life of: 161; Crucifixion of: 161; discussion of name: 161-162; Passion of: 161.
- Manichaeism: cosmogony: 162; dualism: 162, 172; *Kephalaia*: 162; Light and Dark, Manichaeism struggle of: 162-163; morals: 165; Myth: 163-164; Church: 165; abstinence: 168; belief, consequences of: 168; Metempsychosis: 168-169; Docetism: 170; salvation: 170, 172; baptism: 171; determinism: 171; hierarchy: 171.
- Manichaeans: 8, 85-97; 158-172; bibliography on: 158; Augustine's writings on: 158-159; explanation of: 159; our sources of information of: 160-161; Buddhist elements in: 161; value of Augustine's anti-Manichaean Works: 162; the Three Moments in: 162; the two Principles of: 162; the two Roots of: 162; Augustine on morals of: 167-168; charges against: 168.
- Manichaeism: archons: 163; Adam: 163, 164, 169-172; Jesus (ϋουϋ): 164; Eve: 164, 169-170; imprisonment of Light elements in: 164-165; Auditors: 165; Elect: 165; forgiveness of sin: 169; Christ in: 170; Gnostic elements in: 170; treatment of New Testament in: 170; Holy Ghost in: 170-171; spread of: 171; sun and moon in: 171; dying form of paganism: 212.
- Manichaeus: 162.
- Manikhaos: 162.
- Marcellians: 29.

- Marcellina, disciple of Carpocrates: 138.
 Marcellus of Ancyra: 157.
 Marcion: 134, 146-147, 152.
 Marcionites: 73.
 Marcus (Gnostic): 71, 142, 190.
 marriage, rejection of: 150, 173.
 marriage, condemnation of: 154, 201.
 marriages, condemnation of second (Tertullian): 209.
 Marsyas, worship of: 189.
 martyrdom, Circumcellions' passion for: 196-197.
 martyrdom, undue enthusiasm for: 194.
 Martyriani: 186.
 Mary, adversaries of: 185; children of by Joseph: 185; Virginity of: 185.
 Massalians: 103, 185, 186.
 materialism: 207.
 Matthias, Apostle: 136.
 Maximian: 197.
 Maximianists: 197.
 Maximilla, Montanist: 148, 149.
 Mazdaism: 161.
 Melchisedech: 152.
 Melchisedechians: 79, 152.
 Meletians: 97, 173-174, 175.
 Meletius: 173-174, 175.
 Melitonii: 204.
 Menander: 135, 136.
 Menandrians: 65, 135.
 Mensurius: 194.
 Merinthians: 139.
 Merinthus: 139.
 Messalians: 185.
 Messiah: 140.
 Metangismonites: 105, 187.
 mñm: 39.
 Monarchianism: 155, 157.
 Monarchians: 155.
 monism: 141, 147.
 monks: 186.
 Montanism: 150; Tertullian and: 209.
 Montanists: 75, 148-149, 190; of Carthage: 208; African: 209.
 Montanus: 150.
 Montenses: 196.
 Mosaic Law: 140, 142.
 Nakedness, practice of Adamiani: 150.
 Nativitarii: 205.
 natural science, errors in: 49.
 Nazarenes: 69, 139-140.
 New Testament: 38, 41, 42; God: 133; commentators on: 143.
 Nicholas: 137.
 Nicolaïtes: 65, 137-138.
 Noëtians: 79, 155.
 Noëtus: 153, 155.
 νοῦς: 136, 184.
 Novatian: 44, 153-154, 194.
 Novatianism, Donatism and: 215.
 Novatians: 155.
 Novatianus: 154.
 Novatus: 154.
 Old Testament: God: 133, 144; evil doers of honored: 145; opposition to: 146, 147; opposition between the New Testament and: 146, 173.
 δμοιοι: 179.
 δμοιοῦσιος: 179, 183.
 δμοούσιος: 179, 183.
 Onesimus: 43.
 Ophites: 71, 134, 138, 141, 144, 145.
 Oriental religion: 132.
 Origen: 51, 156, 204, 207; on resurrection: 173; exegesis of: 178; opposition to by Egyptian monks: 178; opposition to theology of: 178.
 original sin: 215.
 Origenistic controversies: 178.
 Origenists: 83, 85, 156.
 Orontius: 3.
 Orosius: 214.
 orthodox: 41.
 paganism: dying: 212; Manichaeism: 212; Pelagianism: 212.
 Panarion (Medicine Chest): 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 207; form of: 186-187.
 Paraclete: 148.
 Parmenian: 197.
 parties (αἵρεσις): 42.
 party, meaning "sect": 40.

- Passalorynchitae: 107, 190.
πάσσαλος: 190.
 Paterniani: 119, 208.
 Patriciani: 105-107, 189.
 Patripassianism: 153.
 Paul, First Epistle to the Corinthians: 38.
 Paul, bishop of Constantinople: 180.
 Paul, of Samosata: 157.
 Paulianists: 30, 85, 157.
 Paulinus, of Milan: 213.
 Pelagian controversy: 34, 35.
 Pelagianism: 50; bibliography of: 210; explanation of: 210-211; at Rome: 212; fundamental principle of: 212.
 Pelagians: 8, 29, 49, 123-125, 210-216.
 Pelagius: 211-216; name: 211; origin: 211; ecclesiastical status: 212; at Rome: 212-213; at Carthage: 213; at Palestine: 213; at Syracuse: 213; *De natura*: 213; *De libero arbitrio*: 213, 215; writings of: 215.
 penance, controversy in papacy of Callistus: 141, 151, 153-154.
 Pentateuch criticism: 142.
Πεντάτευκος: 142.
 Pepuza: 149.
 Pepuziani: 77, 149.
 Pepuzians: 29.
 Peripneumones: 205.
 Perpetua and Felicitas, Saints: 14, 18.
 persecution, Diocletian's: 194.
 person, unity of in Christ: 177.
 Peter, bishop of Alexandria: 173-174, 175.
 Pharisees: 23, 40, 41.
 Philo: 39.
 Philocalus: 3, 4.
 philosophical schools: 23.
 philosophy: history of: 131; Platonic: 138; Greek: 132.
 Philumene, associate of Apelles: 147.
 Photinians: 30, 85, 157.
 Photinus: 157.
 Phrygia: 148-149.
 Pistis Sophia: 134.
 Plato: *Phaedrus*: 138.
 Platonic thought: 145, 156, 184.
 pleroma: 133.
 Plotinus: 131; *Enneads*: 35.
πνεῦμα: 184.
 Pneumatici: 145.
 Pneumatomachi: 180.
πνοή: 33.
 Porphyry: 131.
 Possidius: *Vita Augustini*: 10n.
Prædestinatus: 192, 202, 203, 204, 205, 208.
praescriptio: 209.
 Praxeas: 155.
 prayer, extremes in: 51; in Pelagianism: 214.
 "praying people": 185.
 Primasius: 1.
 Primian: 197.
 Prisca (Priscilla), disciple of Montanus: 148-149.
 Priscillian: 199-202; writings discussed: 199-200; differences of opinions on teachings of: 200.
 Priscillianism, explanation of: 198-199; abstinence in: 201.
 Priscillianists: 111-113, 198-202.
 Proclianitae: 105, 189.
 Proclinus: 188.
 private property, rejection of: 154.
 Prosper of Aquitaine, authorship of the *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei* discussed: 13-14.
 Prudentius: 203.
 pseudo-Augustinian sermons: 11-22.
 pseudo-Clementine homilies: 134.
 Pseudo-Jerome: 9; *Indiculus de haeresibus*: 26, 27, 216.
 Pseudo-Prosper: 17, 18.
 Psychici: 145.
 Psychopneumones: 205.
 Ptolemaei: 71, 142.
 Ptolomaeus: 71, 142, 143.
 purification of spirit, Manichaean: 166-167.
ψυχή: 184.
ψυχή ἀλογος: 184.
ψυχή λογική: 184.
 Pythagoreans: 190.
Quaestiones in Heptateuchum: 33.

- Quartodecimani: 150.
 Quartodecimanism: 178.
 Quintilla: 149.
 Quintilliani: 77, 149.
 Quodvultdeus: 19n, 31, 37; exchange of letters with Augustine: 2-6, 7, 10, 13; objection to using Epiphanius and Filastrius: 4; deacon: 10-21; sermons attributed to: 13; identification of bishop with deacon: 13, 14n, 15, 18, 22; identification of bishop with deacon challenged: 17; literary abilities: 19; bishop of Carthage: 12, 14, 20, 21; identification of: 20, 21, 37.
 Rabbinical views: 41.
 Rabbis: 39.
 Redemption, Gnostic concept of: 133, 135; dualistic: 136.
regula fidei: 50.
 religion, eclecticism in: 203.
 "Renuntians": 155.
 restoration, theory of: 156.
 resurrection of body: 141; denial of: 145, 146, 173.
Retractationes: 1, 5, 6.
 Revelation, Divine: 51.
 revelation, of the Montanists: 148.
 revelations: 151.
 Rhetorians: 113, 202, 207.
 Rhetorius: 202-203.
 Rogatus, bishop of Cartennae: 197.
 Rome: 147.
 Rufinus: 28, 29, 207.
ρύγχος: 190.
 Sabellianism: 157, 202.
 Sabellians: 81-83, 155, 188.
 Sabellius: 153, 155.
 sacraments: 46, 185; rejection of: 145; theory on validity of: 194.
 sacrifice, bread and cheese in: 149-150.
 Sadducees: 40, 41.
 salvation, by faith alone: 206.
 Salvian: 14.
 Sampsaeans: 140.
 Sampsaeos: 79, 151.
sancote as term of address: 130.
 Sataniani: 186, 192.
 Satanniani: 192.
 Satannius: 192.
 Satan worshippers: 186.
 Satornilus: 135.
 Saturnians: 65, 135-136.
 Saturnilus: 134, 135.
 Saturninus: 135.
 schism: 45; distinct from heresy: 43-44; etymology of: 45.
schisma: 37, 38, 44, 49.
 schismatics: 44, 51.
 Scripture, commentaries on: 32, 152.
 sect: 40, 45.
secta: 40.
 sects: 41, 42.
 Secundiani: 71, 142.
 Secundus: 142.
 Seleucians: 105, 188.
 Seleucus: 188.
 Semi-Arians: 99, 179, 180, 181, 183, 205.
 sensual excesses, of Nicholas: 137.
 Serapion, bishop of Thmuis: 180.
 sermons, attributed to Quodvultdeus: 13.
 Septuagint: 32, 34, 39.
 serpent worship: 144, 145.
 Seth: 145.
 Sethians: 73, 145.
 Severians: 75, 147.
 Severus: 148.
 sexual excess, of Adamites: 151.
 shoes, wearing of sinful: 109, 192.
 Sibylline Oracles: 35.
 Sidonius Appollinaris: 131.
 Simonians: 63-65, 134.
 Simon Magnus: 133, 134-135, 139.
 sin, forgiveness of: 141.
 sins, equality of: 206.
 Siricius, Pope: 206.
 Smith and Wace: 207.
σωμα: 184.
 Son, beginning of in time: 115, 205; not like the Father: 183.
 soul, origin of: 51.
 souls of wicked, change of into demons: 115, 204-205, 209.
 Stoics: 23, 206, 208.
 substantia: 208.
σχιζμα: 38.

- σχίσμα*: 38, 41, 42.
 Symmachus: 203.
 syncretism: 132, 139, 147; syncretism, Babylonian: 161.
 Synod of Diospolis: 213, 214.
 Synod of Jerusalem, 214.
 Synod of Palestine: 215.
Syntagma of St. Hippolytus: 1, 25, 209.
 Tascodrugitae: 190.
 Tatian: 75, 134, 147, 148, 207.
 Tatians: 29, 75, 147, 148, 155; abstinence among: 148.
 Tertullian: 43, 44, 52, 149, 188; on corporeality of God: 208; on corporeality of the soul: 208; *De monogamia*: 209; *De praescriptione haereticorum*: 209.
 Tertullianists: 119, 208-209; Cyprian on: 208; Optatus on: 208.
 Tertulii: 204.
 Tessarescaedecatitae: 77, 150.
 Themistius, rhetor: 203.
 Theodotians: 79, 152.
 Theodotus, the Elder: 152; the Younger: 152.
 theological error: 49; methods of determining: 50.
 Theopassiani: 203.
 Theopontiae: 203.
 Therapeutae: 39.
 Thnetopsychitae: 207.
 Tixeront, J.: 179.
Tractatus in Ioannem: 33.
traditio: 195.
 Trallians: 43.
 Triformiani: 203.
 Triformii: 203.
 Trinitarian heresy: 196.
De trinitate: 33.
 Trinity: 155, 202; heresy on: 153, 177.
 Triscilidae: 203.
Τυρός: 149.
 Tychonius: 197.
 Tymium: 149.
 Urbanenses: 197.
 Vadiani: 99, 178.
 Vadianites: 51.
 Valentinians: 69-70, 141; unknown: 143.
 Valentinus: 141, 142, 143, 144, 152; father of Gnostic heresy: 141.
 Valesians: 79, 153.
 Vandal Invasion: 20.
 Vandals: 11, 12.
 Vandal sermons, common authorship of: 15.
Veneratio: 130.
 Venustiani: 208.
 Victor, I, Pope: 152, 191.
 Victor de Vita: 14.
 Victor of Garba: 196.
De viris illustribus, of Jerome: 28.
 Voconius: 12.
 Vulgate: 40.
 water, coeternal with God: 115, 204.
 world, continuation of in present state: 192.
 worlds innumerable, heresy of: 115, 204.
 Xenophon: 38.
 Zephyrinus, Pope: 155.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
PATRISTIC STUDIES

Edited by Roy J. Deferrari, J. Marshall Campbell, Martin R. P. McGuire, and
Bernard M. Peebles.

- I. **St. Basil and Greek Literature.** By Leo V. Jacks, Ph.D. Price \$1.75.
- II. **The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great.** By J. M. Campbell, Ph.D. 1922. Price \$1.50.
- III. **A Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of the Letters of St. Augustine.** By Sister Wilfrid Parsons, S.N.D., Ph.D. 1923. (Out of Print.)
- IV. **The Syntax of the "De Civitate Dei" of St. Augustine.** By Sister Mary Columkille Colbert, C.C.V.I., Ph.D. 1923. Price \$1.25.
- V. **The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyric Sermons of St. John Chrysostom.** By Thomas E. Ameringer, O.F.M., Ph.D. 1921. Price \$1.00.
- VI. **St. Augustine the Orator. A Study of the Rhetorical Qualities of St. Augustine's "Sermones ad Populum."** By Sister Inviolata Barry, C.D.P., Ph.D. 1924. Price \$2.00.
- VII. **The Clausulae in the "De Civitate Dei" of St. Augustine.** By Rev. Graham Reynolds, Ph.D. 1924. Price \$1.00.
- VIII. **S. Aurelii Augustini Liber De Catechizandis Rudibus. A Translation with a Commentary.** By Rev. J. P. Christopher, Ph.D. 1926. Price \$3.00.
- IX. **Sancti Ambrosii Oratio de Obitu Theodosii: Text, Translation, Introduction, and Commentary.** By Sister Mary Dolorosa Mannix, S.S.J., Ph.D. 1925. Price, \$1.50.
- X. **The Vocabulary of the Moral-Ascetical Works of St. Ambrose. A Study in Latin Lexicography.** By Sister Mary Finbarr Barry, S.S.J., Ph.D. 1926. Price \$1.50.
- XI. **The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom.** By Rev. F. W. A. Dickinson, Ph.D. 1926. Price \$1.25.
- XII. **The Latinity of the Letters of St. Ambrose.** By Sister Miriam Annunciata Adams, O.S.B., Ph.D. 1927. Price \$1.25.
- XIII. **The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil.** By Sister Agnes Clare Way, C.D.P., Ph.D. 1927. Price \$2.00.
- XIV. **The Syntax of the Confessions of St. Augustine.** By Sister Mary Raphael Arts, O.S.B., Ph.D. 1927. Price \$2.00.
- XV. **S. Ambrosii De Nabuthae: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By M. R. P. McGuire, Ph.D. 1927. Price \$1.50.
- XVI. **Vita S. Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi a Paulino Eius Notario ad Beatum Augustinum Conscripta: A Revised Text and Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By Sister Mary Simplicia Kaniecka, Felician Srs., O.S.F., Ph.D. 1928. Price \$1.50.
- XVII. **Encomium of Saint Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, on His Brother Saint Basil, Archbishop of Cappadocian Caesarea. A Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation.** By Sister James Aloysius Stein, C.C.V.I., Ph.D. 1928. Price \$1.75.
- XVIII. **Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography to 527 A.D.** By Sister Lucilla Dinneen, S.E.J., Ph.D. 1929. Price \$1.75.
- XIX. **S. Ambrosii De Helia et Ieiunio: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By Sister Joseph Aloysius Buck, B.V.M., Ph.D. 1929. Price \$1.25.
- XX. **The Use of Indirect Discourse in the Works of St. Ambrose.** By Sister Marie Antoinette Martin, S.S.J., Ph.D. 1930. Price \$1.50.
- XXI. **Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 A.D.** By Sister Mary Bridget O'Brien, R.S.M., Ph.D. 1930. Price \$2.00.

- XXII. St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of Their Rhetorical Qualities and Form.** By Sister M. Albania Burns, S.N.D., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$1.75.
- XXIII. S. Aureli Augustini De Doctrina Christina Liber IV: A Commentary with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation.** By Sister Therese Sullivan, S.N.D., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$1.75.
- XXIV. The Pagan Divinities and Their Worship as Depicted in the Works of Saint Augustine Exclusive of the City of God.** By Sister Mary Daniel Madden, O.S.F., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$2.00.
- XXV. St. Basil and Monasticism.** By Sister Margaret Gertrude Murphy, S.C.N., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$2.00.
- XXVI. The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. Gregory of Nyssa.** By G. W. P. Hoey, S.S., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$1.25.
- XXVII. The Vocabulary of Hegesippus. A Study in Latin Lexicography.** By W. F. Dwyer, S.S., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.25.
- XXVIII. The Life of the North Africans as Revealed in the Sermons of Saint Augustine.** By Sister Marie Madeleine Getty, P. of M., Ph.D. 1930.
Price \$2.00.
- XXIX. Vergil in the Works of St. Ambrose.** By Sister Dorothea Diederich, S.S.N.D., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.50.
- XXX. Nature-Imagery in the Works of Saint Ambrose.** By Sister Mary Theresa of the Cross Springer, S.H.N., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXI. A Study of the Late Latin Vocabulary and of the Preposition and Demonstrative Pronouns in the Confessions of St. Augustine.** By Clement Louis Hrdlicka, O.S.B., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.75.
- XXXII. The Style of the Letters of St. Gregory the Great.** By Sister Mary Borromeo Dunn, O.M., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXIII. Nature-Imagery in the Works of St. Augustine.** By Sister Mary John Holman, O.S.U., Ph.D. 1931.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXIV. S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani De Habitu Virginum: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By Sister Angela Elizabeth Keenan, S.N.D., Ph.D. 1932.
Price \$1.75.
- XXXV. S. Ambrosii de Tobia: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By Lois Miles Zucker, Ph.D. 1933.
Price \$1.25.
- XXXVI. S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani De Mortalitate: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation.** By Mary L. Hannan, Ph.D. 1933.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXVII. The Life of the North Africans as Revealed in the Works of St. Cyprian.** By Daniel David Sullivan, Ph.D. 1933.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXVIII. The Rhetoric of St. Hilary of Poitiers.** By Sister Mary Frances Buttell, S.B.S., Ph.D. 1933.
Price \$1.50.
- XXXIX. Vergil in the Works of Prudentius.** By Brother Albertus Mahoney, C.F.X., Ph.D. 1934.
Price \$2.00.
- XL. A Study of the Clausulae in the Works of St. Ambrose.** By Sister M. Rosella Delaney, O.S.F., Ph.D. 1934.
Price \$1.75.
- XLI. The Syntax of the Prepositions in the Works of St. Hilary.** By Sister Mary Vincentia Brown, O.S.F., Ph.D. 1934.
Price \$1.50.
- XLII. The Vocabulary and Style of the Soliloquies and Dialogues of St. Augustine.** By Sister Inez Bogan, R. S. M., Ph.D. 1935.
Price \$1.50.
- XLIII. A Study of the Nominal Syntax and of Indirect Discourse in Hegesippus.** By John Patrick McCormick, S.S., Ph.D. 1935.
Price \$1.50.
- XLIV. The Rare and Late Latin Nouns, Adjectives, and Adverbs in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei: A Morphological and Semasiological Study.** By Sister Catherine of Siena Mahoney, G.N.S.H., Ph.D. 1935.
Price \$2.00.
- XLV. The Life and Times of St. Augustine as Revealed in His Letters.** By Sister Mary Emily Keenan, S.C.N., Ph.D. 1935.
Price \$2.00.
- XLVI. The Subjunctive in the Letters of St. Augustine.** By Anthony Blase Paluszak, C.P.P.S., Ph.D. 1935.
Price \$2.00.

XLVII. The Vocabulary of St. Hilary of Poitiers as Contained in Commentarii in Mattaeum, Liber I Ad Constantium, and De Trinitate. By Raymond James Kinnavey, Ph.D. 1935. Price \$2.00.

XLVIII. The Clausulae of St. Hilary of Poitiers. By Sister Mary Emmanuel Mann, R.S.M., Ph.D. 1936. Price \$1.75.

XLIX. The Subordinate Temporal, Causal, and Adversative Clauses in the Works of St. Ambrose. By Leo T. Phillips, C.S.V., Ph.D. 1937. Price \$1.50.

L. The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus. By Daniel Christopher Fives, S.S., Ph.D. 1937. Price \$2.00.

LI. A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome. By Sister Margaret Clare Herron, Ph.D. 1937. Price \$1.75.

LII. Word-Order in the Works of St. Augustine. By Sister Mary Sarah Muldowney, Ph.D. 1937. Price \$2.00.

LIII. The Rare and Late Verbs in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei: A Morphological and Semasiological Study. By Sister M. Bernard Schieman, Ph.D. 1938. Price \$1.50.

LIV. The Syntax of the Simple Cases in St. Hilary of Poitiers. By Brother D. Thomas Gimborn, F.S.C., Ph.D. 1938. Price \$2.00.

LV. The Latinity of the De Vita Contemplativa of Julianus Pomerius. By Sister M. Agnes Cecile Prendergast, O.P., Ph.D. 1938. Price \$2.00.

LVI. The Coordinating Particles in Saints Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine. A Study in Latin Syntax and Style. By Rev. John Hugh Gillis, Ph.D. 1938. Price \$2.00.

LVII. The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great as Revealed in His Works. By Sister Margaret Mary Fox, S.N.D., Ph.D. 1939. Price \$2.00.

LVIII. Sancti Ambrosii Liber De Consolatione Valentiniani: A Text with a Translation, Introduction, and Commentary. By Rev. Thomas A. Kelley, C.S.C., Ph.D. 1939. Price \$2.00.

LIX. The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great. By Rev. William J. Halliwell, Ph.D. 1939. Price \$1.75.

LX. The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome. By John Nicholas Hritzu, Ph.D. 1939. Price \$2.00.

LXI. Word-Order in Selected Sermons of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries. By Mother Myrtle Wilkins, R.S.C.J., Ph.D. 1940. Price \$1.50.

LXII. The Clausulae in the Confessions of St. Augustine. By Sister M. Borromeo Carroll, O.P., Ph.D. 1940. Price \$2.00.

LXIII. The Life and Times of Synesius of Cyrene as Revealed in His Works. By Rev. Jose C. Pando, C.M., Ph.D. 1940. Price \$2.00.

LXIV. Portrait of the Consecrated Woman in Greek Christian Literature of the First Four Centuries. By Sister M. Rosamond Nugent, O.S.F., Ph.D. 1941. Price \$2.00.

LXV. Nature Allusions in the Works of Clement of Alexandria. By Mable Gant Murphy, Ph.D. 1941. Price \$2.00.

LXVI. Ovid in the Contra Orationem Symmachi of Prudentius. By Sister Marie Liguori Ewald, I.H.M., Ph.D. 1942. Price \$2.00.

LXVII. The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great. By Sister Magdeleine Mueller, O.S.F., Ph.D. 1943. Price \$2.75.

LXVIII. The Late Greek Optative and Its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen. By Sister Rose de Lima Henry, Ph.D. 1943. Price \$1.25.

LXIX. The Influence of Ovid on Claudian. By Annette Hawkins Eaton, Ph.D. 1943. Price \$1.50.

LXX. Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome Exclusive of His Letters. By Sister M. Jamesetta Kelly, O.P., Ph.D. 1943. Price \$2.00.

LXXI. A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's "De Sacerdotio." By Rev. William A. Maat, O.S.B., Ph.D. 1944. Price \$1.00.

LXXII. S. Aureli Augustini De Beata Vita. A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. By Ruth Allison Brown, Ph.D. 1944. Price \$2.00.

LXXIII. Rufinus, the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as Illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen. By Sister M. Monica Wagner, C.S.C., Ph.D. 1945. Price \$1.00.

LXXIV. The Commonitorium of Orientius: An Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. By Sister Mildred Dolores Tobin, C.S.C., Ph.D. 1945. Price \$1.50.

LXXV. Nature and the Vocabulary of Nature in the Works of Saint Cyprian. By Sister Mary Tarcisia Ball, Ph.D. 1946. Price \$3.25.

LXXVI. The Syntax of the Nominal Forms of the Verb, Exclusive of the Participle, in St. Hilary. By Richard B. Sherlock, C.M., Ph.D. 1947. Price \$4.00.

LXXVII. A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine. By Sister M. Josephine Brennan, I.H.M., Ph.D. 1947. Price \$1.50.

LXXVIII. The Usage of *Ἀσκήω* and its Cognates in Greek Documents in 100 A.D. By Rev. Hermigild Dressler, O.F.M., Ph.D. 1948. Price \$1.00.

LXXIX. The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa As Reflected in the Letters and Contra Eunomium. By Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin, Ph.D. 1948. Price \$2.50.

LXXX. Some Reflections on Life in North Africa in the Writings of Tertullian. By Sister Margaret Mary Baney, Ph.D. 1948. Price \$1.75.

LXXXI. The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries By Robert Wilde, Ph.D. 1949. Price \$2.75.

LXXXII. The Attitude of the Early Christian Latin Writers Toward Pagan Literature and Learning, By Gerard L. Ellspermann, O.S.B., Ph.D. 1949. Price \$3.00.

LXXXIII. Consolation in Saint Augustine. By Sister Mary Melchoir Beyenka, O.P., Ph.D. 1950. Price \$1.50.

LXXXIV. Saint Augustine's De Fide Rerum Quae Non Videntur: A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By Sister Mary Francis McDonald, O. P., Ph.D. 1950. Price \$1.75.

LXXXV. Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Utilitate Ieiunii: A Text with a Translation, Introduction and Commentary. By Brother S. Dominic Ruegg, F.S.C., Ph.D. 1951. Price \$1.50.

LXXXVI. Studies in the Political and Socio-Religious Terminology of the De Civitate Dei. By R. T. Marshall, Ph.D. 1952. Price \$1.25.

LXXXVII. Studies on the Style of the De Vocatione Omnium Gentium Ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine. By Joseph James Young, Ph.D. 1952. Price \$2.25.

LXXXVIII. The De Natura Boni of Saint Augustine: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. By Brother A. Anthony Moon, F.S.C., Ph.D. 1955. Price \$3.00.

LXXXIX. Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Excidio Urbis Romae Sermo: A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By Sister Marie Vianney O'Reilly, C.S.J., Ph.D. 1955. Price \$1.25.

XC. The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. By Reverend Liguori G. Müller, O.F.M., Ph.D. 1956. Price \$2.50.

The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter. A Study in Greek Epistolography. By F. X. J. Exler, O.Praem., Ph.D. 1925. Price \$1.75.

Greek and Latin in College Entrance and Graduation Requirements. By Brother Giles, C.F.X., Ph.D. 1925. Price \$2.00.

Copies may be obtained by addressing the publishers

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS

Washington 17, D. C.

