

THE  
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,  
No. LX.  
AND  
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.  
No. XCII.

---

OCTOBER, 1858.

---

ARTICLE I.

MESHAKAH ON SCEPTICISM.<sup>1</sup>

*Introduction.*

THE old records of Assyria are being disentombed and read by Biblical scholars with eager interest; but the buried intellect of the East, also, being raised from the grave of centuries, is no less worthy of our regard. As Christians, we have a special interest in the converts brought to Jesus by our missionaries; and it is a duty we owe no less to ourselves than to them, that we become acquainted with the living stones there built up a spiritual house, and their agency in still further advancing the kingdom of our Lord. It may benefit, also, any surviving remnants of that class who used to think any one fit to be a missionary, to take the measure of one of the minds with which they have to deal;

---

<sup>1</sup> A Treatise entitled: An Argument on the Weakness of Man, written by Mikhael Meshakah of Damascus. Prov. 3: 7 and 5: "Be not wise in thine own eyes, and lean not unto thine own understanding." Job 38: 33: "Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?" Beirut, 1853. — The date is inserted here for convenience of reference. In the original, as in Arabic generally, it is placed at the foot of the last page in the book.

shall be assigned his eternal abode in the fire of hell and the society of devils and their reprobate companions. Then let us beseech the Most High to have compassion on the work of his hands, and in mercy bestow on all the sons of men a docile spirit, and lead them to the knowledge of the truth, that they may have an opportunity for salvation and attain to the everlasting glory that is prepared for them in heaven from before the foundation of the world, that they may praise and glorify him for ever and ever. Amen.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE CONFLICT OF TRINITARIANISM AND UNITARIANISM IN THE ANTE-NICENE AGE.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

THE doctrine of the holy Trinity, that is, of the living and only true God, Father, Son, and Spirit, the source of creation, redemption, and sanctification, has in all ages been regarded as the sacred symbol and the fundamental article of the Christian system, in distinction alike from the abstract monotheism of Judaism and Mohammedanism, and from the dualism and polytheism of the heathen religions. The denial of this doctrine implies necessarily also, directly or indirectly, a denial of the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, together with the divine character of the work of redemption and sanctification.

The Bible teaches the Trinity expressly in the baptismal formula, Matt. 28: 19, and in the apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. 13: 14, i. e. in those two passages where all the truths and blessings of Christianity are comprehended in a short summary. These passages, especially the first, form the basis of all the ancient creeds. The Scriptures, however, inculcate the doctrine, not so much in express state-

ments and single passages, as in great living facts; in the history of a threefold revelation of the living God from the creation of the world to its final consummation, when God shall be all in all. Every passage, moreover, which proves the divinity of Christ or the Holy Spirit, proves also the holy Trinity, if we view it in connection with the fundamental doctrine of the divine Unity as revealed in the Old Testament and confirmed in the New.

On this scriptural basis arose the orthodox dogma of the Trinity as brought out in the œcumenical creeds of the Nicene age, and incorporated into the Evangelical Protestant confessions of faith. The same belief directly or indirectly ruled the church from the beginning, even during the ante-Nicene period, although it did not attain its full logical form till the fourth century. The doctrine is primarily of a practically religious nature, and speculative only in a secondary sense. It arose, not from the field of metaphysics, but from that of experience and worship; and not as an abstract, isolated dogma, but in inseparable connection with the study of Christ and of the Holy Ghost; especially in connection with Christology, since all theology proceeds from "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Under the condition of monotheism, this doctrine followed of necessity, as already stated, from the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. The unity of God was already immovably fixed, by the Old Testament, as a fundamental article of revealed religion in opposition to all forms of idolatry. But the New Testament and the Christian consciousness as firmly demanded faith in the divinity of the Son, who effected redemption, and of the Holy Ghost, who founded the church and dwells in believers; and these apparently contradictory interests could be reconciled only in the form of the Trinity;<sup>1</sup> that is, by distinguishing in the one and indivisible essence of God (*οὐσία, φύσις*, substantia, sometimes also, inaccurately, *ὑπόστασις*), three hypostases or persons (*τρεις ὑποστάσεις, τρία πρόσωπα*, personæ); at the

<sup>1</sup> *Τριάς*, first in Theophilus; *trinitas*, first in Tertullian; from the fourth century more distinctly *μονοτηρίς, μὸνὰς ἐν τριάδι, triunitas*.

same time allowing for the insufficiency of all human conceptions and words to describe such an unfathomable mystery.

The Socinian and rationalistic opinion, that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity sprang from Platonism<sup>1</sup> and New-Platonism,<sup>2</sup> is therefore radically false. The Indian Trimurti, altogether pantheistic in spirit, is still further from the Christian Trinity. Only thus much is true: that the Hellenic philosophy operated from without, as a stimulating force upon the form of the whole patristic theology, the doctrines of the Logos and the Trinity among the rest; and that the deeper minds of heathen antiquity discovered a presentiment of a threefold distinction in the divine essence; but only a remote and vague presentiment, which, like all the deeper instincts of the heathen mind, serves to strengthen rather than to weaken the Christian truth. Far clearer and more fruitful suggestions presented themselves in the Old Testament, particularly in the doctrines of the Messiah, of the Spirit, of the Word, and of the Wisdom of God, and even in the system of symbolical numbers, which rests on the sacredness of the numbers three (God), four (the world), seven and twelve (the union of God and the world, hence the covenant number). But the mystery of the Trinity could be fully revealed only in the New Testament after the completion of the work of redemption and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

Again: it was primarily the economic or transitive trinity, which the church had in mind; that is, the trinity of the revelation of God in the threefold work of creation, redemption, and sanctification; the trinity presented in the apostolic writings as a living fact. But from this, in agreement with both reason and Scripture, the immanent or ontologic trinity was inferred; that is, an eternal distinction in the essence

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Plato, Ep. 2 and 6, which, however, are spurious or doubtful. Legg. IV. p. 185. Ὁ θεὸς ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μεσὰ τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων.

<sup>2</sup> Plotin. Enu. V. 1 and Porphyry in Cyril. Alex. c. Jul., who, however, were already unconsciously affected by Christian ideas, speak of *τρῆς ὑποστάσεις*, but in a sense altogether different from that of the church.

of God itself, which reflects itself in its revelation, and can be understood only so far as it manifests itself in its works and words. The divine nature thus came to be conceived, not as an abstract, blank unity, but as an infinite fulness of life; and the Christian idea of God (as John of Damascus has already remarked), in this respect, combined Jewish monotheism with the truth, which lay at the bottom of even the heathen polytheism, though distorted and defaced there beyond recognition. Then for the more definite illustration of this trinity of essence, speculative church teachers of subsequent times appealed to all sorts of analogies in nature, particularly in the sphere of the finite mind, which was made after the image of the divine, and thus to a certain extent authorizes such a parallel. They found a sort of triad in the universal law of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis; in the elements of the syllogism; in the three persons of grammar; in the combination of body, soul, and spirit in man; in the three leading faculties of the soul; in the nature of intelligence and knowledge, as involving a union of the thinking subject and the thought object; and in the nature of love, as likewise a union between the loving and the loved ("ubi amor, ibi trinitas," says St. Augustine). These speculations began with Origen and Tertullian; they were pursued by Athanasius and Augustine, and by the scholastics and the mystics; and they are not yet exhausted. For the holy Trinity, though the most evident, is yet the deepest of mysteries, and can be adequately explained by no analogies from finite and earthly things.

The theological activity of the ante-Nicene, and even of the Nicene period, centred around the divinity of Christ, while the divinity of the Holy Ghost was far less clearly and satisfactorily developed, and was not made the subject of special controversy at all, until the middle of the fourth century, in the dispute with the Macedonians or Pneumatomachians. Hence in the Apostles' Creed only one article (*credo in Spiritum Sanctum*) is devoted to the third person of the holy Trinity, while the confession of the Son of God, in six or seven articles, forms the body of the symbol. The reason is

because the Christological article precedes the pneumatological article in the order of the Christian consciousness, and consequently also in the order of doctrine history. With this connects itself the fact that the Christological dogma was first and chiefly assailed by the early heresies, Ebionism which denied the true divinity of the Saviour, and Gnosticism which denied its true humanity; also by the two classes of Monachians or Unitarians, who either denied the divinity of Christ, like the Ebionites, or sunk it in the divinity of the Father, so as to destroy the proper personality of the Son.

In either dogma, however, we should well remember, that the belief of the ante-Nicene church here is to be inferred by no means simply from express doctrinal passages of the ecclesiastical writers which bear testimony to the divine character of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. The whole worship and practical life of ancient Christianity, up to the apostolic age, furnish as strong an argument for the true belief, as the logical statements. Thus the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord is clearly implied in the custom of the early Christians to sing hymns to Christ as God, which is testified by the heathen governor Plinius under Trajan, and the synod of Antioch, which deposed Paul of Samosata; in the act of baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; in the celebration of the eucharist, or the atoning sacrifice of Christ as the Mediator between God and man and the only source of salvation; in the weekly celebration of his resurrection; in the annual festivals of Easter and Pentecost; in the catechetical use of those early creeds; in the use of emblems and symbols which represent the mystery of the cross; and finally in the martyrdom of so many hundreds and thousands of professors, who would never have sacrificed their life for a mere man.

If we allow these facts their proper weight, the testimony of the ancient church in favor of the divinity of Christ and also of the Holy Ghost, will appear to us far more strong, decided, and overwhelming, than if we take in view merely the express logical statements of the Fathers. For these, it

must be confessed, fall short of the clearness and precision of the Nicene system, and exhibit to us a gradual growth of the church in the knowledge of these divine mysteries.

We now proceed to the patristic statements of the trinity itself. As the doctrines of the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost were but imperfectly developed in logical precision in the ante-Nicene period, the doctrine of the trinity founded on them cannot be expected to be more clear. We find it first in the most simple Biblical and practical shape in all the creeds of the first three centuries (*regulæ fidei, κανόνες τῆς πίστεως*); for these, like the Apostles and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan, are all based on the baptismal formula, and hence arranged in Trinitarian form. Then it appears in the Trinitarian doxologies used in the church from the first, such as occur even in the epistle of the church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp.<sup>1</sup> The sentiment that we rise through the Holy Ghost to the Son, through the Son to the Father, belongs likewise to the age of the immediate disciples of the apostles (in Irenæus, *adv. hæres. V. 36. 2*). Thus far the influence of philosophy upon this doctrine is of course beyond supposition. It began with the apologists.

*Justin Martyr* (died A. D. 166) repeatedly places Father, Son, and Spirit together as objects of divine worship among the Christians (though not as being altogether equal in dignity), and imputes to Plato a presentiment of the doctrine of the Trinity. He was the first to develop the idea of the Logos on the ground of the prologue to the Gospel of John. He distinguishes in the Logos, that is, the divine nature of Christ, two elements, the immanent (*Λόγος εὐδιάθετος*), or that which determines the revelation of God to himself, and the transitive (*Λόγος προφορικός*), in virtue of which God reveals himself to the world. The act of the procession of the Logos from God he illustrates by the figure of generation (*γεννᾶν, γεννᾶσθαι*, comp. the Johannean expression, the only

<sup>1</sup> C. 14, where Polycarp concludes his prayer on the scaffold with the words: *Μεθ' οὗ* (i. e. Christ), *σοι καὶ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας*. Comp. at the end of c. 22: *Ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός . . . φῶς ἡ δόξα, σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

*begotten*), without division or diminution of substance; and in this view the Logos is the only and absolute Son of God, the Only begotten. The generation, however, is not with him an eternal act, grounded in metaphysical necessity, as with Athanasius and in the Nicene orthodoxy, but proceeded from the free will of God. This begotten Logos he conceives as a hypostatical being, a person numerically distinct from the Father. To his agency, before his incarnation, Justin attributes the creation and preservation of the world, all the theophanies, i. e. with him Christophanies of the Old Testament, and also all that is true, rational, and good in the heathen world. In his efforts to reconcile this view with monotheism, he at one time asserts the moral unity of the two divine persons, and at another decidedly subordinates the Son to the Father. He is therefore, as Semisth in his valuable monograph has satisfactorily shown, neither Arian nor Nicene; but his whole theological tendency was evidently towards the Nicene orthodoxy. He likewise broke the way to orthodox pneumatology, although he is far yet from reaching the full idea of essential coequality. In refuting the charge of atheism, raised by the heathens against the Christians, he says (Apol. I. 13), that the Christians worship the Creator of the universe, in the second place (*ἐν δευτέρῃ χώρῃ*) the Son, in the third rank (*ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει*) the prophetic Spirit; thus placing the three divine hypostases in descending gradation as objects of worship.

The other apologists of the second century mark no decided progress either in Christology or pneumatology.

*Athenagoras* confesses his faith in Father, Son, and Spirit, who are one *κατὰ δύναμιν*, but whom he distinguishes as to *τάξις*, in subordinatian style.

*Theophilus* of Antioch (about A. D. 180) is the first to denote the relation of the three divine persons<sup>1</sup> by the term *triad*.

*Origen* (A. D. 180—254) conceives the Trinity as three concentric circles, of which each succeeding one circum-

<sup>1</sup> Θεός, λόγος, and σοφία, by which, like Irenaeus, he means the Holy Ghost.



scribes a smaller area. God the Father acts upon all created being; the Logos, only upon the rational creation; the Holy Ghost, only upon the saints in the church. But the sanctifying work of the Spirit leads back to the Son, and the Son to the Father, who is consequently the ground and end of all being, and stands highest in dignity, as the compass of his operation is the largest. Origen spent the main force of his speculation on the Christological problem. He felt the full importance of this fundamental article, but obscured it by foreign Platonizing speculations, and wavered between the homoousian or orthodox, and the subordinatian theories, which afterwards were brought out in their full antagonism in the Arian controversy. On the one hand, he brings the Son as near as possible to the essence of the Father; not only making him the absolute personal wisdom, truth, righteousness, and reason (*αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτόλογος*, etc.), but also expressly predicating eternity of him. He first clearly propounds the church dogma of the *eternal* generation of the Son. Generally he makes it proceed from the will of the Father, but he represents it also as proceeding from his *essence*, and thus in one passage at least (in a fragment of his Comm. on the Hebrews), he already applies the term *ὁμοούσιος* to the Son, making him equal in substance with the Father. But on the other hand he distinguishes the essence of the Son from that of the Father; speaks of a *εἰερότης τῆς οὐσίας* or *τοῦ ὑπὸ κειμένου*, and makes the Son decidedly inferior, calling him merely *θεός* without the article, i. e. God in an inferior sense (*Deus de Deo*), also *δύτερος θεός*, but the Father God in the absolute sense, *ὁ θεός* (*Deus per se*), or *αὐτόθεος*, and *πληγὴ* and *ρίζα τῆς θεότητος*. Hence he also taught that the Son should not be directly addressed in prayer, but the Father only through the Son in the Holy Ghost.

*Irenæus*, after Polycarp the most faithful representative of the Johannean school (died about A. D. 202) keeps more within the limits of the simple biblical statements, and repudiates any *à priori* or speculative attempts to explain what

he regards an incomprehensible mystery. He is content to define the actual distinction between Father and Son, by saying that the former is God revealing himself, the latter God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other the actual appearing revelation itself. Here he calls the Father the invisible of the Son, and the Son or Logos, the visible of the Father. This is evidently a very close approach to the Nicene homoousia. As to the Trinity, Irenæus goes no further than the baptismal formula and the Trinity of revelation; proceeding on the hypothesis of three successive stages in the development of the kingdom of God on earth, and of a progressive communication of God to the world. He also represents the relation of the persons according to Eph. 4: 6, the Father as above all, and the head of Christ; the Son as through all, and the head of the church; the Spirit as in all, and the fountain of the water of life.<sup>1</sup> Of a supra-mundane Trinity of essence, he betrays but faint indications.

*Tertullian* (died about 120) advances a step. He supposes a distinction in God himself, and on the principle that the created image affords a key to the uncreated original, he illustrates the distinction in the divine nature by the analogy of human thought; the necessity of a self-projection, or a making one's self objective in word, for which he borrows from the Valentinians the term *προβολή* or *prolatio rei alterius ex altera*,<sup>2</sup> but without connecting with it the sensuous emanation theory of the Gnostics. Otherwise he stands on subordinatian ground, if his comparisons of the Trinitarian relation to that of root, stem, and fruit, or fountain, flow, and brook, or sun, ray, and raipoint, be dogmatically pressed.<sup>3</sup> Yet he directly asserts also the essential

<sup>1</sup> Adv. Hæreses, V. 18, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Adv. Prax. c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Tertius — says he, Adv. Prax. c. 8. — est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex fructu, et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine, et tertius a sole ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur, a qua proprietates suas ducit. Ita trinitas (here this word appears for the first time, comp. c. 2: *οικονομία* quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit) per consortes (al. consortes) et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens et monarchiæ nihil obstrepit et *οικονομία* statum protegit. Further, above he says: Nam et radix et frutex duæ res sunt, sed conjunctæ; et fons et flumen duæ species sunt, sed indivisæ; et sol et radius duæ formæ

unity of the three persons.<sup>1</sup> But then this seems to be meant only in a limited sense; for in another passage he bluntly calls the Father the whole divine substance, and the Son a part of it,<sup>2</sup> appealing for this view to John 14: 28: "My Father is greater than I" (which must be understood to apply only to the Christ of history, the *λόγος ἔνσαρκος*, and not to the *λόγος ἄσαρκος*). In other respects Tertullian prepared the way for a clearer distinction between the Trinity of essence and the Trinity of revelation. He teaches a threefold hypostatical existence of the Son (*filiatio*):

1. The preëxistent, eternal immanence of the Son in the Father; they being as inseparable as reason and word in man, who was created in the image of God, and hence in a measure reflects his being.
2. The coming forth of the Son with the Father, for the purpose of the creation.
3. The manifestation of the Son in the world by the incarnation.

The Pneumatology figures very prominently in the Montanistic system, and consequently, also, in Tertullian's theology. He made the Holy Spirit the principle of the highest stage of revelation and the proper essence of the church, but subordinated him to the Son, as he did the Son to the Father; though elsewhere he asserts the *unitas substantiæ*.

With equal energy *Hippolytus* (died about 235), in his recently discovered "Philosophoumena," or, Refutation of all Heresies, combated Patripassianism, and insisted on the recognition of different hypostases, with equal claim to divine worship. Yet he, too, is somewhat trammelled with the subordinationian view.

The same may be said of *Novatian*, of Rome, the schismatic but orthodox contemporary of Cyprian, and author of a special treatise (*De Trinitate*) drawn from the

sunt, sed coherentes. Omne quod prodit ex aliquo secundum sit eius necesse est de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum.

<sup>1</sup> C. 2: Tres autem non statu, sed gradu, nec substantia, sed forma, nec potestate, sed specie, unius autem substantiæ et unius status, et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur.

<sup>2</sup> Adv. Prax. c. 9: Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio totius et portio.

Creed, and fortified with Scripture proofs, against the two classes of Monarchians.

The Roman bishop *Dionysius* (A. D. 262) stood nearest the Nicene doctrine, and may be said to have clearly anticipated it. He maintained distinctly, in the controversy with *Dionysius* of Alexandria, a pupil of Origen, at once the unity of essence and the real personal distinction of the three members of the divine triad, and avoided Tritheism, Sabellianism, and Subordinatianism, with the instinct of orthodoxy, and also, it must be admitted, with the art of anathematizing already familiar to the popes of that age. His view has come down to us in a fragment in *Athanasius*,<sup>1</sup> where it is said: "Then I must declare against those who annihilate the most sacred doctrine of the Church, by dividing and dissolving the unity of God into three powers, separate hypostases, and three deities." This notion (some tritheistic view, not further known to us) is just the opposite of the opinion of Sabellius; for while the latter would introduce the impious doctrine, that the Son is the same as the Father, and the converse, the former teach in some sense three Gods, by dividing the sacred unity into three fully separate hypostases. But the divine Logos must be inseparably united with the God of all, and in God also the Holy Ghost must dwell, so that the divine triad must be comprehended in one, viz.: the all-ruling God, as in a head."<sup>1</sup> Then he condemns the doctrine that the Son is a creature, as "the height of blasphemy," and concludes: "The divine adorable unity must not be thus cut up into three deities; no more may the transcendent dignity and greatness of the Lord be lowered by saying the Son is created; but we must believe in God, the Almighty Father, and in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and must consider the Logos inseparably united with the God of all; for he says: I and my Father are one; and, I am in the Father, and the Father in me. In this way are both the divine triad and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Τὴν θείαν τριάδα εἰς ἓνα ὡσπερ εἰς κορυφὴν τινα, τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων τὸν παντοκράτορα λέγω, συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι τε καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη.

sacred doctrine of the unity of the Godhead preserved inviolate."

This is by far the clearest ante-Nicene statement of the Nicene faith, and closes the development of the dogma within the period to which our essay is limited.

But this is only the positive part of our discussion. To understand it properly, we must now pass under review the Unitarian antithesis in the same period. For this view of the Trinity, which was then more fully brought out in the Arian and semi-Arian controversies of the Nicene age, and finally settled by the oecumenical councils of Nice, A. D. 325, and of Constantinople, A. D. 381, was already in this less definite ante-Nicene form, in great part the result of a conflict with the opponents of the Trinity, who flourished in the third century. These Antitrinitarians are commonly called *Monarchians*, or *Unitarians*, on account of the stress they laid upon the unity (*μοναρχία*) of God.

But we must carefully distinguish among them two opposite classes: the *rationalistic*, or *dynamic* Monarchians, who denied the divinity of Christ, or explained it as a mere power (*δύναμις*); and the *Patripassian* Monarchians, who identified the Son with the Father, and admitted, at most, only a modal Trinity, a threefold mode of revelation. The first form of this heresy, involved in the abstract Jewish Monotheism, deistically sundered the divine and the human, and rose little above Elionism. The second proceeded, at least in part, from pantheistic preconceptions, and approached the ground of Gnostic Docetism. The one prejudiced the dignity of the Son, the other the dignity of the Father; yet the latter was by far the more profound and Christian, and accordingly met with the greater acceptance.

I. The Monarchians of the *first* class saw in Christ a mere man, filled with divine power; but conceived this divine power as operative in him, not from the baptism only, according to the Ebionite view, but from the beginning; and admitted his supernatural generation by the Holy Ghost. To this class belong:

1. The *Alogians* (from *ἄ* and *λόγος*, unreasonable and op-

ponents of the Logos), a heretical sect in Asia Minor, about A. D. 170, of which very little is known. Epiphanius gave them this name, because in the Monarchian interest they rejected the Logos doctrine and the Logos gospel. In opposition to Montanism, they likewise rejected Chiliasm and the Apocalypse. They attributed the writings of John to the Gnostic Cerinthus.

2. The *Theodotians*; so called from their founder, the tanner *Theodotus*. He sprang from Byzantium; denied Christ in a persecution, with the apology that he only denied a man; but still held him to be the supernaturally begotten Messiah. He gained followers in Rome, but was excommunicated by the bishop, Victor (192–202). After his death, his sect chose the confessor Natalis bishop, who is said to have afterwards penitently returned into the bosom of the Catholic Church. A younger Theodotus, the “money-changer,” put Melchisedek as mediator between God and the angels, above Christ, the mediator between God and men; and his followers were called Melchisedekians.

3. The *Artemonites*, or adherents of *Artemon*, who came out somewhat later, at Rome, with a similar opinion; declared the doctrine of the divinity of Christ an innovation, and a relapse to heathen polytheism; and was excommunicated by Zephyrinus (202–217). The Artemonites were charged with placing Euclid and Aristotle above Christ, and esteeming mathematics and dialectics higher than the gospel. This indicates a critical intellectual turn, averse to mystery, and shows that Aristotle was employed, by some, against the divinity of Christ, as Plato was engaged for it. Their assertion, that the true doctrine was obscured in the Roman Church only from the time of Zephyrinus (Euseb. V. 28), is explained by the fact, brought to light recently, through the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus, that Zephyrinus (and perhaps his predecessor, Victor), against the vehement opposition of a portion of the Roman Church, favored Patristianism, and probably in behalf of this doctrine, condemned the Artemonites.

4. *Paul of Samosata*, from 260 bishop of Antioch, and at the same time a civil officer (Ducenarius procurator), denied the personality of the Logos and of the Holy Ghost, and considered them merely powers of God, like reason and mind in man; but granted that the Logos dwelt in Christ in larger measure than in any former messenger of God, and taught, like the Socinians in later times, a gradual elevation of Christ, determined by his own moral development, to divine dignity (*ἡ θεοποίησις ἐκ προκοπῆς*). To introduce his Christology into the mind of the people, he undertook to alter the church hymns, but was wise enough to accommodate himself to the orthodox formulas, calling Christ, for example, *θεὸς ἐκ παρθένου*, and ascribing to him even *ὁμοουσία* with the Father, but of course in his own sense. The bishops under him in Smyrna accused him not only of heresy, but also of extreme vanity, arrogance, pompousness, avarice, and undue concern with secular business; and, at a council in 269, they pronounced his deposition. But as he was favored by the queen, Zenobia of Palmyra, the deposition could not be executed till after her subjection by the emperor Aurelius, in 272, and after consultation with the Italian bishops. His overthrow decided the fall of the Monarchians, though they still appear at the end of the fourth century, as condemned heretics, under the name of Samosatenians, Paulianists, and Sabellians.

II. The *second* class of Monarchians, called by Tertullian *Patripassians* (as afterwards a branch of the Monophysites was called Theopaschites), together with their Unitarian zeal, felt the deeper Christian impulse to hold fast the divinity of Christ, but they sacrificed to it his independent personality, which they merged in the essence of the Father.

1. The first prominent advocate of the Patripassian heresy was *Praxeas* of Asia Minor. He came to Rome under Marcus Aurelius, with the renown of a confessor, procured there the condemnation of Montanism, and propounded his Patripassianism, to which he gained even the bishop Victor. But Tertullian met him, in vindication at once of Montanism and of Hypostasianism, with crushing logic, and

charged him with having executed, at Rome, two commissions of the devil: having driven away the Holy Ghost, and having crucified the Father ("Paracletum fugavit et Patrem crucifixit"). According to Tertullian, Praxeas, constantly appealing to Is. 45: 5, John 10: 30 ("I and my Father are one"), and John 14: 9 seq. ("He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"), as if the whole Bible consisted of these three passages, taught that the Father himself became man, hungered, thirsted, suffered, and died, in Christ. True, he would not be understood as speaking directly of a suffering (*pati*) of the Father, but only of a sympathy (*copati*) of the Father with the Son; but, in any case, he lost the independent personality of the Son. He conceived the relation of the Father to the Son as like that of the spirit to the flesh. The same subject, as spirit, is the Father; as flesh, the Son. He thought the Catholic doctrine tritheistic.

2. *Noetus* of Smyrna published the same view about A. D. 200, appealing also to Rom. 9: 5, where Christ is called the one God over all. When censured by a council, he argued, in vindication of himself, that his doctrine enhanced the glory of Christ.<sup>1</sup> The author of the *Philosophoumena* places him in connection with the pantheistic philosophy of Heraclitus, who, as we here for the first time learn, viewed nature as the harmony of all antitheses, and called the universe at once dissoluble and indissoluble, originated and unoriginated, mortal and immortal; thus, *Noetus* supposed that the same divine subject must be able to combine opposite attributes in itself.

3. *Callistus* (pope Calixtus I.) adopted and advocated the doctrine of *Noetus*, which *Epigonus* and *Cleomenes*, disciples of *Noetus*,<sup>2</sup> propagated in Rome under favor of pope *Zephyrinus*. He declared the Son merely the manifestation of the Father in human form; the Father animating the Son, as the spirit animates the body,<sup>3</sup> and suffering with

<sup>1</sup> Τί οὖν κακὸν ποιῶ, he asked. δοξάζων τὸν Χριστόν;

<sup>2</sup> Not his teachers, as was supposed by former historians, including *Neander*.

<sup>3</sup> John 14: 11.



him on the Cross. "The Father," says he, "who was in the Son, took flesh, and made it God, uniting it with himself, and made it one. Father and Son were therefore the name of the God, and this one person (*πρόσωπον*) cannot be two; thus, the Father suffered with the Son." He considered his opponents "ditheistic" (*διθεοί*), and they, in return, called his followers "Callistians."

These and other disclosures respecting the Church at Rome, during the first quarter of the third century, we owe to the ninth book of the "Philosophoumena" of Hippolytus, which were first published in 1851, and have created so much sensation in the theological world. Hippolytus was, however, it must be remembered, the leading opponent and rival of Callistus, and in his own doctrine of the Trinity inclined to the opposite subordinatian extreme. He calls Callistus, evidently with passion, an "unreasonable and treacherous man, who brought together blasphemies from above and below, only to speak against the truth, and was not ashamed to fall now into the error of Sabellius, now into that of Theodotus" (of which latter, however, he shows no trace). After the death of Callistus, who occupied the papal chair between 219 and 221 or 224, Patripassianism disappeared from the Roman Church.

4. *Beryllus* of Bostra, in Arabia; from him we have only a somewhat obscure and very variously interpreted passage preserved in Eusebius (H. E., VI. 33). He denied the personal preëxistence,<sup>1</sup> and in general the independent divinity (*ἴδια θεότης*) of Christ, but at the same time asserted the indwelling of the divinity of the Father (*ἡ πατρικὴ θεότης*) in him during his earthly life. He forms, in some sense, the stepping stone from simple Patripassianism to Sabellian Modalism. At an Arabian Synod in 244, where the presbyter Origen, then himself accused of heresy, was called into consultation, Beryllus was convinced of his error by that great teacher, and was persuaded particularly of the existence of a human soul in Christ, in place of which he

<sup>1</sup> Ἰδιὰ ἑαυτοῦ ὡς ἀνεξαρτήτου, i. e. a circumscribed, limited, separate existence.

had probably put his *πατρικὴ Θεότης*, as Apollinaris, in a later period, put the *λόγος*. He is said to have thanked Origen afterwards for his instructions. Here we have one of the very few theological disputations which have resulted in unity, instead of greater division.

5. *Sabellius*, we learn from the "Philosophoumena," spent some time in Rome in the beginning of the third century, and was first gained by Callistus to Patripassianism, but when the latter became bishop, about 220, he was excommunicated.<sup>1</sup> Afterwards we find him presbyter of Ptolemais, in Egypt. There his heresy, meantime modified, found so much favor, that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, excommunicated him at a council in that city in 261, and, in vehement opposition to him, declared, in almost Arian terms, for the hypostatical independence and subordination of the Son in relation to the Father. This led the Sabellians to complain of that bishop to Dionysius of Rome, who held a council in 262, and in a special treatise controverted Sabellianism, as well as Subordinationism and Tritheism, with nice orthodox tact. The bishop of Alexandria very cheerfully yielded, and retracted his assertion of the creaturely inferiority of the Son in favor of the orthodox *ὁμοούσιος*. Thus the strife was for a while allayed, to be renewed with still greater violence, by Arius, half a century later.

Sabellius is by far the most original, ingenious, and profound of the Monarchians. His system is known to us only from a few fragments, and some of those not altogether consistent, in Athanasius and other Fathers. It was very fully developed, and has been revived in modern times, by Schleiermacher, in a peculiarly modified form.

While the other Monarchians confine their inquiry to the relation of Father and Son, Sabellius embraces the Holy Ghost in his speculation, and reaches a trinity; not a simultaneous trinity of essence, however, but only a successive trinity of revelation. He starts from a distinction of

---

<sup>1</sup> Or was this possibly another Sabellius?

the monad and the triad in the divine nature. His fundamental thought is, that the unity of God, without distinction in itself, unfolds or extends itself,<sup>1</sup> in the course of the world's development, in three different forms and periods of revelation,<sup>2</sup> and, after the completion of redemption, returns into unity. The Father reveals himself in the giving of the law or the Old Testament economy (not in the creation also; this, in his view, precedes the Trinitarian revelation); the Son, in the incarnation; the Holy Ghost, in inspiration. He illustrates the Trinitarian relation by comparing the Father to the disc of the sun, the Son to its enlightening power, the Spirit to its warming influence. He is said also to have likened the Father to the body, the Son to the soul, the Holy Ghost to the spirit of man; but this is unworthy of his evident speculative discrimination. His view of the Logos,<sup>3</sup> too, is peculiar. The Logos is not identical with the Son, but is the monad itself in its transition to triad; that is, God conceived as vital motion and creating principle, the speaking God (*Θεὸς λαλῶν*), in distinction from the silent God (*Θεὸς σιωπῶν*). Each *πρόσωπον* is another *διαλέγεσθαι*, and the three *πρόσωπα* together are only the successive evolutions of the Logos, or the world-ward aspect of the divine nature. As the Logos proceeded from God, so he returns at last into him, and the process of Trinitarian development (*διάλεξις*) closes.

Athanasius traced the doctrine of Sabellius to the Stoic philosophy. The common element is the pantheistic leading view of an expansion and contraction (*ἔκτασις*, or *πλατυσμός*, and *συστολή*), of the divine nature immanent in the world. In the Pythagorean system also, in the Gospel of the Egyptians, and in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, there are kindred ideas. But the originality of Sabellius cannot be brought into question by these. His theory broke the way for the Nicene church doctrine, by its full

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ μονὰς πλατυθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς.

<sup>2</sup> Ὀνόματα, πρόσωπα, — not in the orthodox sense of the term, however, but in the primary sense of mask, or part (in a play).

<sup>3</sup> Which has been for the first time duly brought out by Dr. Baur.

coördination of the three persons. He differs from the orthodox standard mainly in denying the trinity of essence and the permanence of the trinity of manifestation, making Father, Son, and Holy Ghost only temporary phenomena, which fulfil their mission and return into the abstract monad. The Athanasian or Nicene formula unites the truths of the Sabellian and the hypostasian theories, by teaching the eternal tripersonality in the unity of substance.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### BAPTISM A SYMBOL OF THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE NEW LIFE.

BY REV. H. L. WAYLAND, M. A., WORCESTER, MASS.

THE January number of this periodical contained a very interesting Article, upon "Baptism a Consecratory Rite." The remarks which follow are designed to illustrate the view, that baptism is rather an initiatory rite — is intended to symbolize the commencement of the new Christian life.

In conversion, the soul passes through a change miraculous in its origin, marked in its character, and momentous in its results. The man is changed in his relations to God and to his law. Formerly he was the object of deserved condemnation; now he meets with the benignant smile of his Heavenly Father, and with the full approval of his law. He is changed as to his central motive and leading principle. Formerly he sought his own interests with supreme regard, while the will of God was matter of entire indifference to him. Now it is his supreme desire to please God, and he is regardless of his own interests. This is the theory of conversion, and only as it bears this character has it attained its divine ideal. Corresponding to this inward